

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2005](#) > Feb

UFO UpDates Mailing List Feb 2005



Feb 1:

[Kenny Young Passes](#) - Ron Schaffner [24]
[Re: Kenny Young Passes - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [5]
[Kenny Young](#) - Terry Groff [4]
[Kenny Young](#) - Chaz Stuart [18]
[In Memory Of Kenny](#) - Ron Schaffner [132]
[More Mexican UFO Video](#) - Scott Corrales [32]
[Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [13]
[Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [6]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [13]
[Re: Bad-Think? - King](#) - Kyle King [65]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [20]
[Peter Jennings' UFO Program](#) - Frank Warren [9]
[Re: Hynek Interview? - LeClair](#) - Aaron LeClair [3]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [32]

Feb 2:

[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [186]
[Re: Bad-Think? - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [19]
[Jennings' ABC UFO Special](#) - Rich Reynolds [9]
[Re: Bad-Think? - White](#) - Eleanor White [22]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [22]

[Peter Jennings TV Show](#) - Stanton Friedman [10]
[Re: Bad-Think? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]
[Zamora & The Bean?](#) - Kyle King [105]
[Newspaper's Switchboard Jammed With UFO Reports](#) - Stig Agermose [23]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hebert](#) - Amy Hebert [30]
[Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?](#) - Stuart Miller [12]
[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 5](#) - John Hayes [693]
[Kenny Young](#) - Brian Adams [7]
[Sonora UFO Sightings](#) - Frank Warren [49]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [42]
[Re: Aliens Of The Deep - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [5]
[Secrecy News -- 02/01/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [132]
[Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle](#) - Peter Rogerson [20]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [16]
[14 "Lightbulbs" In Yorkshire Sky](#) - Frank Warren [23]
[Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle](#) - Larry Hatch [13]
[Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle](#) - Larry Hatch [8]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [3]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [5]
[Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [29]
[Re: Bad-Think? - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [12]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [5]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Jamieson](#) - Sue Jamieson [16]
[Re: Mysteries Lurk Between The Walls Of Capitol](#) - Terry W. Colvin [89]
[Kenny Young](#) - Royce J. Myers III [13]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [10]
[Re: Jennings' ABC UFO Special - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [23]
[Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [8]
[Re: Aliens Of The Deep - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [24]
[Re: Peter Jennings UFO Show - Fortson](#) - Mike Fortson [11]
[Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle](#) - Joe McGonagle [11]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [7]

Feb 3:

[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [17]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - King](#) - Kyle King [30]
[Re: Bad-Think? - King](#) - Kyle King [26]
[Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [6]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [7]
[Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [9]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [110]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [8]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith](#) - James Smith [63]
[Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle](#) - Christopher Allan [32]
[Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [25]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Davenport](#) - Peter Davenport - NUFORC [25]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith](#) - James Smith [13]
[Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [8]
[Re: Zamora & The Bean? - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [23]
[Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle](#) - Peter Rogerson [18]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bueche](#) - Will Bueche [15]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bueche](#) - Will Bueche [3]

[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [288]
[Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -](#) - Larry Hatch [5]
[Re: Kenny Young - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [13]
[Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI'](#) - Isaac Koi [107]
[Re: PRG/X-Conference 2005 Press Release - 02-03-05](#) - Stephen Bassett [160]
[UFO Groups Clash Over Credibility](#) - Stig Agermose [99]
[Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern](#) - Greg Boone [11]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Colvin](#) - Terry W. Colvin [17]
[The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?](#) - Greg Boone [25]
[MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World](#) - Frank Warren [57]

Feb 4:

[MoD Reveals 88 Sightings In '04](#) - Frank Warren [63]
[Seattle's Museum Of Mysteries](#) - Frank Warren [46]
[Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story](#) - Stig Agermose [85]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [14]
[Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [5]
[Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [18]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [18]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [20]
[Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [15]
[Shirley C. Fickett Passes](#) - Loren Coleman [69]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [6]
[Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [18]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [8]
[Re: Zamora & The Bean? - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [7]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [10]
[Re: Kenny Young - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [4]
[Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Warren](#) - Frank Warren [4]
[UFOs Are Out There Say Real X-Files](#) - Stig Agermose [36]
[Scientists Discuss UFOs](#) - Stig Agermose [108]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [31]
[Kenneth Young Obituary](#) - Stig Agermose [40]
[New England Couple's Mystery](#) - Stig Agermose [99]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Freeman](#) - Kelly Freeman [13]
[Secrecy News -- 02/03/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [135]
[Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI'](#) - Don Ledger [10]
[Re: Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [7]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [3]
[Close Encounters With The Human Imagination](#) - Stig Agermose [33]
[NH Man's UFO Beliefs Attract Plenty Of Interest](#) - Stig Agermose [112]
[Re: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World - Boone](#) - Evolbaby@aol.com [37]
[Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [77]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [11]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [30]
[Re: Media UFO Pattern Rrevealed? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [28]

Feb 5:

[UFO Beliefs Attract Plenty Of Earthly Interest](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [109]
[Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News](#) - Josh Goldstein [6]
[Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [12]

[UFO Over Santa Rosa Argentina](#) - Scott Corrales [24]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [28]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [9]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [16]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [115]
[Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [8]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [4]

Feb 6:

[Re: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [10]
[Re: Leather As A Countermeasure? - Menkin](#) - Mike Menkin [26]
[Re: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special? - LeClair](#) - Aaron LeClair [14]
[Re: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time](#) - John Rimmer [7]
[The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [57]
[HypeCouncil Banner Ad For Peter Jennings UFO](#) - Larry Hatch [41]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [11]
[Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [10]
[Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News](#) - Larry Hatch [30]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [19]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [36]
[Re: Kenny Young - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [17]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [29]
[We Need A Memorial](#) - Greg Boone [9]
[Re: Close Encounters With The Human Imagination -](#) - Martin Shough [5]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [135]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [39]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [43]
[Re: ABC UFO Special - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [22]
[Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Harney](#) - John Harney [4]
[Re: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time](#) - Don Ledger [4]
[ABC UFO Aftermath](#) - Greg Boone [29]
[Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [9]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - McCoy](#) - G T McCoy [11]

Feb 7:

[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [16]
[Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News](#) - Jim Deardorff [8]
['A Word To The Wise'](#) - Ray Dickenson [27]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [34]
[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Weber](#) - Bill Weber [16]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -](#) - Michael Salla [75]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [36]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [8]
[Re: Leather As A Countermeasure? - White](#) - Eleanor White [13]
[Re: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [26]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [15]
[Re: We Need A Memorial - Hale](#) - Roy Hale [12]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -](#) - Will Bueche [10]
[Still Searching For Clinton's UFO Quote In Belfast!](#) - Giuliano 'Jimmy' Marinkovic [29]
[Hayakawa Recants?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [91]

[PRG/X-Conference 2005 Press Release 01-09-05](#) - Steven Bassett [136]
[Ufology Needs A Ribbon](#) - Greg Boone [16]
[New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy!](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [67]
[Renaissance Art & Culture Lacks Link To ETs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [137]
[Here's Why I Believe In UFOs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [59]
[It's A Close Encounter In The Park](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [50]

Feb 8:

[Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [15]
[Pulitzer Pass-ups & A "Flatwoods Monster" Redux](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [219]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [16]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [61]
[Minot B-52 Case \[was: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?\]](#) - Gildas Bourdais [115]
[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [20]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [5]
[Infrasound UFO Detection](#) - James Smith [56]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Stanton Friedman [19]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Eleanor White [4]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - White](#) - Eleanor White [3]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Eleanor White [7]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Landahl](#) - Erik Landahl [13]
[Secrecy News -- 02/07/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [97]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [63]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [29]
[Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [5]
[An Open Letter To ABC News' Nightline Program](#) - Larry W. Bryant [44]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [9]
[Re: New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy! -](#) Terry Groff [12]
[Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [5]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [48]
[Satellite Restrictions](#) - Don Ledger [30]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gevaerd](#) - A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO [8]
[Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News](#) - Larry Hatch [11]
[UFO Research Software?](#) - Nikolay Subbotin [14]
[Large Colour Image Of Area 51](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [4]
[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [15]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [4]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Myers](#) - Royce J. Myers III [7]
[Brazilian Physician Compelled To Lie About UFOs](#) - A.J. Gevaerd [240]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [6]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [10]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [24]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [41]
[Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [21]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [8]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [10]
[Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - King](#) - Kyle King [9]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Steven G. Bassett [29]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [18]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - King](#) - Kyle King [6]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [21]
[Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [4]

[Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Scott Corrales [41]

Feb 9:

[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [18]
[How UFOs Relate To The New World Order](#) - William Bolt [158]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - King](#) - Kyle King [54]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Michael Salla [84]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [54]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Christopher Allan [13]
[Youngsters Outstripped At Some Visual Tasks](#) - Joe McGonagle [57]
[Fort Wayne Media Watch \[was: Socorro & Balloons\]](#) - David Rudiak [179]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case](#) - Jan Aldrich [11]
[A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii](#) - Ralph Howard [34]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [60]
[Re: An Open Letter To ABC News' Nightline Program](#) - Stanton Friedman [15]
[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 6](#) - John Hayes [733]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [34]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [8]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [6]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [18]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [48]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [115]
[Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing](#) - Brad Sparks [6]
[Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Escamilla](#) - Becky Escamilla [18]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [101]
[Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - White](#) - Eleanor White [5]
[Crop Circle Documentary Biased](#) - Dave Haith [267]
[SETI Contradiction?](#) - Mac Tonnies [37]
[Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [4]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [7]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Nick Balaskas [21]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [8]
[CI: The Biggest Planetary Anomaly Yet?](#) - Mac Tonnies [76]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Subbotin](#) - Nikolay Subbotin [14]
[UFO Over Hawaii Puzzles Astronomers](#) - Stig Agermose [30]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [21]
[Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gevaerd](#) - A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO [13]
[Salla & Bassett](#) - Josh Goldstein [43]
[Don't Get Me Started The Truth is Not There](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [98]
[Christianity Extraterrestrial Religion?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [125]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [5]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 or 53 - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [36]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [12]
[Re: How UFOs Relate To The New World Order - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [18]
[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [12]
[Re: Youngsters Outstripped At Some Visual Tasks](#) - Martin Shough [4]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [53]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [16]
[Re: Fort Wayne Media Watch - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [40]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [25]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [3]
[Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [13]

[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [7]
[Re: SETI Contradiction? - Deardorff](#) - Jim Deardorff [4]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Don Ledger [6]
[Re: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii - Cammack](#) - Diana Cammack [12]
[Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [17]
[Secrecy News -- 02/09/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [108]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [15]
[Re: Christianity Extraterrestrial Religion? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [14]
[Space Time And Surface Area](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [5]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [28]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [31]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [205]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - King](#) - Kyle King [13]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [13]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [16]

Feb 10:

[Filer's Files #7 - 2005](#) - George A. Filer [557]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [5]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King](#) - Kyle King [14]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [9]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Salla](#) - Michael Salla [122]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - King](#) - Kyle King [37]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [32]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Kimball](#) - Paul Kimball [62]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - King](#) - Kyle King [25]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [41]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Velez](#) - John Velez [8]
[Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Kimball](#) - Paul Kimball [64]
[Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [12]
[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [7]
['Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'](#) - Michael Brownlee [182]
[Re: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [10]
[Re: Brazilian Air Force Spokesman Lies About UFOs](#) - A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO [129]
[UFO Reported Over Billerica](#) - Frank Warren [144]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [20]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith](#) - James Smith [53]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [102]
[Re: Socorro & Balloons - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [217]
[UFO Review issue 8 - February 2005](#) - Stuart Miller [41]
[Re: UFO Reported Over Billerica - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [5]
[Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -](#) - Kyle King [22]

Feb 11:

[Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [17]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [34]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [40]
[Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - White](#) - Eleanor White [8]
[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [9]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [10]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [14]

[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [10]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [7]
[The Fortean Nailgun](#) - Mac Tonnies [61]
[How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?](#) - Eleanor White [36]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [14]
[Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'](#) - Josh Goldstein [5]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Johnson](#) - Donald A. Johnson [21]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos [12]
[Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [34]
[UFO Sighting In Chatteris First Of The Year](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [38]
[What To Tell The Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [75]

Feb 12:

[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [26]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [54]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [22]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Salla](#) - Michael Salla [107]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [71]
[Re: Secrecy News -- 02/11/05 - Aftergood](#) - Steven Aftergood [190]
[Re: Is Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages?](#) - Ray Dickenson [31]
[Re: Socorro and Balloons - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [7]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King](#) - Kyle King [18]
[Advert For ABC TV Special In Newsweek](#) - Will Bueche [7]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - King](#) - Kyle King [23]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [11]
[Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?](#) - Stanton Friedman [18]
[UFO Sighting May Have Educational Explanation](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [30]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [68]
[Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Kimball](#) - Paul Kimball [38]
[Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?](#) - Paul Kimball [43]
[Re: Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call](#) - Paul Kimball [12]
[Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero](#) - Jerome Clark [32]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [26]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [75]
[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [15]
[Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [5]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]
[Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop](#) - Scott Corrales [50]
[Strange Phenomena In Mar del Plata Argentina](#) - Scott Corrales [63]
[Mysterious Prints Found In Argentine Industrial](#) - Scott Corrales [74]
[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [9]
[Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'](#) - Paul Kimball [21]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [35]
[Re: Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call](#) - Nick Balaskas [65]
[Re: The Fortean Nailgun - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [41]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [39]
[Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [11]
[UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [22]

Feb 13:

[Re: UFO Research Software? - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [422]

[Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [38]
[Re: Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [23]
[Re: Underlying Threat Fears \[was: Magonia](#) - John Rimmer [72]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [13]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [3]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [14]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [5]
[Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [47]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [5]
[Re: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop](#) - Larry Hatch [14]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [26]
[Starchild Research Funded](#) - Lloyd Pye [58]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC - King](#) - Kyle King [17]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [7]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [13]
[Re: The Fortean Nailgun - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [22]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [98]
[Magazine Article Help Please!](#) - Ray Boeche [27]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - Brad Sparks [95]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Nick Balaskas [37]
[UFO In Phoenix Sky?](#) - Stig Agermose [19]

Feb 14:

[Recent Iran UFOs US Drones?](#) - Stig Agermose [51]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Hicks](#) - Simon Hicks [2]
['Mysterious Streak' Over Hawaii Generates Wide Buzz](#) - Stig Agermose [50]
[Re: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero - Morton](#) - Dave Morton [13]
[Popular Mechanics On UFO Detector](#) - Stig Agermose [64]
[Radio And TV Shows In Europe?](#) - Giuliano Marinkovic [22]
[Researchers Sure E.T. Life Exists](#) - Stig Agermose [72]
[An Apology From A.J. Gevaerd](#) - A.J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO [10]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [8]
[Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help](#) - Greg Boone [60]
[Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennowitz Book](#) - Greg Bishop [59]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [4]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [18]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Hebert](#) - Amy Hebert [30]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [19]
[The Fermi 'Paradox' - Again](#) - Mac Tonnies [39]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - bruce maccabee [11]

Feb 15:

[Re: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop](#) - Scott Corrales [6]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Stanton Friedman [5]
[New UFO Sightings Maps](#) - Larry Hatch [19]
[Re: Salla & Bassett - Frehley](#) - Paul Frehley [51]
[Re: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [16]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [4]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Bruce Maccabee [23]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Don Ledger [11]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [13]

[Re: Ufology Trapped In The Middle Ages? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [24]
[Re: Popular Mechanics On UFO Detector - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [19]
[Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz](#) - Terry Groff [7]
[Communique Regarding Argentina's Mar del Plata](#) - Scott Corrales [90]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Nick Balaskas [29]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [7]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Don Ledger [47]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [13]
[UFO Hunters Closer To The 'X files' Truth](#) - Stig Agermose [65]
[Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz](#) - Bruce Maccabee [32]
[Re: Researchers Sure E.T. Life Exists - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [5]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [10]
[MUFON N.C. Debates Aztec Crash](#) - Stig Agermose [86]
[Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran](#) - Stig Agermose [68]
[Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -](#) Eleanor White [22]
[Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - White](#) - Eleanor White [7]
[Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Bueche](#) - Will Bueche [46]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [33]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? \[was: Magonia](#) - David Rudiak [296]
[Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz](#) - Michael Salla [94]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [12]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Johnson](#) - Don Johnson [14]
[Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Hebert](#) - Amy Hebert [18]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [2]
[Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz](#) - Terry Groff [5]

Feb 16:

[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [18]
[Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Warren](#) - Frank Warren [65]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [45]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [3]
[Analysis Of Digital Picture Requested](#) - Max Burns [14]
[Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran](#) - Bruce Maccabee [9]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Nick Balaskas [17]
[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 7](#) - John Hayes [774]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [22]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [37]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [41]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [24]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [19]
[Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [11]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [38]
[Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [42]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [46]
[Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -](#) Paul Kimball [19]
[Women In Ufology \[was: Magonia Supplement No. 54\]](#) - Sheryl Gottschall [37]
[What's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth About](#) - Will Bueche [89]
[Re: Minot B-52 Case - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [13]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [71]
[Secrecy News - 02/15/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [111]
[The Foo Fighters](#) - Terry W. Colvin [55]
[The Los Angeles Air Raid](#) - Terry W. Colvin [58]

[Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - King](#) - Kyle King [11]
[Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - King](#) - Kyle King [17]
[Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Michael Salla [52]
[Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -](#) - Kyle King [33]
[ET Visits More Likely Deep In The Past?](#) - Stig Agermose [93]
[USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation](#) - Stig Agermose [45]
[New Info On Varginha At March Laughlin Convention](#) - A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO [23]
[Bennewitz-Related Questions](#) - Josh Goldstein [14]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [36]
[Re: Women In Ufology - Cammack](#) - Diana Cammack [14]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Owens](#) - Steve Owens [2]
[Re: Women In Ufology - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [47]
[Evidence For Present Life On Mars](#) - Greg Boone [80]
[Re: Bennewitz-Related Questions - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [8]

Feb 17:

[Filer's Files #8 - 2005](#) - George A. Filer [511]
[Big Doings On SDI Saturday Night](#) - Wendy Connors [54]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [36]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [35]
[Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special](#) - Will Bueche [40]
[Re: Women In Ufology - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [22]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -](#) - John Rimmer [10]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Paul Kimball [30]
[Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Bueche](#) - Will Bueche [13]
[Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran -](#) - Cathy Reason [59]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Martin Shough [7]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [30]
[Secrecy News -- 02/16/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [144]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [10]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [18]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [202]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [7]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [54]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -](#) - Santiago Yturria [4]
[AUFORN Meeting In Brisbane Friday Night](#) - Robert Frola [7]
[Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Bruce Maccabee [30]
[Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [27]
[British MoD Comes Clean Over Little Green Men](#) - Stig Agermose [83]
[Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -](#) - Erik Landahl [8]
[Re: Women In Ufology - Gottschall](#) - Sheryl Gottschall [21]
[Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [39]
[Re: hat's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth](#) - Don Johnson [31]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Johnson](#) - Don Johnson [5]
[Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz](#) - Robert Gates [70]
[Astrobiology A Principal Motivator For NASA Now](#) - Stig Agermose [130]
[Jennings' Documentary Treats St. Clair County](#) - Stig Agermose [95]
[Iran Confirms Reports Of US Drones](#) - Stig Agermose [58]
[Jennings Explores Roswell, Minot, Phoenix, St.Clair](#) - Stig Agermose [82]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [9]
[Medieval Media](#) - Rich Reynolds [7]
[File On UFO At Airbase Opened](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [17]

[Blind 'Abductee'](#) - Luis R. Gonzalez [28]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Greg Boone [10]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [9]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Jerome Clark [7]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Michael Salla [62]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [16]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Nick Balaskas [37]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [19]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [21]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [49]
[Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - King](#) - Kyle King [25]
[Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - King](#) - Kyle King [12]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [8]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King](#) - Kyle King [14]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [18]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [14]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [71]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research](#) - Paul Kimball [41]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Kyle King [26]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [6]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Jerome Clark [24]
[Pelicanist \[was: Magonia Supplement No. 54\]](#) - Jerome Clark [24]
[Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [24]
[Re: Pelicanist \[was: Magonia Supplement No. 54\]](#) - Rich Reynolds [24]
[Re: Women In Ufology - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [19]
[Re: Pelicanist \[was: Magonia Supplement No. 54\]](#) - John Rimmer [37]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [5]
[Re: Pelicanist \[was: Magonia Supplement No. 54\]](#) - Rich Reynolds [8]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Greg Boone [16]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King](#) - Kyle King [35]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Larry Hatch [16]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Frola](#) - Robert Frola [30]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Richard Hall [15]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Frola](#) - Robert Frola [20]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [11]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [43]
[Re: Pelicanist - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [46]

Feb 18:

[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Jerome Clark [21]
[Introduction & Information On Events In Phoenix](#) - Rob Kritkausky [34]
[Re: Pelicanist - King](#) - Kyle King [17]
[Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [16]
[Re: British MoD Comes Clean Over Little Green Men](#) - Bruce Maccabee [15]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Ray Dickenson [26]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Bruce Maccabee [2]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [20]
[Re: Pelicanist - King](#) - Kyle King [46]
[Re: Pelicanist - King](#) - Kyle King [14]
[Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King](#) - Kyle King [29]
[Re: Pelicanist - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [23]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King](#) - Kyle King [11]

[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Simon Hicks [11]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Stanton Friedman [11]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - - Santiago Yturria [28]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [30]
[NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of Life](#) - NASANews@hq.nasa.gov [30]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [9]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - - Don Ledger [9]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [19]
[Re: Women In Ufology - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [29]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Josh Goldstein [54]
[Re: Women In Ufology - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [4]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [50]
[Re: Pelicanist - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [33]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research](#) - Michael Salla [111]
[Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [10]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [5]
[Mystery Of Tasmanian UFO Deepens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [40]
[Re: Pelicanist - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [8]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Greg Boone [19]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [5]
[Re: Pelicanist - Reynolds](#) - Rich Reynolds [6]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Michael Salla [87]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [47]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Jerome Clark [10]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [4]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - - Kyle King [22]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - - Kyle King [22]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Kyle King [22]

Feb 19:

[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [29]
[Re: Pelicanist - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [9]
[Re: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of](#) - Kyle King [8]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - - Will Bueche [58]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King](#) - Kyle King [11]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - - Don Ledger [13]
[Re: Women In Ufology - King](#) - Kyle King [35]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [91]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Michael Salla [47]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [6]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [16]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [14]
[Re: Pelicanist - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [32]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Isaac Koi [221]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [22]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [11]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparkks [6]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - From: Brad Sparks [8]
[Re: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies - Harrison](#) - Diane Harrison [16]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - - William Matchen [17]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research](#) - Paul Kimball [31]
[Bill Moore Interviews Project Beta Author Sunday](#) - Greg Bishop [9]

[Disclosure Australia announcement 22](#) - Diane Harrison [18]
[AF Debunker Balloons Even Before MOGUL](#) - Brad Sparks [72]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [7]
[Re: Pelicanist - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [19]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [13]
[Peter Jennings Focuses On Matters Of The Media](#) - Frank Warren [86]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [66]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [15]
[Re: Introduction & Information On Events In](#) - Larry Hatch [24]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Michael Salla [30]
[Re: Pelicanist - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [9]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [37]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [95]

Feb 20:

[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [23]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [39]
[Alien Autopsy Info Request](#) - Philip Mantle [13]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [5]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [49]
[EBE Awards Listings?](#) - Dante Rosati [6]
[Re: Pelicanist - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [4]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [13]
[Re: Pelicanist - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [5]
[Re: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [9]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [46]
[Re: Peter Jennings Focuses On Matters Of The Media](#) - Greg Boone [9]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research](#) - Paul Kimball [59]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Bruce Maccabee [35]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Bruce Maccabee [5]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Michel](#) - Lyle Michel [10]
[Re: Pelicanist - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [4]
[Jennings Explores ABCs Of UFOs](#) - Terry Groff [78]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King](#) - Kyle King [7]
[Re: Pelicanist - King](#) - Kyle King [11]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Josh Goldstein [7]
[Re: Pelicanist - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [4]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [22]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [17]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [33]

Feb 21:

[Re: Pelicanist - Richardson](#) - Geoff Richardson [2]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [27]
['Jesus' Said There's No Life Out There](#) - Greg Boone [39]
[Re: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of](#) - Paul Anderson [25]
[Re: Pelicanist - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [3]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [52]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [16]
[Re: Jennings Explores ABCs Of UFOs - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [18]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [53]

[UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs](#) - Michael Salla [226]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Will Bueche [28]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [10]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [24]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Nick Balaskas [48]
[New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean](#) - Larry Hatch [9]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King](#) - Kyle King [4]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Nick Balaskas [33]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Don Ledger [15]
[Re: Pelicanist - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [22]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Don Ledger [6]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [39]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [45]

Feb 22:

[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [83]
[Re: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [20]
[Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research](#) - Simon Hicks [12]
[Scottish UFO Wave Caused By Video Phones?](#) - Greg Boone [79]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [385]
[Re: Pelicanist - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [5]
[Re: Alien Autopsy Info Request - Morton](#) - Dave Morton [13]
[Canadian UFO Sightings Hit Record Pace](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [40]
[Aliens: Why They Are Here By Bryan Appleyard](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [127]
[Is Anyone Out There?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [147]
[Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [168]
[UFOs Over Hornopiren Chile](#) - Scott Corrales [35]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [42]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs](#) - Greg Boone [32]
[Re: Pelicanist - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [14]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Warren](#) - Frank Warren [33]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [3]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs](#) - Stanton Friedman [80]
[The Black Vault Major Renovation & Addition](#) - John Greenewald - The Black Vault [45]
[New Einstein@home Program Ready To Roll](#) - Greg Boone [28]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs](#) - Bruce Maccabee [27]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [41]
[Re: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [13]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [20]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC](#) - Bruce Maccabee [6]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [38]
[Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile](#) - Kyle King [8]
[Re: Pelicanist - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [40]
[Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO](#) - Greg Sandow [39]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [16]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs](#) - Brad Sparks [12]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [12]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [21]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Randle](#) - Kevin Randle [97]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [11]
[X-Conference 2005 Press Release - 02-22-05](#) - Stephen Bassett [184]
[Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [11]

[Daniel Sheehan \[was: Applying Uncertainty](#) - Kyle King [65]

Feb 23:

[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 8](#) - John Hayes [197]
[Re: New Einstein@home Program Ready To Roll - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [7]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - King](#) - Kyle King [5]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [19]
[Re: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [20]
[Re: Pelicanist - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [45]
[Re: Pelicanist - King](#) - Kyle King [14]
[Re: Pelicanist - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [29]
[Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [10]
[Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [24]
[Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [10]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -](#) - Don Ledger [21]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -](#) - Michael Salla [171]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -](#) - Michael Salla [63]
[Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -](#) - Rob Kritkausky [30]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [8]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [65]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [9]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [95]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [56]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [30]
[Re: Hats Off To George Noory - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [44]
[Rich Dolan Update - 02-05](#) - Richard Dolan [23]
[Secrecy News -- 02/22/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [132]

Feb 22:

[The 2004 Canadian UFO Survey](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [38]

Feb 24:

[E.T. Have A Tim Bit](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [29]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [14]
[UFO Sleuth With An Eye To The Sky](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [38]
[Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea](#) - William Matchen [96]
[Filer's Files #9 - 2005](#) - George A. Filer [566]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Scheldroup](#) - John Scheldroup [11]
[SETI Billboards 'UFOs - Seeing is Believing'](#) - Frank Warren [16]
[Michael Hesemann?](#) - Philip Mantle [6]
[Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -](#) - Don Ledger [3]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [23]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [11]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [35]
[Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation - King](#) - Kyle King [23]
[A Definite Maybe](#) - Terry Grof [48]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [86]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [24]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [7]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [12]

[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King](#) - Kyle King [36]
[Subscription Fee To UpDates?](#) - John Scheldroup [24]
[Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Tonnie](#)s - Mac Tonnie [9]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [26]
[Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [183]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs](#) - Bruce Maccabee [6]
[New York Times On Tonight's Jennings's Documentary](#) - Jerome Clark [77]
[New UFO Sighting Over Mexico City](#) - Scott Corrales [19]
[Argentine Mountaineer Photographs UFO](#) - Scott Corrales [68]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [15]

Feb 25:

[ABC Jennings Special](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]
[ABC Jennings Special - Pt II](#) - Bruce Maccabee [13]
[Jennings Is Toast](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [17]
[Jennings Blinded By Skepticism Ignorant Or What?](#) - William Hand [172]
[ABC - A First Reaction From Outside Ufology](#) - Loren Coleman [33]
[ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed](#) - Kyle King [49]

Feb 24:

[Re: Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [24]
[Re: Pelicanist - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [68]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [15]
[Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [11]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [33]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [28]
[Re: Pelicanist - Deardorff](#) - Jim Deardorff [27]
[Re: Pelicanist - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [4]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [9]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [15]
[Secrecy News -- 02/24/05](#) - Steven Aftergood [106]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [39]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [91]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [16]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [16]
[Re: Pelicanist - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [96]

Feb 25:

[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [9]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [109]
[Re: A Definite Maybe - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [17]
[Re: Pelicanist - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [110]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [6]
[Good Job Peter Jennings And ABC!](#) - Brian Adams [18]
[Re: Pelicanist - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [18]
[Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [10]
[Re: Jennings Is Toast - Weber](#) - Bill Weber [21]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [86]
[50 Years On UFO Interest Still Intense](#) - Loren Coleman [91]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed](#) - Bill Hamilton [18]

[Re: Jennings Blinded By Skepticism Ignorant Or](#) - Bill Hamilton [10]
[Re: Jennings Is Toast - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [16]
[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [22]
[The Definitive Special About Alien Life](#) - Will Bueche [95]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) - Don Ledger [7]
[Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]
[Website Traffic Increase Last Night](#) - Adam Lowe [11]
[Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [20]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -](#) - Michael Salla [34]
[Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [6]
[Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [13]
[June 24th '47 & January 7th '48](#) - Loren Coleman [16]
[Re: Jennings Is Toast - Freeman](#) - Kelly Freeman [29]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [3]
[Seeing Is Believing Naught](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [121]
[Re: A Definite Maybe - Kimball](#) - Paul Kimball [53]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) - Lan Fleming [30]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) - Lan Fleming [30]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Scheldroup](#) - John Scheldroup [29]
[Re: UFOs: Seeing is Believing - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [27]

Feb 26:

[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith](#) - James Smith [10]
[Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'](#) - Joachim Koch [27]
[Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Groff](#) - Terry Groff [5]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [7]
[Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Woods](#) - Mike Woods [9]
[Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell](#) - Robert Gates [28]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [27]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) - Kyle King [12]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) - Eleanor White [4]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King](#) - Kyle King [18]
[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [6]
[Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?](#) - Greg Boone [114]
[Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [20]
[Re: Pelicanist - King](#) - Kyle King [21]
[Re: Pelicanist - King](#) - Kyle King [46]
[Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [53]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -](#) - Paul Kimball [34]
[Re: Pelicanist - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [19]
[Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Freeman](#) - Kelly Freeman [37]
[Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Morton](#) - Dave Morton [31]
[Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [11]
[Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Stevenson](#) - Colin Stevenson [6]
[Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [46]
[Re: UFOs: Seeing is Believing - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [8]
[Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [9]

Feb 27:

[Re: Pelicanist - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [22]

[Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'](#) - Bruce Maccabee [3]
[Re: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell - Wise](#) - William Wise [6]
[Re: Pelicanist - Deardorff](#) - Jim Deardorff [14]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [36]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) Kyle King [72]
[Re: Pelicanist - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [6]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) Greg Boone [7]
[Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [38]
[Re: Pelicanist - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [6]
[Re: Pelicanist - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [4]
[Re: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell -](#) Mac Tonnie [6]
[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [11]
[Re: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [65]
[Re: Pelicanist - Sparks](#) - Don Ledger [20]
[Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [47]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [104]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -](#) Michael Salla [95]
[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [5]
[Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [91]

Feb 28:

[Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'](#) - Wendelle Stevens [60]
[Backlash Jennings Style](#) - Greg Boone [47]
[ABC News Special & Stan Friedman Offer](#) - Paul Kimball [51]
[Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - King](#) - Kyle King [19]
[Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [22]
[Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [9]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) Alfred Lehmborg [9]
[Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Lowe](#) - Adam Lowe [17]
[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [77]
[Jennings' Un-Aired Footage](#) - Luis R. Gonzalez [5]
[Re: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program -](#) Greg Boone [17]
[Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [5]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -](#) John Scheldroup [17]
[Re: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?](#) - David Rudiak [76]
[Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Freeman](#) - Kelly Freeman [50]
[Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson](#) - Peter Rogerson [54]
[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Chace](#) - David Chace [69]
[Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -](#) Rob Kritkausky [12]
[If Aliens Can Visit How Did They Get Here?](#) - Terry Groff [59]
[Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [25]
[Re: Pelicanist - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [61]
[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [4]
[Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -](#) Paul Kimball [116]
[Re: Pelicanist - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [23]
[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) Simon Hicks [8]
[Another Response To The Peter Jennings UFO Special](#) - Will Bueche [101]
[Jim Marrs On UFOs: Seeing Is Believing](#) - Larry W. Bryant [108]
[Seeing Is Believing](#) - William Bolt [14]
[Re: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program -](#) Dave Morton [49]
[Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sawers](#) - William Sawers [27]
[Tuptown RND05 UFO Base](#) - Colin Stevenson [5]

[Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -](#) - Kyle King [17]

[Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [4]

[Re: ABC Jennings Special - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [22]

[Re: Jennings' Un-Aired Footage - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [3]

[Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' -](#) - Joachim Koch [43]

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Kenny Young Passes

From: Ron Schaffner <ronschaffner.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:02:37 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 08:12:03 -0500
Subject: Kenny Young Passes

This is very difficult for me to pass on. We have lost a very good friend and researcher, Kenny Young.

More to follow.

Ron

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Coffey [mailto:elviscc.nul]
Date: Monday, January 31, 2005 10:01 PM
To: Ron Schaffner
Subject: Kenny Young

All -

I really regret sending this message - it breaks my heart to say we have lost a VERY DEAR FRIEND today at 12:40 PM.

Kenny passed away.

His sister called me tonight and will call me tomorrow night with the details. I will pass along when I get them.

It's been a very long struggle for him and he was so very courageous - he was a shining light. He never complained and was a true friend to us all.

Please pass this message on to others if I'm missing anyone.

Right now I can't see through my tears - it's so very painful.

Kenny will be missed so very much.

Take Care & God Bless!

Love,

Chris

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Kenny Young Passes - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 06:24:32 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 08:49:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Kenny Young Passes - Connors

Another sad day for Ufology. Kenny was a force to behold in all he gave to us.

My sincerest and deepest condolences to Kenny's family and friends.

Wendy Connors

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Kenny Young

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 09:37:33 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 11:54:00 -0500
Subject: Kenny Young

>From: Ron Schaffner <ronschaffner.nul>
>To: current-encounters.nul
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:02:37 -0500
>Subject: Kenny Young

>This is very difficult for me to pass on. We have lost a very
>good friend and researcher, Kenny Young.

>More to follow.

This is a tragic loss to the science of ufology. Kenny was a true
skeptic in the good sense of the term. He will be greatly
missed.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Kenny Young

From: Chaz Stuart <Daydisk2.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 11:32:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 11:57:32 -0500
Subject: Kenny Young

I really don't know where to begin with this, but let's try here:

I first met Kenny in late 1994 at a UFO meeting at the home of the late Pat Packard, another great UFO investigator who left us far too soon. We quickly became friends and together shared many UFO investigation adventures together, the most notable, I suppose, being in the Owensville, Ohio area east of Cincinnati. We interviewed many people and chased many a light in the sky back in the mid 90's and I will ever forget those days.

Unknown to most, Kenny had been struggling with serious health concerns since around 1996, but true to his nature, he kept it to himself and asked me to do the same as he did not want the sympathy or attention.

Kenny, if you can somehow read this from "out there", just know that you will be greatly missed by the many friends that you accumulated over the years. You were the ultimate and most relentless UFO investigator I have ever known and truly one of a kind.....

--Chaz

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

In Memory Of Kenny

From: Ron Schaffner <ronschaffner.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 12:50:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 13:04:38 -0500
Subject: In Memory Of Kenny

Kenny Young (1966-2005) dies at age 38
Veteran UFO and unusual phenomena Researcher
Video technician, director and producer

By Ron Schaffner

It is with deep regret that I announce the passing of my friend
Kenny Young.

I met Kenny back in 1994 after I got back into research after a
two-year sabbatical. I didn't even have to introduce myself to
him -- he knew who I was and offered me a warm welcome back when
I first came on board to the local cable access show out of
Cincinnati: UFO Update Live.

I knew that Kenny was going to be something special to Ufology.
His early reports were very detailed and resembled legal briefs
and police reports. He was very objective in his reporting which
is something one doesn't see much of. His report on the
Lebanon Correctional Facility UFO case was very complete in
every aspect, as well as his Clermont County video case.

A small group of us who were affiliated with the cable show
decided to start another Ohio group here. It was headed by the
late Pat Packard and called Advocates for Scientific Knowledge.
After Pat's untimely death, we changed the name to Tri-State
Advocates for Scientific Knowledge. Kenny was named as public
relations director.

One of the most celebrated cases of TASK was the 1996 and 1997
UFO flap in southern Ohio. Kenny was very active at this time
and retrieved so much information, that we couldn't have solved
the case without him.

See:

<http://home.fuse.net/rschaffner/flap.htm>

<http://home.fuse.net/ufo/flareinfo.html>

<http://home.fuse.net/ufo/MARCH26.htm>

After the agreed reconstruction of TASK, Kenny went on to do
some important research in such areas of Monsanto, Peebles, Ohio
GE/Northrop plant and the Norwood, Ohio searchlight case of
1949, which was initiated by the late Leonard Stringfield.

Kenny had a natural instinct for working with local law
enforcement and retrieving 9/11 emergency dispatch tapes, when a
possible UFO or Bigfoot report was called in. I can remember
helping him with his first FOIA request, as I told him how to
get around the fees that some agencies wanted. After that, it
was him that I turned to, to ask questions about this process.

Perhaps his best retrieval was the Trumbull County, Ohio
sightings by law enforcement, which chased a UFO in their
cruisers and reported back to dispatch.

Whenever there was case that needed more attention, Kenny was

always there. I often wondered how he could afford all the long distance phone calls, but that didn't matter to him, as long as he received the information he was looking for. If anybody ever needed a favor, you could always count on Kenny.

Kenny always loved a great conspiracy story. He didn't always believe in all of them, but enjoyed researching them anyway. I spent a lot of time talking with him about the "Federal Hypothesis", Area 51 and Roswell.

Kenny also enjoyed the Bigfoot phenomena, as he worked with me on some reports, such as the 1997 case that occurred in Adams County, Ohio. He investigated a few intriguing reports from the same area on his own and was the first to report and debunk the alleged Bigfoot "Campground Closures" of Salt Fork State Park in Northeastern Ohio.

I also had the pleasure of assisting him in a strange creature report out of Indiana.

<http://home.fuse.net/ufo/indianafigure04.html>

Mr. Young was very active in assisting Natural Light productions (Bob Leibold) in producing the UFO LIVE UPDATE programs that were viewed in the Cincinnati area. Kenny would become a live panelist on this show and we won several awards. Kenny's video clips were always a welcome sight. It was his idea to start a 'point-counterpoint' type of program to achieve 100% objectivity. Kenny was the advocate on the show and I would play the skeptic. It always worked out great and gave the audience the option to make up their own minds on the information we set forth. We had some real fun with this and some thought we were bitter at each other. That was far from the truth, as we always worked out the script before hand and laughed at each other about the acts we put on.

There will always be more to say about this brilliant researcher and investigator. I have only touched on a few of his accomplishments.

We will all miss you, Kenny. Hope you meet up with Pat and Leonard.

From all of us at UFO Update in Cincinnati, Ohio
The Ohio groups
All the Forteaners around the world

Below is the bio of Kenny taken from his own web site:

<http://home.fuse.net/ufo/about.html>
<http://home.fuse.net/ufo>

Please visit while the site is still on the Internet.

Sincerely,

Ron Schaffner
Creature Chronicles
<http://home.fuse.net/rschaffner>

Kenny Young, webmaster of "UFO RESEARCH: CINCINNATI!" is a multi-award winning television producer, director and writer and formerly a State Section Director for M.U.F.O.N. and also a former public relations director of Tri-State Advocates for Scientific Knowledge. He is now an independent researcher and has lectured to large audiences about the UFO mystery and served as a host, panelist and debater on several TV programs including "UFO Update: LIVE!" and the award winning documentary "UFO REPORT."

In addition to evaluating UFO and related claims, conducting field investigations and interviewing eyewitnesses and public officials, Young has worked successfully to obtain secret UFO video recordings held by the Department of Energy and has also obtained numerous 9-1-1 audio tapes of police/UFO incidents. In addition, he employs the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to petition the U.S. government for release of UFO-related documents.

His articles have appeared in the "M.U.F.O.N. Journal," "UFO Magazine," "FATE Magazine" and "Equinox Magazine." He was the host and organizer of the 39th Annual 2003 National UFO Conference.

Young's UFO investigations have also been featured nationally on the 2-hour NBC Television program "CONFIRMATION" as well as "SIGHTINGS on The Sci-Fi Channel." He has appeared on numerous radio programs including "Strange Days Indeed with Errol Bruce Knapp," "The Jeff Rense Show," "Coast to Coast A.M. with Art Bell," "Late Night with George Noory," "The Sci-Zone with Bill Boshears," "The X-Zone with Rob McConnell," "The Jim Hickman Report" and many others.

Kenny Young lives in Florence, Kentucky and is also a musician, artist and employed as Info channel Coordinator for a cable television operation in the Greater Cincinnati area. He is also a freelance videographer and editor, specializing in graphic design.

Young remains skeptical and objective concerning UFOs, but feels that a sober evaluation of the data suggests the phenomena warrants further scrutiny.

"It is a capital mistake to theorize before you have all the evidence. Insensibly, one begins to twist the facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts. It biases the judgment." --Sherlock Holmes

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

More Mexican UFO Video

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:11:04 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:07:57 -0500
Subject: More Mexican UFO Video

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
January 31, 2005

Source: Planeta UFO
Date: 01.31.05

MEXICO: MORE UFO VIDEO

An important sighting was recorded by professional cameramen from Televisa in Mexico City on January 9, 2005, as a UFO flew over the Plaza Mexico bullring between 5:45 and 6:00 pm.

On that same day, Mexican researcher Pedro Avila Rubio obtained impressive video evidence of apparently the very same unidentified flying object at an altitude of 4000 meters over the municipality of Tlalnepantla in the state of Mexico at 3:45 p.m.

The witness described it as a sphere with protuberances in its lower side - making the analogy of a pea with corrugated edges - which was precisely in the San Mateo air corridor, adding that no aircraft appeared during the recording.

The strange flying object flew slowly in a north-south direction and the sky was completely clear.

This is highly significant evidence, since it completely discards the possibility of viewer error and that a weather balloon could be mistaken for a UFO. It is my belief that Pedro Avila is the first person to have obtained video evidence of what occurred on January 9 - a result of his perseverance and experience in scanning the skies.

Avila heads the "Los Ojos de la Ciudad" group, which is an organization specializing in UFO studies and well-known for the quality of its investigations. For more information please contact: losojosdelaciudad.nul

Translation (c) 2005 Scott Corrales Institute of Hispanic Ufology
Special thanks to Ana Luisa Cid

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:18:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:11:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 18:55:32 +0000
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:22:48 -0500
>>Subject: Bad-Think?

>If your blog is any indication of what you think constitutes the
>one true path to knowledge about UFOs, that's pitiful.

Richard:

The blog nonsense (as you see it) is just ruminations by me
about things UFO related.

It's not revelations from the gods obviously. It's a blog,
something as ephemeral as a UFO.

I don't remember declaring my comments to be the "one true path
to knowledge about UFOs." I don't have that much hubris.

But from the private e-mails I've been getting, I'm not alone in
my pitiful thinking.

As always, I defer to judgment(s), take them under advisement,
and will try to curtail my vacillating demeanor.

Your continuing admirer,

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:21:04 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:13:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:56:51 -0700
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:22:48 -0500
>>Subject: Bad-Think?

>>A view (or two) of the problem with UFO study, and
>>those who have made it their avocation, or vocation:

>><http://rrrgroup.blogspot.com>

>Your blog view was entertaining. Everyone should read it.

>Reminds me of the proverbial curse of the auto mechanic... you
>know, where there is always the tire-kicker who talks about how
>they can do it better, where the mechanic doesn't do it right,
>etc..

>Yet the mechanic is doing the actual work using actual
>experience while the verbage echos off the garage wall.

Ms. Connors:

Thanks for the slap. You're not angry because I didn't mention
you, are you? (I was fearful of incurring your wrath, but it
happened anyway.)

You are a woman to contend with. surely.

Rich

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 16:00:58 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:14:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

Listers

"Actually I happen to think it would have very interesting implications if a) there was a significant correlation with nuclear sites and b) it was significantly stronger for Unknowns of high quality. Unfortunately the Johnson study does not provide a clear answer in respect of a) and does not even allow us to pose the question in respect of b)."

In case it matters, this important paragraph in my last reply to Gildas Bordais was edited out in the version that appeared on list. This is unfortunate, since it is easy enough already, apparently, for Gildas to misrepresent me as a debunker, without the blue pencil of Fate lending a hand! :-)

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:01:41 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:21:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - King

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:56:51 -0700
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:22:48 -0500
>>Subject: Bad-Think?

>>A view (or two) of the problem with UFO study, and
>>those who have made it their avocation, or vocation:

>><http://rrrgroup.blogspot.com>

>Your blog view was entertaining. Everyone should read it.

>Reminds me of the proverbial curse of the auto mechanic... you
>know, where there is always the tire-kicker who talks about how
>they can do it better, where the mechanic doesn't do it right,
>etc..

>Yet the mechanic is doing the actual work using actual
>experience while the verbage echos off the garage wall.

Hi Wendy, and Rich,

I'm not particularly fond of labels, and rational is not one I
would apply to myself, nor would most of my acquaintances that
know of my penchant for posting on UFO Updates.

But in case the label is accurate, is there an ointment for this
affliction?

But sincerely Rich, is your blog post a knee-jerk reaction to
the reception you received on your Socorro balloon scoop? Or is
it a thoroughly considered and reasoned indictment of the field?
I ask here because the post in question runs counter to much of
what you have asserted here in the past.

Dick Hall, Jerry Clark, Brad Sparks... these are fellows who
talk the talk because they have in every sense of the word,
walked the walk, and continue to do so.

Alfred is not a UFO researcher, nor am I. We are both interested
parties with strong opinions. I respect him while I disagree
with some of his ideas. I can't speak for him, but I suspect he
wouldn't respond to my posts if he didn't feel likewise. Why
bother?

Cathy Reason submits posts here that I can barely understand,
owing to my lack of training in philosophy and psychology. So
because of this, I search on phrases and names in her posts, and
I learn. I doubt I could learn such things on my own, since I
wouldn't know where to begin, and since I'm not in a position to
go back to school. The point remains that I could just as easily
dismiss her posts as gobbledegook and move on. But I follow as
best I can, and I look up what I can't follow. It is to her

credit and my fortune that we are able to "meet" here and discuss such things.

This List is a microcosm of the world at large, albeit a somewhat unique microcosm. There are arguments, there are angry outbursts, and there is progress, halting and disappointingly slow perhaps, but steady. I know Dick and Jerry and Brad might rightly argue this, having had to re-argue the same points on the same cases ad infinitum. But I see the progress due to the perspective of the onlooker, not the participant. I doubt I'd have had the patience and perseverance they display to be here, posting to this List today.

I find none of your cited blog posts assertions helpful, and they seem bent on trying to fracture an already fractious community. But to what end? Is this some kind of divide and conquer strategy? If so, I think it will take someone with a bit more in the "chops" department. No offense, but in my view there is much to learn from all these folks. All of them.

Case in point... I posted a rather haughty reply to a post by Eleanor White, a person with strong feelings and a case. Her response was gracious and patient. I think it's a reflection of her having been at the "bidness" end of such rhetoric before. I got the answer I was looking for, contrary to her stating otherwise. I fully appreciated her response, while I remain unconvinced of some of her assertions. If I thought she was a wacko, I'd not have bothered to ask the questions. She didn't react harshly, and communication happened. Progress.

In this field, as has been told to me by so many, you must acquire and retain a thick skin... preferably wrapped around a suitably open mind. The source of the angst on this List is most often the different opinions on what constitutes an open mind. Some are more open than others, and some are so open that they in fact are narrow in that they accept any argument pro their view and discard or dismiss any counter. Just like in the real world. But they could still and all be right, eh?

In the end, the biggest question remaining is... where does Rich Reynolds fit in your list? Does he?

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:52:49 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:23:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:15:49 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <ufomiami.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 18:17:10 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>And the later sighting on April 26, reported by Orlando Gallego,
>>investigated by police officers, of another landing at La
>>Madera, New Mexico. Another balloon? Another craft?

>Sure, why not another balloon! If you are spies and want to
>drift over top secret areas in the US, then you just don't do
>one fly over. Or if some kind of lame LEM testers, then you
>don't just do one lame test do you? No you do more than one, for
>the adventure of it all!

>However, why would an alien UFO want to make the same ole
>journey in boring New Mexico! Landing, looking at the rocks,
>kicking the engine, freaking our yokel locals. And these are
>advanced beings!

New Mexico was where more money was being spent on classified research and development per capita than in any other state. It had 2 nuclear weapons labs (Los Alamos and Sandia); the largest employer in the states was Kirtland Air Force Base; Roswell was the home of the most elite military group in the world, the 509th, which had dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and then out in the Pacific at Operation Crossroads; and finally White Sands Missile Range was the largest military base in the country and also was the only base firing captured German V-2 rockets. Of course spies, whether Soviet, Chinese, or alien would be interested.

No, I don't buy the balloon explanation for Socorro. I, too, have been at the location, and more than 30 years ago, after a lecture I gave in Las Vegas, was told by a woman working there for the AEC(I believe as a chemist?) that she had in 1964 been a grad student at NM Tech in Socorro, and had been instructed to do careful analysis on the soil from the Socorro landing..in secret. I passed this on to Jim MacDonald who spoke with her.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Peter Jennings' UFO Program

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:23:47 -0500
Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

Good Day Fellow Listerions,

I caught an add Saturday night for the upcoming ABC special on UFOs with Peter Jennings. My bias aside--the add was very impressive, and led one to believe that is going to be about "UFOs only."

I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others? Please raise your hands.

Frank

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Hynek Interview? - LeClair

From: Aaron LeClair <saucer.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 13:31:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:24:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Hynek Interview? - LeClair

>From: Santiago Yturria <syturria.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:20:48 -0600
>Subject: Re: Hynek Interview?

>>From: Aaron LeClair <saucer.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 15:05:05 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Hynek Interview?

>>Interestingly there is an interview with J. Allen Hynek where he
>is wearing the same white jacket and the same blue shirt talking
>to a woman reporter about UFOs and government. The interview was
>on ABC's Good Morning America, sometime in 1985, I think in,
>Hynek's home.

>Information and clip may be obtained from ABC News or at:

><http://www.transcripts.tv/good-morning-america.cfm>

Yeh, sounds like the same clip. I had the impression the
interview may had taken place around 85, just from the looks of
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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 1](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 19:51:45 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 17:29:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 17:03:50 -0000
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:04:02 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>>Just one more word on Rendlesham-Bentwaters. Your negative
>>judgement on the book by Georgina Bruni - unfair in my opinion -
>>is not a valid argument to discard testimonies on UFOs seen
>>above or near the nuclear storage area of Bentwaters.

>For heaven's sake Gildas, who said anything about discarding
>testimonies? Who even said anything about Rendlesham?
>Answer: You, not me.

Martin,

The Rendlesham-Bentwaters 1980 case is in the article of Donald Johnson, along with a series of significant cases.

Again, this part - the direct evaluation of significant cases - is capital in this debate on Ufos and nuclear sites.

Bentwaters happens to be one of them.

>You promoted Bruni's book as being of high quality; I
>questioned its quality, but if you were to read more carefully
>you would see that I limited my comment on Bruni's book to
>matters on which I am competent to comment, specifically
>Lakenheath- Bentwaters 1956.

>It is a fact that her summary of the case therein is a travesty
>of the events.

>It is also a fact that this reduces my confidence in her as a
>reliable source.

>What sensible person would say that reportorial innacuracy is a
>positive sign of a reliable source?

>So _If_ I wish at some time to delve into the Rendlesham
>incident deeply (and I might!) I will not choose this book as my
>primary source. This is simple prudence. Or do you wish to
>debate the Lakenheath case with me and defend Bruni's authority?

I am not a specialist of the Lakenhath-Bentwaters case, but I am sure that there are some on this List. I would like to know if someone shares your opinion on the presentation made by Georgina Brunin in her book.

What I am aware of is that a lot of confusion has been poured on that case.

For instance, when the Cometa Report cited it in 1999, in its presentation of important cases, Jenny Randles launched an ironic critic on them, in the week following its publication - in French and limited to the French territory[!] - calling the authors the "Cometa boys" and stating that they were not aware that she had new pilot testimonies, who had seen nothing. People asked her to communicate them, among whom Georgina Bruni and me, on this list, But Jenny refused to give them, for various reasons ! I waited about two years for these testimonies but they did not come out and after that I lost sight of the argument.

It's a comparable scenario with the 1980 case.

It went from the theory of the confusion with a light house, clearly refuted by Colonel Halt, to the last (?) theory of Jenny Randles : bizarre effects of a powerful radar, or something like that, if I understand it.

I am sending a copy of this to Georgina Bruni, in case she would like to step in here.

Gildas Bourdais

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:22:42 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 04:58:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:15:49 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <ufomiami.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 18:17:10 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 11:37:24 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>1. It had no apparent conventional propulsion system such as
>>>propellers, rockets, or jets, and left no trail.

>Hummm. Where did the flames come from? Still, I assume you need
>some sort of ducts to shoot the flames from.

A chemical rocket or jet would have left chemical residue on the
plants and soil. The AF summary of the case said they looked for
such residue and none was found.

The soil underneath the blue flame was vitrified (turned to
glass), indicating great heat. Yet a mesquite bush underneath
the flame was cut cleanly in half but not destroyed. What
conventional chemical rocket or jet does that?

A conventional rocket capable of lifting a multi-ton object out
of the gully would have totally fried the plant, and maybe
Zamora along with it. (He was 50 feet or less away.)

>>>2. It was oval shaped and lacked a conventional airfoil (i.e.
>>>wings or lifting body shape) to support it in flight.

>Hummm. Could still be a gondola attached by a long thin
>line to a large balloon (like a cocomut to the African Swallow) .

The wind and balloon obligingly came to a dead stop as soon as
the "gondola" touched down. Otherwise the gondola would have
been dragged across the landscape. Then the wind obligingly went
from dead calm to hundreds of miles an hour seconds after the
gondola roared off the ground.

That's a real neat magic trick, isn't it? And it's only one of
several huge nonstarters with this gondola suspended from a long
cable idea.

The wind pressure on any large balloon would have been enormous.
The balloon would have behaved like a big sail. To give a rough
idea of how much pressure, wind pressure is given approximately
by $Pressure = 1/2 * air\ density * (wind\ speed)^2 * shape\ factor$
(drag).

Assume the shape factor is about 1 for a spherical balloon.
Assume the balloon is 6 miles up to try to conceal its
existence. (Even at 6 miles a 30 m = 100 ft balloon still

subtends about 11 minarc, about 1/3 the diameter of the moon or sun, not exactly invisible.) At that altitude, air density is only about a quarter of what it is at sea level, or about 0.3 kg/m³. Assume wind speed at this high altitude is an unusually gentle breeze of only 10 mph or 4.5 m/sec (which can't even remotely account for the extremely rapid departure, but we're getting to that).

Plug in the numbers and we get a wind pressure of about 3 Newtons/m² or 6.6 pounds/m².

Assume for starters that the balloon is 30 m across (to support even a lightweight gondola, cable, etc.). It's cross section area is then about 350 m². So total wind force on the balloon is 6.6 * 350 = 2300 pounds, or over a ton.

That is why any lightweight gondola is going to get dragged across the landscape. It also puts a substantial amount of stress on the supporting cable, meaning it has to be thicker and heavier to keep from snapping (or does the cable have magic properties too?).

Of course, I've low-balled the wind speed, and remember force goes up as the square of the wind velocity. Let's assume the high altitude balloon is really being blown by a more realistic 60 mph wind (also needed to remotely account for the rapid departure). Then the force would be 36 times as great or 83000 pounds (over 40 tons)!

So in the balloon suspended by long cable hypothesis we have the following elements:

1. The gondola is dragged helplessly across the landscape by the balloon, or
2. The gondola instantly anchors itself to the ground (I leave it to others to figure out how that would be done), but in doing so places tens of tons of stress on the cable, making for an extremely thick and heavy cable to avoid snapping (detailed below), and also making for an extremely nasty and deadly departure once the ground bolting is removed (imagine the effect of tons of force being suddenly being applied to the non-anchored gondola), or (next absurd option please)
3. To avoid huge cabling stress or gondola dragging, gondola or balloon have an amazing winching system with miles of extra cable that can play itself out while the gondola is on the ground. If the wind were blowing 60 mph, this also means that for every minute the gondola was on the ground, an extra mile of cable has to be played out, meaning an even bigger balloon to support this insane mess, and also meaning the crew knows they have but minutes on the ground before the gondola gets ripped upward when the cabling comes to the end or the cabling gets cut loose.

To further flesh out this nonsensical model, let's also consider what sort of cable it would take to handle 40+ tons of tensile force (option 2)? Polyamide-imide fiber, a very high-tensile strength plastic (about 50% stronger than nylon), can handle up to 24,000 pounds/inch². A one inch round cable could support about 19,000 pounds. To handle 83,000 pounds, it would have to be over 2 inches thick (2.1 inch to be more exact). A 2.1 inch cable of this stuff 6 miles long would itself weigh over 32,000 pounds (specific gravity of the plastic is about 1.4 -- work out the math if you like).

The cable has to not only handle the weight of the gondola below and the wind force, it also has to be able to support itself (James Smith has either forgotten about this or swept it under the rug). Because of this, it would have to be even thicker and heavier. In fact, it would have to be about 3 inches thick to handle its own weight and the wind force of a 60 mph wind, weigh over 30 tons, and would be pretty hard not to notice visually by Zamora at close range.

The 30 m balloon example, assuming an optimum hydrogen filled balloon for maximum buoyancy, can support about 4000 kg or about 9000 pounds. But in option 2, it needs to support over 60000 pounds. That means you need to double the size of the balloon to 30m or 200 feet across, which at 6 miles is now over 22 minarc in size, approaching full-moon size. To shrink the size, you

could make the balloon higher, but this also increases the length and weight of the cable, meaning you need an even huger balloon to support it.

Option 2 is obviously a huge nonstarter on a number of grounds. So is option 1 (gondola dragged across the ground). This leaves only option 3 as a slightly (and I do mean slightly) viable option. This monstrosity of a flying device has some sort of system that can play out miles of extra cabling (all of which still needs to be supported by the balloon), but the cabling can be much thinner and lighter, under an inch in thickness.

>>>3. It descended and ascended vertically with a roar, but once it >>>reached 20 feet altitude, it became completely silent.

>Hummmmm. A roar. Were there lions nearby? Jet thrusters of the >LEM variety would make sense.

An attempt at humour, no doubt, but hardly much help for the model. Remember the problems above, like no chemical residue, the bush cut in half but not destroyed, etc. And if you have the insane winching system (option 3 above), about the only conceivable, but still nutsy way to get around the wind pressure/cabling problem, what do you need thrusters for? Just start winding the cabling back up. Or are the thrusters there for rapid escape in emergency situations, like approaching traffic cops? What foresight these engineers had!

>>>4. In silent mode it zipped away and disappeared in the distance >>>near Six-mile Canyon in 20 seconds or less (also executed a >>>sharp upward turn). That works out to approximately 1000 mph >>>for its _average_ speed. (It's peak speed was probably substantially >>>greater.)

>>>Sharp turns are okay depending on winds aloft for a balloon, >>>although I wouldn't want to be inside!

So according to Zamora's account, the "gondola" takes off parallel across the ground at an altitude of about 20 feet. This remarkable miles-long cabling system also has the magical ability to keep the gondola at a fixed altitude above the ground and on a straight course. No whipping around and "bungying" with this magic cable, no siree!

Then when the object gets about a mile away, it suddenly executes a sharp turn upward and accelerates out of sight within seconds over the mountains. Aha, that must be the winching system working furiously to take up the extra miles of cable let out when the "gondola" was on the ground. Yeah, that must be it!

>Okay, 1000mph rules out any balloon with or without LEM thrusters.

Whew, at last, a humungous nonstarter that even James Smith can't laugh off.

But fear not. When debunking, it is always possible to dream something absurd up and hope nobody pays close attention. E.g., we could employ an old debunking standby, the "radical misperception." In this case, the "radical misperception" would be Zamora not being able to distinguish seconds from minutes. The departure speed calculation is based on Zamora's account of how much time elapsed during the whole departure sequence, from liftoff to final object fadeout in the distance. Zamora placed the time at only 10 seconds. Ray Stanford in reconstructing the departure upped this to what he thought was a more reasonable 20 seconds. So if we're upping the departure time, why not up it another order of magnitude to over 3 minutes. Yeah, why not? With the "radical misperception" handy-dandy debunking tool, you can assume anything you want.

Let's also cut Zamora's fadeout distance in half, from 6 miles to 3 miles. So using these rather extreme assumptions, we've managed to cut the average departure speed down from 1000+ mph to 3 miles in ~3 minutes, or 60 mph. But even at only 60 mph, the wind pressure is tens of tons, which causes all those cabling problems discussed above.

We also encounter another perceptual problem, such as why didn't Zamora (nor anybody else) notice the much larger balloon above the object? It has to be at least 6 times larger in angular diameter than the "gondola" off in the distance, but Zamora

doesn't see it.

Aha, no doubt his attention was fixated on the "gondola" and he didn't bother to look upward to see the supporting "balloon."
Yeah, that must be it!

>>>Also, how about the unknown symbols or letters that Zamora saw
>>on the craft? Was it English? Russian?

>
>Well, I have to wonder about any symbols on a craft. Red Chinese
>or Soviet Cyrillics? I would think an American device would be
>emblazened with the good ole Amercian flag and not some
>gibberish!

What, you've forgotten about that super-secret CIA/Navy hot air
balloon hybrid already? Don't you realize that Zamora's symbol
is an obvious visual rearrangement of the initials in CIA, a
theory originally proposed by Leon Davidson decades ago? Sheesh,
what amateur detectives!

>>And the later sighting on April 26, reported by Orlando Gallego,
>>investigated by police officers, of another landing at La
>>Madera, New Mexico. Another balloon? Another craft?

>Sure, why not another balloon! If you are spies and want to
>drift over top secret areas in the US, then you just don't do
>one fly over. Or if some kind of lame LEM testers, then you
>don't just do one lame test do you? No you do more than one, for
>the adventure of it all!

Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. In 1964 the Russians and U.S.
have spy planes and spy satellites, but just can't give up those
lovable, old fashioned, uncontrollable spy balloons. Just to
make them even more impractical, they made them manned as well,
with the gondola suspended by miles of cable.

Ah, heck, enough fun already James. Time to throw out the manned
spy gondola suspended by a really, really long cable to a
really, really big balloon. Maybe you should move on to a
slightly (very slightly) better "gondola supported by a really,
really long cable to a circling jet airplane" theory. That, at
least, gets rid of some of the cabling problems and better
accounts for the rapid departure. And unlike a balloon, a plane
can actually control its flight.

I'm sure we could all go on like this for years, dreaming up one
absurd monstrosity of a flying craft after another, with
somebody like Rich Reynolds writing his usual inane blogs about
how we haven't considered all the possibilities and lack
imagination in the Socorro case.

How long are we supposed to go on with this blithering nonsense,
wasting our time in the process? To those still seriously
propose that Socorro was a conventional craft of our own making,
I say its time to stop the silly speculation and actually offer
something of substance, like real documentation. In other words,
either put up or shut up.

David Rudiak

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:54:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:00:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - Rudiak

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:56:51 -0700
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:22:48 -0500
>>Subject: Bad-Think?

>>A view (or two) of the problem with UFO study, and
>>those who have made it their avocation, or vocation:

>><http://rrrgroup.blogspot.com>

>Your blog view was entertaining. Everyone should read it.

>Reminds me of the proverbial curse of the auto mechanic... you
>know, where there is always the tire-kicker who talks about how
>they can do it better, where the mechanic doesn't do it right,
>etc..

>Yet the mechanic is doing the actual work using actual
>experience while the verbage echos off the garage wall.

Wendy,

I think you have it backwards. To apply your analogy, the mechanics are not people like Rich Reynolds. They are more technical people like Bruce Maccabee, Larry Hatch, Brad Sparks, myself, etc., trying to explain in scientific terms to the New Age, muddleheaded customers that you can't fix a bad fuel pump by kicking the tires or replacing the tail lights. Then we get accused of not considering all the possible angles, lack of imagination, and all the other nonsense Reynolds writes in his blogs.

Thinking outside the box has its points, but it should be tempered with a little hard-headed realism. Otherwise all you are left with is magical thinking, like hot-air balloons to explain the Socorro case.

As Bruce Maccabee often points out, maybe we can't say what these things are, but we can rule out many conventional explanations by applying conventional scientific principles and reasoning. Since when did that become a bad thing?

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Jennings' ABC UFO Special

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 16:11:17 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:03:03 -0500
Subject: Jennings' ABC UFO Special

This from our ABC affiliate:

Peter Jennings Reporting show description:

Each year there are thousands of reports of unidentified flying objects, but the U.S. government doesn't investigate any of them. This special program will seriously examine the unexplained phenomena around the world that so many people believe is proof of the existence of UFOs.

Air date again will be on Thursday, February 24, 8-10pm.

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 16:35:07 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:04:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - White

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 18:55:32 +0000
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

<snip>

>But truth will out: You object to orthodox science. Well, well,
>well. The old metaphysical shell game. What else is there, New
>Age nonscience?

Debates like this ignore the way real human beings make scientific progress. Often, an early stage in a given case of scientific progress involves tinkerers, who just don't worry about whether their investigative activity is or isn't "valid" science.

And the ideas that tinkerers sometimes latch on to may be their own, or may come from other "dreamers." Dreamers have the function of keeping promising ideas alive until the right tinkerer comes along.

'UFO believers' are one example of dreamers.

Once a tinkerer makes a discovery, then the prim and proper scientists, with their lab coats and protocols and statistics, get in there and verify what the tinkerers and dreamers discover, and make the discovery understandable to engineers, who make the discovery useful to society at large.

That is the way it works.

There is room in human society for dreamers and tinkerers. What they do is no less valid than what the prim and proper scientists do. Whisking them away with labels like "New Age nonscience" is to ignore how science actually works.

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 14:33:07 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:05:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 20:54:48 +0000
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 11:37:24 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2005 09:47:30 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>An experimental craft seems a possibility for Socorro but I dare
>>>not mention that here, because some will get absolutely
>>>hysterical that a (supposed) "newbie" would suggest that
>>>hypothesis all over again, since it has been discussed ad
>>>infinitum, ad nauseum.

>>You might as well write that a flying pig seems a possibility
>>for Socorro. The point is, where is any evidence for such an
>>"experimental craft?" In 40 years, nobody has ever turned up any
>>evidence that such a craft existed.

>Ah, but David, you miss the point here. According to Jeromian
>principles (as set out in the discussion of the Trindade case)
>it's not enough just for you to point out that in forty years
>no-one has ever turned up with evidence to *prove* the claim.
>It's actually your responsibility to find "negative witnesses",
>i.e. people who can show you documentary evidence that it
>*didn't* happen. I don't know exactly how you'd do this, but I'm
>sure Jerry Clark could tell you.

Ah but John, you miss the point here. A conventional human
craft, however experimental, should have a conventional
classification and leave a conventional trail of paperwork It
should also be explainable using conventional physics and
engineering principles.

The Socorro craft fails all these tests. There is no paperwork
to even suggest such an experimental craft ever existed. And
there are no witnesses of such a project who have ever talked
about it. Eventually conventional projects this old are at least
partially declassified, such as the CIA's Corona spy satellites
of the 1960s. People involved with the project (who would
probably number in at least the hundreds) start to talk. But
where oh where is the information on the Socorro craft?

The rest of my post was about the nonconventional aspects of
the Socorro craft, such as it's shape, VTOL capability, and a
silent propulsion system capable of accelerating the craft to
supersonic speed in a matter of seconds. If we had such an
advanced experimental craft 40 years ago, we would have a fleet
of them now and jet aircraft would be obsolete. The absence of
such aircraft now speaks very eloquently about who made the
Socorro craft. It wasn't us.

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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Peter Jennings TV Show

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 21:06:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:10:02 -0500
Subject: Peter Jennings TV Show

The information below is in an ABC press release. In addition, I asked my contacts again and the show will be on Feb. 24.

Peter Jennings Reporting: UFO's: Life In The Universe - Thursday, February 24 (8:00-10:00 p.m., ET) -- Each year there are thousands of reports of unidentified flying objects, but the U.S. government doesn't investigate any of them. This special program will seriously examine the unexplained phenomena around the world that so many people believe is proof of the existence of UFOs.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:57:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:19:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - Maccabee

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 18:55:32 +0000
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:22:48 -0500
>>Subject: Bad-Think?

>>A view (or two) of the problem with UFO study, and
>>those who have made it their avocation, or vocation:

>><http://rrrgroup.blogspot.com>

>I see you can't maintain any consistency in your views; now I am
>after all part of the 'atrophied thinking' on the part of we
>ancient of days that you say plagues ufology. You specifically
>excluded me from your criticisms, or have you forgotten that?
>Now it is even our fault that UFOs have remained unexplainable
>for so many years. How creative! How original! How stupid!

>But truth will out: You object to orthodox science. Well, well,
>>well. The old metaphysical shell game. What else is there, New
>Age nonscience?

>Somehow I'm not too surprised by this revelation since you were
>weaving all over the place in your arguments and apparently
>disdain logic and facts.

>It seems to me that we get very vigorous debate and discussion
>of issues on this List, with a multiplicity of viewpoints. But
>you still object.

>Hmmm! You apparently have become fossilized in your thinking.

>If your blog is any indication of what you think constitutes the
>one true path to knowledge about UFOs, that's pitiful.

Reading the "blog" I am amused to notice that the "fossilized
ufologists" side-track main issues by "inane attacks on
minutiae" (blog Jan, 30) yet are criticized for ignoring
"details" ("they eschew details"; Jan 21).

Proof that the devil is in the details? Or, damned if you do and
damned if you don't.

If anyone knows a happy medium... please introduce 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Zamora & The Bean?

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:12:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:27:12 -0500
Subject: Zamora & The Bean?

Hi List,

I came across this item while Googling various keywords from the Socorro/Zamora case. I wondered if anyone here had seen or addressed it here or elsewhere previously.

It contains no verifiable names, but it is an intriguing story in light of the current debate on the topic, and includes a possible explanation for the craft Zamora saw...

as found at:

<http://www.weirdload.com/nm-ufo.html>

scroll down halfway.

Lonnie and the Bean

I recently read a curious little book entitled Flying Saucers - Key to Creation? by a "George H. Eastland". Despite the title, there's no channeling, contactee lore or New Age blather. Instead, this gentleman seems to be an old aerospace engineer who's seen a few things and thought long and hard about them. Very nuts and bolts type of guy, but with a surprising amount of insightful and intelligent speculation about the various ways flying saucers could work.

In this thought-provoking book, he tells an amazing story as a cautionary tale that things are not always as they seem and that there is more than one kind of UFO out there. Illustrated with diagrams from bar napkins and replete with fascinating technical details, the yarn was supposedly related to him by a biker called "Tea-Mex," whom he met at a now long-vanished bar during a motorcycle rally in New Hampshire many years ago. They fell to talking about motorcycles, and thence other machines, which led to flying saucers, and then the guy causally remarked that he'd built one once.

A do-it-yourself flying saucer

With a little prodding, Tea-Mex explained he was a machinist who at one time hung out with a bunch of fellows from some unnamed contractor to the military in central New Mexico. (Most likely involved with White Sands, because not only were they able to get custom-milled aluminum and steel parts, but practical advice from on-site aviation experts. But that's getting ahead of the story.)

Anyway, these guys started playing around with the design of a engine described in Popular Mechanics which consisted of two pistons on opposite ends of a rod shuttling back and forth between combustion chambers. Since the pistons didn't do anything but make a lot of hot compressed exhaust gas, it was considered merely an impractical toy.

After melting a version cobbled out of old lawnmowers, the boys got serious. They machined parts at work, hiding them in a

dumpster for later retrieval - "involuntary contributions from the aircraft industry" as Tea-Mex put it. By the time they were through, they basically had a vertically-mounted jet engine that spun like a gyroscope, powered by propane. Once they mounted a big fan atop it to increase the cooling airflow, the lift, combined with the thrust of the exhaust, was enough to allow the device to actually fly.

Of course, nothing for it then but to build a light frame with fixed landing gear, put a couple of chairs in for the pilot and engineer, and encase the frame in white aircraft aluminum. One sheet had an old logo on it which they attempted to paint over with abstract "characters" in red. They called their egg-shaped contraption "the Bean" because it looked somewhat like a lima bean mounted on four toothpicks.

Being essentially a really big flying gyro, the ship was quite tricky to maneuver, requiring two people, who dressed in jump suits with motorcycle helmets. On one test flight going into a strong headwind, the guys had to land abruptly in an arroyo right off a highway. But being spotted and chased by a local cop, they quickly hopped back in and took off again.

They weren't quite so lucky this time and some distance away suffered a crash landing that wrecked the Bean, though they were unhurt. But they were stuck: they couldn't patent or sell the damn thing because all the parts had been scrounged or otherwise ill-gotten. Nor, having been totally unlicensed, dare they come forward. So they secretly trashed the ship but didn't have the heart to junk the engine, which is still quietly rusting in somebody's garage somewhere out there. The end.

The biker finished his beer and rode off. Tea-Mex had never mentioned the policeman by name, though one of the guys had said he'd recognized him. Nor do any other identifying names whatsoever appear in the story.

But in all the annals of ufology, this tale could relate to one and only one case: the world-famous sighting by Socorro Police Sergeant Lonnie Zamora, who on April 24, 1964, saw and pursued a craft landing in a gully near Socorro. Two occupants emerged briefly but hastily re-entered the craft, which then took off with a flaming roar, leaving behind some of the best trace evidence ever collected.

The incident got a great deal of national attention. The head of Project Blue Book admitted that it was the "best-documented case on record." The story of the Bean fits the details exactly, even down to the funny symbol on the side of the craft and its near collision with a green Cadillac on the highway just before the landing, details which are not that widely known.

And it sounds very plausible, especially with all the engineering detail in the full story. Indeed, people at the time wondered if it wasn't some NASA lunar-landing gizmo being tested at nearby White Sands that had seriously gone astray. This was around the time the first prototypes of the LM were being experimented with there, after all. Plus the craft made a lot of noise and even started a fire in the bushes with its exhaust, which is not typical of most flying saucers.

Apparently, the vessel may have been a bit more astray from the military-industrial complex than anyone had thought, but not from anywhere near as far away as most imagined.

I found nothing on this in the UpDates Archive.....

Any comments?

Best,

Kyle

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Newspaper's Switchboard Jammed With UFO Reports

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 22:00:18 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:35:02 -0500
Subject: Newspaper's Switchboard Jammed With UFO Reports

Source: The Independent on Saturday - Johannesburg, South Africa

<http://www.tios.co.za/index.php?fSectionId=1009&fArticleId=2390511>

01-29-05

Not UFOs - Just Choppers

The aliens haven't landed - yet.

But last night as The Independent On Saturday's switchboard was jammed with callers reporting five strange green lights moving slowly over Durban, we thought it might finally have happened.

Fortunately, the truth was that it was a carefully-choreographed publicity stunt to promote the launching of Qatar Airlines in South Africa.

Police, emergency services and Durban International Airport staff were also inundated with calls after five "extra-terrestrial" objects were sighted flying at low altitude over several suburbs.

Airport Control Tower manager Kevin O'Brien said the objects were five helicopters doing some promotional advertising for Qatar Airlines.

The choppers were spotted as far as Verulam, Phoenix and Durban North. They were also sighted in central Durban, Berea, Morningside, La Lucia and Umhlanga Rocks.

c. 2005 The Independent on Saturday & Independent Online (Pty) Ltd. All rights reserved.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hebert

From: Amy Hebert <ahebert.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 03:25:41 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:36:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hebert

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 12:10:01 -0600
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2005 11:32:01 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>Something that I haven't seen addressed in this thread (or maybe
>>I missed it) is the fact that Zamora saw the flames coming from
>>the bottom of the object and that they burned the sage brush
>>around the landing site.

>>Is there any kind of balloon configuration, then or now, that
>>would do this?

>The question is why would NASA need the supporting balloon to be
>so high up? So people would think the LEM was a UFO?

>Seems much more likely that the craft was similar to the LEM,
>and did not need a balloon which was not seen anyway.

<snip>

Hi, Kyle:

I don't know if this has already been mentioned but Zamora never actually saw the two beings go into the object before it took off and no one knows what materials the object was made of.

Zamora heard two loud slams, no longer saw the beings and the object took off (according to Ray's book and other accounts). Therefore, no one really knows if the beings were in the object when it took off.

Since we don't know if the beings were actually in the egg-shaped object when it took off, we don't know if their weight was included in the take-off load. Neither do we know what the object's hull or interior was made of (the word "metallic" is used repeatedly, almost excessively, in references to the object but Zamora only made a visual observation).

If the beings were not in the object when it took off and the object was not made of any kind of metal, perhaps the object itself was some form of balloon/UAV (patents do exist that include these features). The two loud slams Zamora described hearing could have just as easily been the slamming of two car doors as the "beings" got in a car and drove off beyond Zamora's view and while he was focused on the object as it launched (they may have only appeared small from a distance). Like the LEM, the object may have had small thrusters for maneuverability (going against the wind).

The description of the object emitting flames and a roaring sound while landing and taking off makes it sound more like something man-made - from the '60's - than something from another planet.

A. Hebert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 13:30:45 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:40:03 -0500
Subject: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

Raymond Czechowski, the man charged in connection with the death of Dr. John Mack appeared at Brent magistrates court on the 27th of January 2005.

Just "how" he appeared there I have no idea for despite numerous calls to Brent yesterday, there appeared to be no record of his appearance. The information below comes from the Metropolitan police and not from the court system.

The case was transferred to Wood Green Crown Court for him to next appear on 9/3/2005 (9th March). Unless there are further remands etc. it is expected that his trial will take place on that date.

Stuart Miller

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 5

From: John Hayes <John.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 14:07:07 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:49:54 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 5

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan.nul>
=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 10, Number 5
February 1, 2005
Editor: Joseph Trainor

E-mail: Masinaigan.nul
Website: <http://www.ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

UFOs AGAIN REPORTED IN THE INDIAN OCEAN AREA

"People are again reporting having UFO sightings in the Nicobar Islands, the Andaman Islands, India, the Maldive Islands and in the central area of Sri Lanka."
"The animals in these areas are again showing strange behavior. Tribesmen around the Andamans are again taking the signs seriously and are refusing to move back into the area" that was devastated by an earthquake measuring 9.0 on the Richter scale and a subsequent catastrophic tsunami.

"The tribal people of the Nicobar and Andaman Islands have again moved to high ground. The sea birds are also showing strange signs."

On Monday, January 25, 2005, "powerful earthquakes sparked panic in two countries Monday, nearly a month after a quake triggered a deadly wall of water that killed more than 160,000 people."

"The two quakes, both magnitude 6.3" on the Richter scale "jangled nerves across the Indian Ocean region hit by the December 26 (2004) tsunami."

"Panic briefly spread through the Indian coastal city of Madras after residents felt an earthquake centered in the Bay of Bengal, about 1,548 kilometers (930 miles) away, near the Nicobar and Andaman Islands."

"Samuel Cherian, the senior police officer in Campbell Bay on the southernmost island in the Andaman archipelago, said he was sitting in his office when he felt 'a sudden jolt.'"

"The aftershock was felt in Banda Aceh province on the northern tip of Sumatra," the largest island in Indonesia, "but such tremors have been common in the last month and residents have largely come to ignore them."

"Seismologists said the quake near the Andamans was clearly an aftershock of the 9.0 magnitude quake that struck off the coast of Sumatra a month ago. The two lie on the same fault line, said John Bellini, a geophysicist at the U.S. Geological Survey in Golden, Colorado."

"But a predawn temblor earlier Monday on the Indonesian island of Sulawesi--nearly 3,200 kilometers (2,000 miles) to the east--was not triggered by the Dec. 26 quake because they lie on different faults, Bellini said."

"Still, the Sulawesi quake, centered about 40 kilometers (25 miles) southwest of the city of Palu, sent

thousands of panicked residents running to higher ground."

"'They were shouting, 'Water! Water!' because they feared waves,' said Dr. Riri Lamadjido, at the city's Undata Hospital, which received no injured patients as a result of the temblor."

"About 30 wooden houses and some shops were damaged, Palu police said."

Tremors continued Wednesday, January 26, 2005 in the Nicobar Islands with three more, one of which was about 6.0 on the Richter scale. On Thursday, January 27, 2005, thirteen tremors, measuring about 4.5 to 5.5 on the Richter scale, again rattled the Nicobar Islands. Two more were reported in the same island chain on Friday, January 28, 2005.

According to the newspaper India Daily, "The UFO sightings happen at night with strange lights. Ships travelling between India and the Nicobar and Andaman Islands, as well as commercial fishermen on the Indian Ocean, have reported receiving strange signals on their radios as they pass over the area," suggesting that the UFOs "are affecting the maritime radio frequencies."

"According to some experts, these are signs of possible experimentation with tectonic plates by some entity."

"People in the Nicobar Islands claim that something is going on under the ocean--deep underground--a few kilometers beneath the watery surface."

"The timing of the aftershocks is also strange. After one large aftershock, there is a considerable length of time before the next one. It means someone is controlling the aftershocks and are making sure the (tectonic) plates are not overstressed."

"Since the big earthquake on Dec. 26, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands have experienced 121 aftershocks, all ranging between 5.0 and 6.0 on the Richter scale."

"A sailor with the Shipping Authority of India, Ltd., who has sailed on trans-Atlantic routes, says this part of the Indian Ocean now resembles the Bermuda Triangle region." (See India Daily for January 24, 2005, "UFO sightings and strange signals again reported in the Indian Ocean." Also the Duluth, Minn. News-Tribune for January 25, 2005, "Earthquakes rattle nerves in tsunami region." Many thanks to Krishnari Bai Dharapurnanda for the Indian newspaper article.)

MYSTERIOUS LIGHT BEAM SWEEPS SHROPSHIRE

"Astronomical experts have joined forces with puzzled Shropshire residents in a bid to identify the mysterious beam of light spotted in the county's skies."

"People across the county stopped in their tracks as a massive beam of light lit up the early morning skies on Tuesday," January 18, 2005. "But no one could explain what caused the eerie light, which disappeared three seconds later."

"Now county residents and top boffins (UK slang for scientists--J.T.) have drawn up a list of possible explanations, including an iridium flare, a burning meteor, a bright searchlight, aircraft landing lights or even a UFO."

"Sue Oliver, 37, of Briarwood, Brookside, Telford," Shropshire, UK "saw the beam of light at 6:40 a.m. while walking her dog at nearby Nedge Hill."

"She said that although she doesn't usually believe in 'weird happenings,' after seeing the light, she thought it could have been a UFO."

"Montgomeryshire MP (Member of Parliament) Lembit Opik, who has campaigned to raise awareness of the idea of a meteorite or comet hitting the earth, claimed the light was most likely an iridium flare, which can illuminate hundreds of square miles and would look like a bright light."

"But Kev Wildgoose, from the Shropshire Astronomical Society, disagreed and said 40 years of experience has led him not to believe it was an astronomical sighting."

"'I'd be more inclined to identify it as an aircraft, perhaps a bright searchlight,' he said."

"People in Lancashire also reported something strange in the sky on Tuesday," January 18, 2005. (See the

Shropshire Star for January 21, 2005, "Experts join debate on mystery light." Many thanks to Robert Fischer for this newspaper article.)

ANOTHER UFO REPORTED IN NEW ZEALAND

On Wednesday, January 26, 2005, at 4 a.m., Mark and Fran Hirst were sound asleep at their home in Wainuiomata, near Lower Hutt on New Zealand's North Island when something unusual happened.

"I was woken just before 4 a.m. by a loud wooshing sound like a small tornado," Fran reported, "It became louder and louder, and it certainly didn't sound anything like a plane or a chopper (helicopter--J.T.). A UFO is all I could think of right then."

"Then I saw a row of bright white strobe lights all moving in a circling motion through the (window) curtain. It lit the whole room even though the curtain were thick and were pulled. It passed overhead at a fairly slow speed."

"Then the noise and the lights disappeared, and I summoned the courage to look out the window. But it was nowhere to be seen. Nothing--just a still, quiet night. I did not see the actual craft. It was quite low but above roof height. A quick approach and an even quicker departure, an instantaneous departure."

Lower Hutt is on New Zealand's North Island, located about 100 kilometers (60 miles) east of Wellington. (Email Form Report)

CYLINDRICAL UFO SEEN IN LEHIGHTON, PENNSYLVANIA

On Tuesday, January 25, 2005, at 6:15 p.m., Dan F. was driving through East Penn Township near Lehighton, Pennsylvania (population 5,537) when he saw a cylindrical UFO coming from the west.

"I was driving home on Route 895, looking west and saw a flat, bar-shaped structure of white lights heading towards me," Dan reported, "I at first thought it was a plane but then realized it was very large and very low. It veered south toward the valley along the Blue Mountains and was probably 100 to 200 feet (30 to 60 meters) above the ground."

"It made a steep turn and headed back towards the highway, as I slowed down to almost a stop to get a better look at it. There is nothing (in the township--J.T.) but old abandoned (stone) quarries, some farmland and woodlands along the stretch, and this would be nowhere near large enough to hold whatever it was."

"As soon as I slowed down enough and was within a quarter-mile (0.4 kilometers) of the object, it made a showy right turn towards the mountains and promptly vanished. I turned off my radio and opened my window and heard no sounds at all. The skies were relatively clear. (The UFOs) speed variable, sometimes very fast, at other times almost floating."

Lehighton, Pa. is on Highways 476 and 209, approximately 18 miles (30 kilometers) north of Allentown. (Email Form Report)

THREE UFOs SIGHTED NEAR ROXBURY, VIRGINIA

On Friday, January 14, 2005, Kenneth Seay was outdoors in Charles City County, Virginia, southeast of Roxbury (population 500) when he spotted an unusual glimmer in the southwestern sky.

"They were just above the horizon," Ken reported, "Pulsating with red, green, yellow and blue lights. The three of them stayed still for several moments. Then they moved directly west. They were closer and I could barely see lights in them. They stayed for about 15 minutes, then the closest one faded, vanished. There were still colored lights around. Their height was just above the horizon, and their speed was very slow."

Roxbury, Va. is on Route 106 about 20 miles (32

kilometers) east of Richmond, the state capital. (Many thanks to Tracy and Amy Helvey for this report.)

CHILEAN POULTRY SLAIN BY CHUPACABRAS

"Two families of the commune of Victoria" in southern Chile "were shocked after finding almost all of their farm birds dead inside their henhouses."

"The first occurred on a property located a few blocks from the city's main plaza during the early morning hours of Sunday," January 23, 2005. "It was still possible to see the feathers of the dead birds scattered throughout the sector."

"People who were in the sector at the time of the attack stated that they had gone to bed around 4 a.m. without hearing any strange sounds. The first dead specimens were locked in a double-gated cage that was kept shut at night to keep the poultry safe from mice and cats. But the creature opened the gates to the cage, killing ten chickens."

"Afterwards, the strange animal toured the two henhouses in the area, killing everything in its way, leaving feathers in its path."

"The next case occurred in a house located three blocks from the municipal buildings in the downtown area of Victoria. This time, the birds showed clear wounds--puncture marks in their extremities and under their wings, leaving the birds completely purple, without a trace of blood on their plumage."

"Luis Gonzalez, owner of the property, revealed that there was no need for guard dogs since his rooster played that role. The rooster kept strangers from approaching the enclosure, and its aggressiveness was such that the owner" allowed it to patrol the farmyard. "But the rooster's natural violence did not keep it from being killed by the 'animal' together with six hens."

"There are other strange cases that had alarmed the residents of La Araucania, this time in the vicinity of Angol. One such case occurred while the city's jail was being built in 2000. A night watchman was doing his rounds when he saw a strange animal land on the hook holding the streetlight, bending it. The watchman managed to see 'something' with wings, measuring one meter (3 feet, 3 inches), red eyes and completely covered in fur." (Editor's Note: Angol is a notorious UFO hotspot. A couple had an alien encounter there in 2000. See UFO Roundup, volume 6, number 10 for March 8, 2001, "Chilean couple's first date turns into an encounter with aliens," page 2.)

"According to Erasmo Mela, president of IFOV (Spanish acronym for Victoria UFO Phenemena Research--J.T.), 'We have had at least five cases attributable to the Chupacabras, and the same incisions were found on the wings. Other characteristics of these attacks are the absence of spilled blood. If you see an animal killing another, the killer shakes it, spilling blood everywhere. There were no traces of blood on the floor,' he stressed."

"What is strange about the events in Victoria and neighboring communities is that the animal, which allegedly attacks rural areas, is now active in densely-populated areas, including backyards 400 meters from the central area of any city, such as its Plaza Mayor." (See the Chilean newspaper El Austral for January 24, 2005, "Chupacabras behind avian deaths?" Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales y Liliana Nunez Orellana por esto articulo de diario.)

THE RAIN ON TITAN'S PLAIN IS MAINLY METHANE

"Black-and-white photos from the Huygens probe show a rugged terrain of ridges, peaks, dark vein-like channels and apparently dry lakebeds" on Saturn's largest moon, Titan.

"On Earth, methane is a flammable gas. On Titan, it is a liquid because of the intense pressure and cold--274 degrees below zero" on the Fahrenheit scale.

"There is liquid that is flowing on the surface of

Titan. It is not water--it is much too cold--it's liquid methane, and this methane really plays the same big role on Titan as water does on Earth,' said mission manager Jean-Pierre Lebreton. 'There are truly remarkable processes at work on Titan's surface and in the atmosphere of Titan which are very, very similar to those occurring on Earth.'"

"A sensor about the size of a police officer's nightstick on the front of Huygens probed beneath the moon's crust and found a material with the consistency of loose sand."

"Channels on the (Titanian) surface are evidence of methane rain. There are also what appear to be river systems and deltas, frozen protrusions riddled by channels, apparent dried-out pools where liquid has perhaps drained away, and stones--probably (methane) ice pebbles--that seem to have been rounded by erosion."

"Does it rain only once a year? Is there a wet season once a year? Does it rain more frequently? We don't know,' said another member of the team, Martin Tomasko of the University of Arizona. 'The feeling is that in the place we landed, it must rain fairly frequently, but we can't be more precise than that.'"

"The area is 'more like Arizona, or someplace like that, where the river beds are dry most of the time,' he added. 'Right after the rain, you might have open flowing liquids, then there are pools, the pools gradually dry out, and the liquid sinks down into the surface. Perhaps it's very seasonal.'"

"The river beds are darkened by what appears to be particles of smog that fall out of Titan's atmosphere, coating the terrain. The dirt apparently gets washed off the ridges by the methane rain to collect in the river channels."

"It did not appear to be raining when Huygens descended through Titan's (orange) haze on parachutes, 'but it has been raining not long ago,' Lebreton said."

"Scientists believe the dark smog particles are formed by Titan's methane, breaking up in the atmosphere. That raised another question: where does the methane come from?"

"There must be some source of methane inside Titan which is releasing the gas into the atmosphere. It has to be continually renewed, otherwise it would have all disappeared,' Owen said."

"Lebreton, the mission manager, said a next possible step in Titan exploration would be to send mobile probes, perhaps balloons to float around before landing."

"The Mars Rover team has already contacted him to say that 'they really now are dreaming of sending their rovers on the surface of Titan,' he added. 'This is highly possible--that we can now dream seriously of sending rovers on the surface of Titan. We just need the money.'"

"The probe was named after Titan's discoverer, the Seventeenth Century Dutch astronomer Christiaan Huygens."

"Huygens was spun off from the Cassini mother ship on (Friday) December 24 (2004). The \$3.3 billion Cassini-Huygens mission to explore Saturn and its moons was launched in 1997 from Cape Canaveral, Florida, a joint effort between NASA, the European Space Agency and the Italian Space Agency. Titan is the first moon other than Earth's to be explored." (See the Duluth, Minn. News-Tribune for January 23, 2005, "Titan: Scientists unsure how often methane rains down on the moon's surface," page 7A.)

From the UFO Files...

1945: FLIGHT OF THE OSTARA

"On the gray morning of January 8, 1945, a flock of reporters, pencils and notepads at the ready, hovered around Admiral Jonas Ingram, commander of the Eastern Sea Frontier, in his wardroom aboard a warship in New York harbor. The scribes had come for what Ingram's public-relations staff had promised would be 'a historic press conference.'"

"Ingram, a heavyset, flat-nosed old salt who had gained national recognition as football coach at the (U.S.) Naval Academy (in Annapolis, Maryland), was one of

the Navy's colorful characters--and most outspoken. Seated behind a long table, Ingram said, 'Gentlemen, I have reason to assume that the Nazis are getting ready to launch a strategic attack on New York and Washington by robot bombs.'

"There was a gasp of astonishment from the reporters."

"I am here to tell you that these attacks are not only possible, but probable as well, and that the (USA's) East Coast is likely to be buzzbombed within the next thirty or sixty days."

Ingram eyed his listeners, then added grimly, 'But we're ready for them. The thing to do is not to get excited about it. (The buzzbombs) might knock out a high building or two, might create a fire hazard, and most certainly would cause casualties. But (the buzzbombs) cannot seriously affect the progress of the war.'

"The hard-nosed Ingram added that 'it may be only ten or twelve buzzbombs, but they may come before we can stop them.'"

"'At any rate,' the admiral concluded, 'I'm springing the cat from the bag to let the Huns know that we are ready for them!'"

Coach Ingram's announcement triggered a media sensation. The following day, January 9, 1945, the New York Times ran the story with the headline ROBOT BOMB ATTACKS HERE HELD POSSIBLE. But the war in Europe ended on May 8, 1945, and no Nazi rocket came plummeting out of orbit to crash in Manhattan.

Was Coach Ingram given to flights of fancy? Not at all. Allied intelligence knew that the Germans were working on a "New York Rocket." At least twenty of these large rockets were built at the SS underground base at Nordhausen. What happened to them is one of the enduring mysteries of World War II.

In his 1952 book, V2--Der Schuss ins Weltall, Major General Walter Dornberger, commander of the Peenemunde Rocket Research Institute, described the "New York Rocket" in detail. He wrote, "Thus the A-9 came into being...the missile was planned to reach at a height of about 20 kilometers (12 miles), a maximum speed of 4,400 kilometers per hour (2,800 miles per hour) and then go into a shallow curving glide with a peak of nearly 30 kilometers (18 miles). On arrival over the target at a height of 5 kilometers (3 miles), it was planned to dive vertically, like the V-1, a primitive rocket-powered cruise missile, best known in World War II as "the buzz bomb."

"A better plan, however, and one which greatly improved range, was to construct the A-10, weighing 87 tons and with a total propellant capacity of 62 tons, as the first step of the combined A-9/A-10. The A-9 was placed on top of the A-10. The latter had a thrust of 200 tons for 50 to 60 seconds and gave the rocket a speed of 4,400 kilometers per hour. After the exhaustion of the first step (stage or A-10--J.T.), the A-9 would be ignited and lift out of the A-10."

"Once we reached this stage (in the blueprints), the horses fairly bolted with us," Dornberger wrote, "With our big rocket motors and step (multi-stage) rockets, we could build space ships which would circle the earth like moons at a height of 500 kilometers (300 miles) and at speeds of 30,000 kilometers per hour (18,000 miles per hour). Space stations and glass spheres containing the embalmed bodies of the pioneers of rocket development and space travel could be put into permanent orbits around the earth. An expedition to the moon was a popular topic, too. Then we dreamed of atomic energy, which would at last give us the necessary drive for flight into the infinity of space, to the very stars."

Amazingly, the gang at Peenemunde drew up these blueprints during 1942 and 1943. In his book, Gen. Dornberger, a child of the Nineteenth Century, admits to being a little "disconcerted" by these off-duty bull sessions, in which Werner von Braun, Willy Ley, Klaus Reidel and even Hitler's favorite aviatrix, Hannah Reisch, "chatted with such easy familiarity about outer space, the moon, the planets and what forms extraterrestrial life might take."

The question remains: did the A-9/A-10 combo ever make it into space?

There are a handful of clues that it did. In 1968,

Ballantine published a photo on the back cover of their paperback book on German secret weapons of World War II. It shows a swept-winged A-9 on top of a cluster of rocket boosters. Flames pour out of five nozzles on the array. It has the hazy appearance of being shot with a long telephoto lens.

When your editor first saw this photo, I was struck by the similarity to the Soviet rockets then being launched from Baikonur. Unfortunately, with nothing in the photo's background to offer a size comparison, there is no telling whether the "customized" Nazi rocket is full-sized or merely a much smaller test model.

On the other hand, on November 19, 1954, Hermann Klein, a former scientist at Peenemunde then living in exile in Zurich, said he had worked on a Flugeschiebe (German for flying disc--J.T.) project at Peenemunde in 1942. The Nazi saucers were built by a team of three scientists--Schriever, Miethe and Belonzo--and the vehicle was given the code name V-7.

On October 10, 1952, the Swedish newspaper Aftonbladet reported that a space rocket had been launched from an SS facility near Prague (now the capital of the Czech Republic--J.T.) in February 1945. The vehicle sounds suspiciously like an A-9/A-10. And the launch came about a month after Admiral Ingram's press conference in New York City.

During the summer of 1943, the Peenemunde research center was seized by Reichsfuehrer-SS Heinrich Himmler. German rocketry became a wholly-owned subsidiary of the SS. During a trip to Berlin on September 6, 1943, Gen. Dornberger met his new boss, 42-year-old SS-Brigadefuehrer Hans Kammler.

"He had the slim figure of a cavalryman, neither tall nor short," Dornberger wrote, "In his early forties, broad-shouldered and narrow in the hips, with bronzed, clear-cut features, and a high forehead under dark hair slightly streaked with gray and brushed straight back, Dr. Kammler had piercing and restless brown eyes, a lean curved beak of a nose, and a strong mouth, the underlip thrust forward as though in defiance. That mouth indicated brutality, derision, disdain and overweening pride. The chin was well-molded and prominent."

"One's first impression was of a virile, handsome and captivating personality. He looked like some hero of the Renaissance, a condottiere of the period of the civil wars in northern Italy."

Kammler was Himmler's most trusted aide. He had a reputation of being the man who could get things done. In 1942, for example, Kammler, an architect by trade, had personally designed and supervised the construction of the giant Vernichtungslager (German for destruction camp--J.T.) called Auschwitz II, with its capacity for 200,000 prisoners, at Birkenau in southern Poland.

Now Himmler had new work for him. The Reichsfuehrer-SS wanted an underground factory "completely impervious to Allied bombs" that would build all of the contraptions in the Peenemunde gang's "blue sky" blueprints. It is not known if Hitler approved of this or not--it's part of what Colonel-General Erich von Manstein once called "the hermetically-sealed SS-Reich"--but Himmler was determined to build a workable spacecraft.

Himmler "urged Pohl to build factories for the production of war materials in natural caves and underground tunnels immune to enemy bombing and instructed him to hollow out workshop and factory space in all SS stone quarries, suggesting that by the summer of 1944 they should have the 'new cavemen' installed in the greatest number of 'uniquely bomb-proof work sites'...Brigadefuehrer Hans Kammler succeeded in creating underground workshops and living quarters from a cave system in the Hartz mountains in central Germany in what (Albert) Speer, writing to congratulate him, called 'an almost impossibly short period of two months' a feat, he continued, 'unsurpassable even by American standards.'"

With Kammler at the helm, production of V-1 and V-2 weapons went into high gear. In his book V-1, V-2: Hitler's Vengeance on London, David Johnson noted that "During the (V-1) Flying Bomb assault, from mid-June to early September 1944, 2,419 of the pilotless aircraft crash-dived into London. Rail and transportation networks were seriously disrupted. War production fell off."

"Between 8th September 1944 and 27th March 1945, 517 V-2 rockets struck London, with another 378 falling short of their target and impacting in Essex. Throughout southern England, a grand total of 1,054 came down. In London alone over 2,700 civilians were dead from the rockets."

On March 27, 1945, "the last V-2 to hit Britain came down on Orpington, Kent, about 20 miles (32 kilometers) south-east of London."

"On the night of 17 December (1944) a V-2 crashed into the Rex cinema in Antwerp (Belgium) during a crowded show. When Hitler was informed that 1,100 people, including 700 (Allied) soldiers had been killed, by a characteristic irony he was reluctant to credit the report. 'That would finally be the first successful launch,' he observed sarcastically, 'But it is so fairytale that my scepticism keeps me from believing it. Who is the informer? Is he paid by the launch crew?'"

But if Hitler had little faith in the V-2, the same cannot be said of Himmler and Kammler. Himmler gave his aide everything he needed to keep the rocket program going.

"Kammler still believed that he alone, with his Army Corps and the weapons over which he had absolute authority, could prevent the imminent collapse, postpone a decision and even turn the scales. The (V-2) transports still moved without respite to the operational area" in the Netherlands, Dornberger wrote. "Convoys of motor vehicles bridged the gaps in the railways. Kammler's supply columns, equipped with infrared devices that enabled them to see in the dark, rumbled along the Dutch highways."

Himmler's interest in spaceflight grew out of his personal commitment to the occult. When he had been appointed leader of the Schutzstaffel (German for Protection Squad--J.T.) in 1929, the group had been a small unit within the larger Sturmabteilung or Brownshirt militia, a kind of Secret Service devoted to the protection of Hitler and the Nazi leadership. By 1945, however, Himmler had transformed the SS into "a state within a state." Under his direction, the SS had become the Schwarze Sonne (German for Black Sun--J.T.), an order of mystics that numbered in the low millions.

In his book Hitler's Flying Saucers, author Henry Stevens pointed out, "The Black Sun to these initiated individuals was a physical body like our visible sun except that the Black Sun was not visible to the naked eye...The Black Sun is sometimes represented symbolically as a black sphere out of which eight arms extend. Such is its most famous rendition on the mosaic floor at Wewelsburg Castle which served as the spiritual home of the SS."

Himmler's "scientists were influenced by some ideas originating in Asia. Tibet and India are the suspects in question. UFOs have been reported over Mongolia, Tibet and India for centuries. The ancient Indians even claimed to have constructed aircraft which resembled flying saucers. These saucers are called Vimanas."

Since his days in the mystical group Artamen in the early 1920s, Himmler had been fascinated with the scriptures of ancient India. As a reader of the Rig-Veda and the Mahabharata, he would have been familiar with the tales of rishis (Hindu wizards--J.T.) visiting other worlds in outer space. So perhaps it's no surprise that he sent "the German SS-Ahnenerbe, an organization whose purpose was associated with researching German ancestry, out (on) expeditions to the East with the express purpose of acquiring ancient, hidden knowledge."

Kammler transferred Gen. Dornberger and Werner von Braun into the Wasserfall anti-aircraft rocket program in late 1944. Meanwhile, work continued on the Schriever-Meithe V-7 flying disc. With help from another mystical group, the Thule Gesellschaft, the project developed a craft called the Haunebu-1. This saucer "had a 25-meter diameter, a speed of 4,800 kilometers per hour (3,000 miles per hour) and carried a crew of nine men."

In November 1943, a second saucer, the Haunebu-2, was built, "slightly larger and could travel 6,000 kilometers per hour (3,600 miles per hour) for fifty-five hours."

A year later, in early December 1944, Gruppe Kammler unveiled its showpiece, the Haunebu-3, which "had a

diameter of 71 meters (234 feet), and could reach a speed of 40,000 kilometers per hour (25,000 miles per hour)" and remain in space "for up to eight weeks, carrying a crew of 32 men."

Unaware of the progress of the Schriever-Miethe team, Gen. Dornberger proposed to suspend work on the A-9/A-10 "New York Rocket." The order was immediately countermanded. "But now, at the end of 1944, Kammler demanded its resumption," the general wrote, "I had no idea why."

In retrospect, it appears that either Himmler or Kammler--it is not at all clear who--planned to use the A-9/A-10 as a booster to get the Haunebu-3, now referred to as the Ostara (ancient German goddess of the dawn--J.T.), into orbit rather than have the big saucer make the trip under its own power.

"On January 8, 1945, the first version of the A-9...took off. The control failed about 30 meters (100 feet) above the firing table (launch pad)," Dornberger wrote, "A few days later, we were unable to launch another missile because the alcohol tank had developed a leak. At last, on January 24 (1945), we had our first success. The rocket, climbing vertically, reached a peak height of nearly 80 kilometers (50 miles) at a maximum speed of 4,300 kilometers per hour (2,700 miles per hour)." (Editor's Comment: I think this may have been the rocket in the wartime photo that appeared on the back cover of Ballantine's book.)

All that needed to be done now was to strap two or three A-9/A-10 boosters together, with the Ostara as payload, and launch from Himmler's new SS base near Prague.

The same day the A-9/A-10 had its successful launch, January 24, 1945, Soviet troops of Marshal Ivan Konev's First Ukrainian Front (army group--J.T.) entered Auschwitz. Russian soldiers saw for themselves the results of Kammler's earlier "big project."

"On April 3, 1945, I had orders from Kammler to evacuate my staff of four hundred and fifty old Peenemunde hands to the Lower Alps near Oberammergau. We moved on April 6, as the American tanks advanced through Bleicherode toward Bad Sachsa," Dornberger wrote, "I parted from Kammler and spent the last month of the war at Oberjoch near Hindelang with my staff and Professor von Braun, who had been injured in an automobile accident."

So, on April 7, 1945, Hans Kammler, the architect of Auschwitz-Birkenau, pulled a disappearing act worthy of Houdini. "There are five different versions of his death," Henry Stevens wrote, "And they all read like pulp fiction."

Did Kammler head for outer space aboard the Ostara? Or did he leave on an even larger spacecraft, the Andromeda? Only one person knows the answer to that question, and he committed suicide with a cyanide pill on May 23, 1945--Heinrich Himmler.

But if anybody had a really, really pressing need to leave Earth in April 1945 it was SS-Brigadefuehrer Hans Kammler. (See the books V2--Der Schuss ins Weltall by Walter Dornberger, Bechtle Verlag, Esslingen, Germany, 1952, pages 128, 129, 130, 131, 176, 177, 219 and 235; Hitler's Undercover War by William Breuer, St. Martin's Press, New York, N.Y., 1989, pages 317, 318 and 319; V-1, V-2, Hitler's Vengeance on London by David Johnson, Stein & Day Publishers, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y., 1981, pages 193, 194 and 195; Flying Saucers Uncensored by Harold T. Wilkins, The Citadel Press, New York, N.Y., 1955, pages 252 and 253; Himmler by Peter Padfield, MJF Books, New York, N.Y., 1990, pages 389, 464, 481, 482 and 611; Armageddon: The Battle for Germany 1944-1945 by Max Hastings, Alfred A. Knopf, 2004, pages 171, 172, 248 and 492; Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism and the Politics of Identity by Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, New York University Press, New York, N.Y., 2002, pages 166, 167 and 168; and Hitler's Flying Saucers by Henry Stevens, Adventures Unlimited Press, Kempton, Illinois, 2003, pages 86, 87, 89, 90, 95, 158, 160, 161, 225, 264 and 265.)

Well, that's it for this week. Join us next time for more UFO, Fortean and paranormal news from around the planet Earth--and occasionally, Titan--brought to you by "the paper that goes home--UFO Roundup." See you next

time.

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2005 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their Web sites or in news groups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan.nul>
or use the Sighting Report Form at:

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/submit/sightings.shtml>

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster.nul>

UFOINFO: <http://www.ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives for UFO Roundup, AUFORN Australian
UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI Magazine
plus archives of Humanoid Sighting Reports (Albert
Rosales), Filer's Files, Oz Files, UFO News 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Kenny Young

From: **Brian Adams** <ufosource.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 08:39:55 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:52:40 -0500
Subject: Kenny Young

RIP Kenny. We'll miss you. My sympathy to the Young family and friends.

We shall endeavor to carry on Kenny's fervent support for ufology.

Brian Adams
ufomig.bravehost.com
Mo. St. Dir. 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Sonora UFO Sightings

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 09:22:32 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:56:17 -0500
Subject: Sonora UFO Sightings

Fellow Listerions,

I received some interesting correspondence from Mr. Mark Olson in response to my last article; with his permission I'm posting the gist of that here:

1-25-05

Dear Mr. Warren:

I read your blog article with interest as I have emailed, phoned and wrote to all the newspapers, radio stations, and UFO organizations I could find regarding the ongoing UFO Wave over Sonora, CA to no avail. Nor have I been able to get any organization to independently investigate these unidentified aerial objects. It has been extremely frustrating. I do not believe I am qualified to investigate these things on my own, but I'm doing the best that I can.

Are you are familiar with the Sonora UFO Sightings? There have been some very remarkable sightings that have been videotaped since May of 2004 and the sightings continue. Please see www.sonorasightings.com for video clips of these extraordinary objects and details of the sightings.

I wrote:

Thank you for your consideration of my article. In perusing your web-site it would seem that you have done an excellent job in at the very least "documenting" your experiences. The mainstream media's response of course isn't a surprise, but I am curious; what UFO organizations have you been in contact with?

Hello Mr. Warren,

I have contacted NUFORC, NARCAP, and MUFON. I have also contacted any and all UFO Organizations I could find, but never received a response.

Peter Davenport never acknowledged the video that I sent to him, while the Asst. Director of Northern California held my video for over four months before "remembering" to give it to the Director, and only after I asked what happened to it. Peter Davenport asked me if the first triangular object I videotaped on May 31 was the Space Station, because "it flew over your area an hour later", that without looking at the footage.

I still have yet to hear from MUFON whether they have even begun to analyze the footage. I finally emailed the Board of Directors of MUFON. Only then did I get a response from Ruben Uriarte, the Director of No. Cal. MUFON.

I have yet to see any investigation of these sightings. I've

repeatedly asked that someone come out for at least a week as these objects don't appear every night. Sometimes, I would wait for days before seeing another object.

If someone had responded and investigated, these objects could have been videotaped by the investigators. I began asking for investigators in May of 2004.

Sincerely,

Mark

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 16:17:05 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 05:59:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 02:26:49 -0400
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 14:13:05 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>I think the balloon theory in all of it's aspects is a non-
>>>starter.

>>It may be a non-finisher, but what we need to do is to do a
>>_better_ job of trying to make it work than Robinson, Reynolds &
>>>co., and still fail. Get rid of the strongest and strangest
>>versions of it, not just the weakest and most obvious. Until
>>then it will remain a runner.

>Why must it be a runner since it doesn't match the scenario?

But Don, we need to prove that it doesn't match the scenario,
not just assert it. Don't we? I've read a lot of assertions on
the List recently about what is or is not possible, and at least
half of them are simply not directed at the theory under
consideration, but rather hark back to old discussions and
appear to be reflex dismissals based on opinions so entrenched
that their authors don't even bother to read what is being
proposed with any care. How can that possibly be good enough??

I find the idea that's been proposed interesting enough to
explore and to criticise, and I've been doing so on and off-List
with one or two others who are motivated to get their
calculators out and their brains in gear. Not everybody here has
to give a damn, of course, but you can bet your life that some
future Larry Robinson will find it interesting too, and you
might then be lucky enough to be able to retort, "Nice try, but
that suspended test-rig notion was rigorously disproved by David
Rudiak way back in 2005", and then you can get on with more
important things.

>Following the reasoning that we must knock down all arguements
>no matter how off-the-wall brings us back , in the end, back to
>the possibility of the biggest off -the-wall explanation of them
>all, that this was an intelligently controlled vehicle of an
>extraterrestrial nature.

>Then where are you?

Considering how to turn that "off-the-wall possibility" into a
testable scientific hypothesis, is where you are. Same place. No
one is stopping you working on that now.

If at the end of this little exercise some small new thing is
known, with real confidence, about what the Socorro object
definitely wasn't then in my book this is of value and we are
doing exactly what ufologists should be doing (in the absence of
warp drives to examine and aliens to interview). You and a
number of others on this List might disagree with that. Fair

enough. Indeed it might well be the case that this list is simply not the right forum for UFO study.

Some probably believe they know all there is to know about Socorro and don't want to be bothered with obvious nonsense. I reckon a lot people - many of them sceptics - thought they knew all there was to know about Trindade until fairly recently, and Lakenheath too. I don't hear so many confident opinions on these cases recently. Yes we should pay attention to what witnesses say, and to physics, logic and the ingenuity of explainers as well. You can sneer if you want, and others can (comically) cast me as a debunker. But I have absolutely no problem with my self-indulgent nit-picking and time-wasting. At least I can make my own ideas clearer. I guess you all just go and do whatever it is you want to do.

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Aliens Of The Deep - Hall

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 16:55:49 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 06:00:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Aliens Of The Deep - Hall

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:50:25 -0000
>Subject: Aliens Of The Deep

>"Stanford graduate student Kevin Hand explores the potential for
>life on Europa, an icy moon of Jupiter, for his doctoral work
>with geological and environmental sciences Associate Professor
>Christopher Chyba. Like most astrobiologists and planetary
>scientists, Hand must do his research from afar. He can't ride a
>rocket 365 million miles to Europa, drill into the ice-capped
>ocean and scuba dive to find signs of life."

>Full article at:

><http://www.astrobio.net/news/article1420.html>

Joe,

A little sauce for the gander: If he can't bring it into the laboratory and conduct physical and chemical tests on it, it's not real. It's just astrobiological science fiction.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Secrecy News -- 02/01/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 12:45:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 06:07:53 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 02/01/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 11
February 1, 2005

** DOE DENIES RELEASE OF HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM STUDY
** NEW OFFICIAL RESOURCES ON SECURITY POLICY, OVERSIGHT
** STILL MORE FROM CRS

DOE DENIES RELEASE OF HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM STUDY

In a radical shift in information disclosure and nuclear nonproliferation policies, the Department of Energy last week formally denied release of a history of highly enriched uranium (HEU) production that it had promised to publish nearly a decade ago.

DOE said that the study was exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act because it is an "internal" document that is also "pre-decisional."

"The responsive document is internal because it does not purport to regulate activities among members of the public," wrote DOE security officer Marshall O. Combs.

This is a bizarre redefinition of the FOIA exemption for "internal" agency records that would probably exempt the majority of government records from public disclosure, including most historical records, since they do not specifically regulate public activities. The new DOE definition would turn the FOIA into the Freedom From Information Act.

As evidence that the document is pre-decisional and deliberative in nature, Mr. Combs notes that the cover page states that it "Contains Deliberative Process Information."

Legally, this is flimsy stuff. The study was written for publication and it is unclassified, as confirmed in a DOE classification review. That means it "could not reasonably be expected to cause damage to the national security." In particular, the HEU study does not meet the standard for classification of "vulnerabilities... of systems, installations, infrastructures, ... relating to the national security." (Executive Order 13292, section 1.4g).

Mr. Combs cannot gainsay the fact that the study has been reviewed and declassified. Inexplicably, however, he still insists that "disclosure of the information would permit terrorists to assess the nation's vulnerability and target locations to damage the nation's critical infrastructure." And while he cannot claim that disclosure would "damage national security" (which would make it properly classified), he offers the legally meaningless claim that it would be "harmful to the nation's security."

As a whole, the DOE denial letter is a monument to the Ashcroft FOIA policy, cited by Combs, which encourages agencies to

confabulate legal arguments against disclosure. The denial will be appealed. See a copy of the January 24 denial letter here:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/2005/01/doe012405.pdf>

In 1997, DOE made a "commitment" to publish the study that it has just refused to release. It was an era, rapidly receding, in which DOE officials valued public accountability, and sought to lead by example in promoting transparency and nuclear nonproliferation.

"This report will describe the history of Government production, acquisition, use, disposition, and inventories of highly enriched uranium," DOE stated back then. "This report will provide assistance to worldwide nonproliferation efforts by revealing where United States highly enriched uranium resides in the United States as well as in other nations. It will also assist regulators in environmental, health, and safety matters at domestic sites where this material is stored or buried." See this 1997 fact sheet:

<http://www.osti.gov/html/osti/opennet/document/jan97/prcfacts.html#I11>

A companion report on the history of plutonium production was previously published by DOE, and it gives the lie to Mr. Combs' contrived arguments for withholding of the HEU study.

That report, entitled "Plutonium: The First 50 Years," was posted for several years on the DOE web site. It is gone now, but a copy can still be found here:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/othergov/doe/pu50y.html>

NEW OFFICIAL RESOURCES ON SECURITY POLICY, OVERSIGHT

The rules of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence were republished in the Congressional Record yesterday, as slightly modified last year. A copy is posted here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_cr/sscirules.html

The Defense Security Service last month published Industrial Security Letter ISL 05L-1, including updates on some of the dizzyingly detailed security rules that contractors handling classified information must comply with. See:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/library/nispom/isl05l-1.pdf>

Oversight of highly classified special access programs (SAPs) in the Department of Defense is the subject of a briefing presented last week to the Defense Science Board. It is the provocative contention of William Arkin's new book Code Names that the rules governing DoD SAP oversight are effectively circumvented by means of SAP-like "Alternative or Compensatory Control Measures" (ACCMs). At any rate, this January 27 briefing describes how the SAP oversight process is supposed to work. (Thanks to IWP Newsstand, defense.iwpnewsstand.com):

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/othergov/dod/sapoversight.pdf>

STILL MORE FROM CRS

The tiresome Congressional Research Service does not permit direct public access to its products. The following new or newly updated CRS reports were obtained by Secrecy News.

"Military Aviation: Issues and Options for Combating Terrorism and Counterinsurgency," January 24, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RL32737.pdf>

"Arms Control and Nonproliferation Activities: A Catalog of Recent Events," updated January 7, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/crs/RL30033.pdf>

"Information Sharing for Homeland Security: A Brief Overview," updated January 10, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/RL32597.pdf>

"Terrorist Attacks and National Emergencies Act Declarations,"
updated January 7, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21017.pdf>

"Continuity of Government: Current Federal Arrangements and the
Future," updated January 7, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/RS21089.pdf>

"Martial Law and National Emergency," updated January 7, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/RS21024.pdf>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the
Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to
secrecy_news-request.nul
with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 18:59:16 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 06:12:34 -0500
Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:52:19 -0700
>Subject: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 14:02:57 +0000 (GMT)
>From: Lawrie Williams <lawrie_williams.nul>
>To: forteana.nul
>Subj: FWD [forteana] A list of ships but no Llandoverly Castle

><http://www.genseek.net/ships.htm>

>This might be of interest. In a lot of accounts of paranormal
>events a ship is involved. Here is a web page with long lists of
>old ships. I have just been looking for the Llandoverly Castle,
>but no dice, alas.

>Here are the old items that most relate to this:

>Llandoverly Castle Cigar Ship Close Encounter - July 1 1947

>23. GIANT IN THE SKY

<snip>

The earliest published reference to this story appears to be in FSR Vol 9 no 3 which would have been in 1963. It features in Coral Lorenzen's "Flying Saucers: the startling evidence of the invasion from outer space" Signet/NAL 1966 on page 19. Coral says that Edgar Jarrold the pioneer Australian Ufologist, forwarded her a letter from the witness in 1954. However the account does not appear in the hardback edition "The Great Flying Saucer Hoax" published in 1962.

CL's account gives what purport to the witnesses own words and she says the event took place "early July" with no precise date given.

There was indeed a ship called The Landoverly Castle which plied the Durban route see:

<http://www.catalogue.nationalarchives.gov.uk/searchresults.asp?SearchInit=0&txtsearchterm=Llandoverly+Castle&txtfirstdate=1945&txtlastdate=1960&txtrestriction=&hdns>

If you have problems just type in:

www.catalogue.nationalarchives.gov.uk

and put in the words.

Sadly no passenger list for this particular voyage.

Peter Rogerson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 15:05:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 06:15:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Ledger

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 14:23:41 EST
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 20:54:48 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>Ah, but David, you miss the point here. According to Jeromian
>>principles (as set out in the discussion of the Trindade case)
>>it's not enough just for you to point out that in forty years
>>no-one has ever turned up with evidence to *prove* the claim.
>>It's actually your responsibility to find "negative witnesses",
>>i.e. people who can show you documentary evidence that it
>>_didn't_ happen. I don't know exactly how you'd do this, but I'm
>>sure Jerry Clark could tell you.

>Completely full of it as usual. Where are the 300 crew members
>who could serve as potential "negative witnesses" at Socorro? If
>the event never happened _and_ there were 300 people who were in
>a position to see nothing happened or know about it from close
>range, that would be significant. But Socorro occurred in an
>uninhabited mesa and there were no 300 people around to be
>positive or "negative" witnesses.

Hi Brad,

Apparently even John couldn't get himself to accept a balloon
explanation for the Socorro incident, so his only out was to
attack Jerry Clark.

The negative witness theory is nonsense.

An astronomer on lonely mountain top in the Andes Mountains
happens to view a Super Nova through his telescope while it's
unfolding. However just about everyone else in North and South
America is asleep and didn't see this happen. These are the
negative witnesses-all~700 million of them. Therefore by John's
reasoning, it didn't happen.

But it did.

Supernova SN 1987a

http://library.thinkquest.org/18188/n_english/universe/stars/supernova.htm?tqskip1=1

Watch for the wrap.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

14 "Lightbulbs" In Yorkshire Sky

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 11:51:00 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 06:20:00 -0500
Subject: 14 "Lightbulbs" In Yorkshire Sky

Source: Scarborough Today - Yorkshire, UK

<http://www.scarboroughtoday.co.uk/ViewArticle2.aspx?SectionID=3D800&ArticleID=3D934677>

02-01-05

Bright lights spotted in sky

A series of moving bright lights were spotted in the sky off Scarborough -- cementing claims that the East Coast is the UFO capital of Europe.

Pat Glenwright, of Grange Avenue, saw the lights shoot across the sky at 4.30pm yesterday.

She said: "There were about 14 so it definitely wasn't an aeroplane. They were flying in a group and it looks from here as though they were the size of lightbulbs."

A friend added: "They were bright and were very high up. It was very noticeable.

"They were coming from right and left and looked as though they were heading towards Whitby."

In December Chris Parr, of the British UFO Hunters group, said the coastal area between Filey and Scarborough was the British hotspot for UFO activity.

Filey UFO hunter Russ Kellett said there are more recorded sightings of UFOs in Filey and along the East Coast than anywhere else in the country.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 13:21:11 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 06:59:52 -0500
Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:52:19 -0700
>Subject: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 14:02:57 +0000 (GMT)
>From: Lawrie Williams <lawrie_williams.nul>
>To: forteana.nul
>Subj: FWD [forteana] A list of ships but no Llandoverly Castle

><http://www.genseek.net/ships.htm>

>This might be of interest. In a lot of accounts of paranormal events a ship is involved. Here is a web page with long lists of old ships. I have just been looking for the Llandoverly Castle, but no dice, alas.

>Here are the old items that most relate to this:

>Llandoverly Castle Cigar Ship Close Encounter - July 1 1947

>23. GIANT IN THE SKY

<snip>

This could be interesting Terry:

Is there some question, whether the Llandoverly Castle existed, as a ship by that name?

I'm off to work now, but might dig around when I get back in 12 hours.

I would think its hard for a a large passenger liner would vanish from the records, even if scrapped long ago.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 14:15:05 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:01:33 -0500
Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:52:19 -0700
>Subject: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

<snip>

><http://www.genseek.net/ships.htm>

>This might be of interest. In a lot of accounts of paranormal
>events a ship is involved. Here is a web page with long lists of
>old ships. I have just been looking for the Llandoverly Castle,
>but no dice, alas.

<http://www.gwpda.org/naval/lcastl10.htm>

The Llandoverly Castle definitely existed, at least until World
War ONE, when it was sunk by a German submarine.

It was a hospital ship during WW1.

Now the question becomes, was there a second ship by that same
name, one carrying passengers down the SE African coast in 1947?

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 16:31:12 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:02:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Clark

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>Please raise your hands.

I was flown to New York City and interviewed for the show last
July. Mike Swords was filmed after me.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 22:35:31 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:04:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>I caught an add Saturday night for the upcoming ABC special on
>UFOs with Peter Jennings. My bias aside--the add was very
>impressive, and led one to believe that is going to be about
>"UFOs only."

>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>Please raise your hands.

To my personal knowledge, add Mike Swords who preceeded me in
the NYC ABC-TV studio interview chair; Jerry Clark who was
interviewed earlier the same day; and Col. Charles Halt, USAF
(Ret.).

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 17:54:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:07:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:01:41 -0600
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

<snip>

>Your blog view was entertaining. Everyone should read it.
>But sincerely Rich, is your blog post a knee-jerk reaction to
>the reception you received on your Socorro balloon scoop? Or is
>it a thoroughly considered and reasoned indictment of the field?
>I ask here because the post in question runs counter to much of
>what you have asserted here in the past.

>I find none of your cited blog posts assertions helpful, and
>they seem bent on trying to fracture an already fractious
>community. But to what end? Is this some kind of divide and
>conquer strategy? If so, I think it will take someone with a bit
>more in the "chops" department. No offense, but in my view there
>is much to learn from all these folks. All of them.

>In the end, the biggest question remaining is... where does
>Rich Reynolds fit in your list? Does he?

Kyle...

Fractious may be the tenor of my blog postings. And I'm open to
all other kinds of accusations.

How can one be more fractious than what is seen here at UpDates?

The cacaphony of diverse views, some loopy and some not, is
grist for a psychiatrist's couch - if psychiatry was accepted
here as a bonafide profession.

A blog, as you know, since you have one, is a place where a kind
of stream of consciousness occurs. It's a "diary" written off
the cuff, not beholden to the civilized restraints of the
superego.

The point of my posts here and at our blog-site is to rattle the
cages of somnambulism and ill-think which is rampant here, and a
lot of other places.

One can be nice (which I have been on occasion) but then one is
call a sycophant.

One can be pointed, almost obnoxious, and one is called
fractious, or seen to have some kind of ulterior motive for
making waves. You know better, but want to have at me today, and
that's okay. I expected it sooner than later from the e-mails
I've gotten about some here at UFO UpDates.

All I can say is that my goal is to raise questions and
eyebrows, hoping to vitalize old discussions and create new one.
If people don't like that, I'll be ostracized, which you seem
anxious to spur on.

I'll try to behave, nonetheless, glad that Errol is in charge

Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

here and not some other folks (ahem).

Rich

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 16:11:49 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:09:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - Connors

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:21:04 -0500
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:56:51 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

<snip>

>Ms. Connors:

>Thanks for the slap. You're not angry because I didn't mention
>you, are you? (I was fearful of incurring your wrath, but it
>happened anyway.)

>You are a woman to contend with. surely.

Rich,

What slap? I commented that your blog thingamajig was comedic
and recommended others read it. Then I commented on what it
reminded me from life's observations.

As to the womanly talons exhibited with the snitty remark about
mentioning my name, I'm glad you didn't. I am careful about
associations; guilt by association... that kind of thing.

I bet you were a hoot in all the organizations you belonged to
as you are making the long and arduous journey toward attempting
to correct the defect.

Wendy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Peter Jennings's UFO Program - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 16:21:28 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:11:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings's UFO Program - Connors

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>I caught an add Saturday night for the upcoming ABC special on
>UFOs with Peter Jennings. My bias aside--the add was very
>impressive, and led one to believe that is going to be about
>"UFOs only."

>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>Please raise your hands.

Hi Frank,

I supplied audio/visual materials for the program. Haven't a
clue what kind of treatment of Ufology is coming. Like everyone
else, I'm waiting to watch.

Wendy Connors

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Jamieson

From: Sue Jamieson <Hilandvt.nul>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 19:17:22 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:16:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Jamieson

[Non-Subscriber post]

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>Please raise your hands.

I was interviewed with a couple of other people at the late Dr. John Mack's home in Cambridge, MA in early September, 2004 for the Life in the Universe documentary.

I'm curious about how the network has chosen to present the program and am looking forward to seeing it (with some trepidation about how deep a hole I might have to dig to hide in). I'm hoping, as we all are, that ABC will present the interviews with integrity. It remains to be seen.

My understanding is it will be aired Thursday, February 24th at 8:00 PM EST. If you have a different date and time, please let me know.

Best wishes,

Sue Jamieson
Vermont

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Mysteries Lurk Between The Walls Of Capitol

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 18:12:57 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:20:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Mysteries Lurk Between The Walls Of Capitol

Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 00:40:38 -0800
From: "T. Peter Park" <tpeterpark.nul>
To: forteana.nul
Subj: FWD [forteana] Re: Mysteries Lurk Between The Walls Of Capitol Hill Museum

D. Parvaz's Seattle Post Intelligencer article on the Seattle Museum of the Mysteries stated:

"If UFOs are more your speed, you're in the right spot: The first official UFO sighting took place near Mount Rainier on July 24, 1947. It turns out someone else spotted a UFO on July 21 of the same year over Vashon Island, but the July 24 one is considered the first official, reported sighting"

The dates should be June 24 and June 21, 1947--not July 24 and July 21.

The June 21 sighting over Vashon Island actually took place over Maury Island, and is famous or notorious in ufological literature as the "Maury Island Affair" or "Maury Island Hoax" (depending on your viewpoint). Vashon and Maury Islands are twin islands connected by a causeway in Puget Sound, in-between Tacoma and Seattle.

On the afternoon of June 21, 1947, a Tacoma floating lumber salvager and auxiliary harbor patrolman named Harold Dahl was in his boat near Maury Island, along with his teen-age son and two crewmen, when he saw six doughnut-shaped UFO's high in the sky over Maury Island. One weird craft seemed to be in trouble, and spewed several tons of hot dark lava-like slag and some sort of light aluminum-like metal onto the Maury Island beach and adjacent waters before finally zooming off with its fellows. Dahl and his crew salvaged some of the slag and metal fragments, and afterward reported the sighting to Dahl's boss, Fred Crisman--who years later was discovered to have been an undercover OSS/CIA agent! The morning after the sighting, Dahl was visited by a mysterious stranger in a dark suit, who seemed to know everything that had transpired the day before almost as if he'd been on Dahl's boat himself, and warned Dahl not to tell about his sighting to anybody if he loved his family! Dahl's dark-suited visitor was one of the very first "Men in Black" or MIB!

In July, Dahl and Crisman described the sighting to Amazing Stories editor Ray Palmer, enclosing some alleged "saucer" debris fragments with their letter. Palmer passed on their report to Kenneth Arnold, suggesting Arnold go to Tacoma to investigate the case. Arnold spent several days in late July and early August in Tacoma, interviewing Dahl and Crisman, inspecting the alleged saucer fragments, visiting Dahl's boat at the waterfront.

Arnold's hotel room was apparently bugged, as Arnold got several calls during his Tacoma sojourn from the local United Press International bureau chief, Ted Morello, who said a mysterious informant was continually calling him up from a pay phone

describing everything that was being done or said in Arnold's room! Arnold called two Army Air Force intelligence officers from Hamilton Field in California whom he knew to help him with his investigation. They flew to Tacoma, interviewed Crisman (Dahl refused to meet them), inspected thge saucer fragments, decided the whole thing was probably a hoax, and proceeded to fly back to Hamilton Field. Shortly after taking off from Tacoma, their plane crashed, killing both officers, in a crash attributed to sabotage by the Tacoma Times. Shocked, saddened, and discouraged, Arnold flew back home to Boise a couple of days later--but not before another Air Force officer visited him and confiscated all the saucer fragments even while telling Arnold it was just a hoax! The Air Force and FBI declared the whole Maury Island affair a hoax. However, many UFO investigators have wondered...

John A. Keel suggested in 1987 that the Maury Island affair might have been a hoax by the newly formed Atomic Energy Commission to cover up the illegal dumping of radioactive waste in Puget Sound. Crisman was secretly working for the AEC, Keel thought, and persuaded or pressured Dahl to go along with him in concocting a cock-and-bull story about UFO's for public consumption to distract public curiosity about US government planes flying over Maury Island dumping radioactive waste on the island's beach!

In 1968, Crisman was subpoenaed by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison's investigation of the JFK assassination as a witness who knew some of the shady businessmen, gangland figures, and rogue undercover intelligence agents Garrison believed to be implicated in the assassination. Crisman, however, told the New Orleans grand jury that he knew nothing definite or positive about a JFK assassination plot, though he did believe some sort of conspiracy was probably involved. In the 1970's, Crisman was alleged to have been one of the three "tramps" arrested at Dealey Plaza in Dallas a few minutes after the Kennedy assassination. However, his one-time principal at Rainier High School in Rainier, Oregon told the House Select Committee on Assassinations that Crisman had been teaching school as usual at Rainier High on November 22, 1963.

Peace,

T. Peter

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Kenny Young

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog.nul>
Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 20:22:53 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:22:56 -0500
Subject: Kenny Young

This is so unbelievable... I don't know where to begin. Like many of you, I'm simply shocked to hear the news of Kenny's passing.

I had the opportunity to speak with Kenny a few times and was glad to have known him, even if it was a long distance connection through the List, e-mails, and telephone.

Kenny was a breed of investigator this field is rarely blessed with. We've lost a shining example of what this field needs more of, as well as a friend.

My most sincere condolences to Kenny's family and friends.

Sincerely,

Royce J. Myers III
UFOWATCHDOG.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 08:10:23 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:26:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rimmer

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 14:23:41 EST
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 20:54:48 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 11:37:24 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>You might as well write that a flying pig seems a possibility
>>>for Socorro. The point is, where is any evidence for such an
>>>"experimental craft?" In 40 years, nobody has ever turned up any
>>>evidence that such a craft existed.

>>Ah, but David, you miss the point here. According to Jeromian
>>principles (as set out in the discussion of the Trindade case)
>>it's not enough just for you to point out that in forty years
>>no-one has ever turned up with evidence to *prove* the claim.
>>It's actually your responsibility to find "negative witnesses",
>>i.e. people who can show you documentary evidence that it
>>_didn't_ happen. I don't know exactly how you'd do this, but I'm
>>sure Jerry Clark could tell you.

>Completely full of it as usual. Where are the 300 crew members
>who could serve as potential "negative witnesses" at Socorro? If
>the event never happened _and_ there were 300 people who were in
>a position to see nothing happened or know about it from close
>range, that would be significant. But Socorro occurred in an
>uninhabited mesa and there were no 300 people around to be
>positive or "negative" witnesses.

Oh dear, always fatal to have to explain a joke, but here goes:
the 'negative witnesses' I was postulating were not people who
didn't see the UFO when Zamorra did, but people who knew about
or worked on the 'experimental craft' project postulated by
David. (Two postulates in the one sentence, not bad for before
breakfast) And the reason why the chicken crossed the road
was... oh, I've forgotten.

Cheerio!

BTW - How do you know the UFO _didn't_ have 300 crew members?

--
John Rimmer

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Jennings' ABC UFO Special - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 05:20:47 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:29:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Jennings' ABC UFO Special - Boone

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 16:11:17 -0500
>Subject: Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>This from our ABC affiliate:

>Peter Jennings Reporting show description:

>Each year there are thousands of reports of unidentified flying
>objects, but the U.S. government doesn't investigate any of
>them. This special program will seriously examine the
>unexplained phenomena around the world that so many people
>believe is proof of the existence of UFOs.

>Air date again will be on Thursday, February 24, 8-10pm.

Now I'm worried. If that's the official press release blurb it's an indicator on how badly this Special can turn out.

"This special program will seriously examine..."

As opposed to 'not' seriously examine?

"...that so many people believe is proof of the existence of UFOs"

I'm going to scream at that one.

Bottom line is this Special has got to break new ground. Pro or con or just leave us where we are now longing for forensic evidence that can and will be accepted for review by the mainstreamers.

Hopefully ABC actually asked you scientists who've got the data about your data and not some personality examination of their idea of the motivations to why you examine UFO data.

We all know that just a professional cursory examination will reveal the overwhelming evidence at hand, the stonewalling and long term invalidation of the powers that be and the public's never ending hunger to find out the truth.

Anything short of a final analysis by ABC that the public is not being serviced regarding the UFO issue is just blowin' in the wind.

Best,

Greg

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 04:59:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:31:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 13:30:45 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

>Raymond Czechowski, the man charged in connection with the death
>of Dr. John Mack appeared at Brent magistrates court on the 27th
>of January 2005.

>Just "how" he appeared there I have no idea for despite numerous
>calls to Brent yesterday, there appeared to be no record of his
>appearance. The information below comes from the Metropolitan
>police and not from the court system.

>The case was transferred to Wood Green Crown Court for him to
>next appear on 9/3/2005 (9th March). Unless there are further
>remands etc. it is expected that his trial will take place on
>that date.

No record of his appearance in court after numerous calls? Now
that's odd, isn't it? Would the court system keep this
appearance fuzzy to preclude a circus at the courthouse because
of the popularity of or interest in the case? Is remanding a
case around in this fashion usual?

Thanks for keeping us up to speed on the case, Stuart.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Aliens Of The Deep - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 11:23:26 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:32:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Aliens Of The Deep - McGonagle

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 16:55:49 +0000
>Subject: Re: Aliens Of The Deep

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:50:25 -0000
>>Subject: Aliens Of The Deep

<snip>

>>Full article at:

>><http://www.astrobio.net/news/article1420.html>

>A little sauce for the gander: If he can't bring it into the
>laboratory and conduct physical and chemical tests on it, it's
>not real. It's just astrobiological science fiction.

I find it interesting that science has altered it's view on the possibility of life existing in hostile conditions. 30 years ago, it was considered unlikely that life could develop under the extreme temperature and pressure conditions 2 miles underwater and without solar energy to power a food chain. Not only that, the the chemical environment is highly toxic to most terrestrial lifeforms, yet life has adapted to it.

I know that the existence of life under such conditions has been acknowledged for over 20 years, but it still challenges a lot of accepted scientific thought, and ultimately improves the odds of extraterrestrial intelligence existing - more planets will be capable of sustaining life in some form or another than was thought 20 years ago, and possibly even more than currently anticipated.

What other incorrect assumptions about the conditions required to sustain life have been made? What other extremes of the environment currently thought to preclude life do not actually do so? Is liquid water really a prerequisite? Is it possible for life in such inhospitable environments to develop into intelligent, space-faring societies given enough time for evolution to advance?

Regards,

Joe

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Peter Jennings UFO Show - Fortson

From: **Mike Fortson** <satmike.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 04:38:34 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:35:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings UFO Show - Fortson

[Non-Subscriber post]

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>Please raise your hands.

Frank,

I was interviewed last October. I was interviewed as a witness to the 8:30 events on March 13, 1997 of the so-called, Phoenix Lights.

I was assured by the producers that ABC is taking a fresh approach on this subject.

It is to be aired Thursday evening, February 24th.

Mike Fortson
Gilbert, AZ.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 12:18:51 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:36:50 -0500
Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 14:15:05 -0800
>Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

>>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:52:19 -0700
>>Subject: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

<snip>

>Now the question becomes, was there a second ship by that same
>name, one carrying passengers down the SE African coast in 1947?

Yes, indeed there was - please see:

<http://www.clydesite.co.uk/clydebuilt/viewship.asp?id=4067>

<http://www.merchantnavyofficers.com/unioncastle3.html>

<http://www.maritimematters.com/union-castle.html>

<http://www.union-castle-line.com/home.htm>

Peter Rogerson mentioned an article in FSR in an earlier post,
but there is an article on-line at the excellent Project 1947
site dated 1953 about the incident, see:

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/csi/csi1-3.html>

Joe

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 2](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 06:32:01 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 07:45:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 22:35:31 +0000
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>I caught an add Saturday night for the upcoming ABC special on
>>UFOs with Peter Jennings. My bias aside--the add was very
>>impressive, and led one to believe that is going to be about
>>"UFOs only."

>>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>>Please raise your hands.

>To my personal knowledge, add Mike Swords who preceeded me in
>the NYC ABC-TV studio interview chair; Jerry Clark who was
>interviewed earlier the same day; and Col. Charles Halt, USAF
>(Ret.).

Hall, Friedman, Swords, and Clark... the 'force' seems well
represented. Any word on who it is who fronts for the 'dark'
side? I hope Shermer is one of them... gives me an opportunity
to hoot and boo and otherwise carry on in an immature manner in
the privacy of my own home. <g>

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 08:56:23 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:42:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Boone

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 06:32:01 -0600
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 22:35:31 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>>>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>>I caught an add Saturday night for the upcoming ABC special on
>>>UFOs with Peter Jennings. My bias aside--the add was very
>>>impressive, and led one to believe that is going to be about
>>>"UFOs only."

>>>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>>>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>>>Please raise your hands.

I was interviewed. I flew out there to NY but during the
interview something bad happened.

I was ragging on Peter Jennings about how it's taken mainstream
media so long to go into detail about the UFO issue when
suddenly and unexpectedly one of my antennae popped out from
under my baseball cap.

Well as anyone knows when one antennae pops out the other has to
or you lose your sense of balance.

So since my cover was blown I just hit the emergency button on
my teleportation belt, hopped on my saucer and made a bee line
back to Hollywood.

It never fails, soon as you get a chance to divulge the biggest
secret to modern man something goes wrong.

Could have been worse I guess. Like when you're out on a date
and you can't keep your human shape.

Best,

Greg - aka Exegesis 13

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 08:07:59 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:44:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - King

>From: Amy Hebert <ahebert.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 03:25:41 -0600
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 12:10:01 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>I don't know if this has already been mentioned but Zamora never
>actually saw the two beings go into the object before it took
>off and no one knows what materials the object was made of.

<snip>

>The description of the object emitting flames and a roaring
>sound while landing and taking off makes it sound more like
>something man-made - from the '60's - than something from
>another planet.

Hi Amy,

I agree that the rocket aspect of the Socorro craft baffles me along with the logo or marking on the craft. Why would an ET vessel need a logo or symbol? Why would such a craft need thrusters at ground level but not at even very low altitude? Just doesn't wash ET to me.

Nonetheless, while your hypothesis that the beings on the scene were not occupants of the craft is plausible, there is no evidence that this is the case, and there is no way to test the hypothesis. We have an eyewitness account, and evidence on the ground. One would think that tire tracks would have been noticed by Ray or Lonnie, during the examination of the area. But if they weren't looking for tire tracks it's certainly possible that they were missed if not directly in the location of the craft. There's just no evidence one way or the other.

You could be right, but nothing in the record exists to support it.

We may yet find a heretofore undiscovered witness, but that's what it would take. And there would be much questioning of the veracity of such a late "revelation".

My best guess is that the craft was terrestrial, but I'm doggoned if I can find a shred of evidence to support that hypothesis. And I've looked...case in point my current post on "Zamora and the Bean". Elegant and unprovable, and darned frustrating.

I'll keep this one marked...for the time being... Unknown.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 08:35:26 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:46:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - King

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 17:54:12 -0500
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 10:01:41 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

<snip>

>Kyle...

>Fractious may be the tenor of my blog postings. And I'm open to
>all other kinds of accusations.

<snip>

>The point of my posts here and at our blog-site is to rattle the
>cages of somnambulism and ill-think which is rampant here, and a
>lot of other places.

<snip>

>All I can say is that my goal is to raise questions and
>eyebrows, hoping to vitalize old discussions and
>create new one.

>If people don't like that, I'll be ostracized, which you seem
>anxious to spur on.

>I'll try to behave, nonetheless, glad that Errol is in charge
>here and not some other folks (ahem).

Hi Rich,

Fair enough. I mistook your cage-rattling for something more.

My mistake. I accept responsibility for presuming new evidence
had come to light, and perhaps my post was more an indication of
the frustration I felt than anything else. If you felt I was
unfair, my apologies.

The term fractious was to indicate the divisive and over-
simplified categorization of people who post here. Since the
agreements and alliances criss-cross and overlap depending on
the subject at hand, I find such pigeon-holing unimaginative and
inaccurate except when applied to a specific instance, and even
then the question remains... why create neat cubby-holes for
everyone when you'll just have to do it all over again when the
next instance arises?

I am not in favor of any ostracization. I was asking questions.
None of them are answered above.

That is your prerogative, and at any rate I welcome your cage-
rattling. I am not above it myself on occasion.<g>I just don't

Re: Bad-Think? - King

feel that this thread revealed anything new, except perhaps your motivations as stated above.

I know more than I did.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 10:14:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:48:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Bad-Think? - Reynolds

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:57:13 -0500
>Subject: Re: Bad-Think?

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:22:48 -0500
>>>Subject: Bad-Think?

>Reading the "blog" I am amused to notice that the "fossilized
>ufologists" side-track main issues by "inane attacks on
>minutiae" (blog Jan, 30) yet are criticized for ignoring
>"details" ("they eschew details"; Jan 21).

>Proof that the devil is in the details? Or, damned if you do and
>damned if you don't.

>If anyone knows a happy medium... please introduce me.

Dr. Bruce:

There is a distinct difference between minutiae and details.

I may not know my balloons from flying saucers, but I do know
word usage, and use them judiciously, exactly as they are meant
to be used.

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 11:16:03 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:50:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Friedman

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 06:32:01 -0600
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>Hall, Friedman, Swords, and Clark... the 'force' seems well
>represented. Any word on who it is who fronts for the 'dark'
>side? I hope Shermer is one of them... gives me an opportunity
>to hoot and boo and otherwise carry on in an immature manner in
>the privacy of my own home. <g>

In a bulk mailing from Skeptic, Shirmer lists the Peter Jennings special as one of his appearances. Don Schmitt was also interviewed in Roswell last July. There were interviews at MUFON in Denver in July as well. What a collection of outtakes there must be.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:19:30 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:52:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Rimmer

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 04:59:27 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

<snip>

>No record of his appearance in court after numerous calls? Now
>that's odd, isn't it? Would the court system keep this
>appearance fuzzy to preclude a circus at the courthouse because
>of the popularity of or interest in the case? Is remanding a
>case around in this fashion usual?

>Thanks for keeping us up to speed on the case, Stuart.

Unlikely. Apart from a brief notice in newspapers at the time there has been very little follow up to this event in the British media. I can't see any great conspiracy about what appears to be a bureaucratic oversight. Of course, some people want to see a conspiracy in everything!

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:50:13 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:54:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 19:51:45 +0100
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 17:03:50 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 11:04:02 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

><snip>

>>>Just one more word on Rendlesahm-Bentwaters. Your negative
>>>judgement on the book by Georgina Bruni - unfair in my opinion -
>>>is not a valid argument to discard testimonies on UFOs seen

>>For heaven's sake Gildas, who said anything about discarding
>>testimonies? Who even said anything about Rendlesham?
>>Answer: You, not me.

>The Rendlesham-Bentwaters 1980 case is in the article of Donald
>Johnson, along with a series of significant cases.
>Again, this part - the direct evaluation of significant cases -
>is capital in this debate on Ufos and nuclear sites.
>Bentwaters happens to be one of them.

Hi Gildas,

I'm aware that the Woodbridge-Rendlesham Forest case is cited by Johnson, in passing, as an example of a UFO being reported near a place where nuclear weapons are stored. However that is only an anecdote. We all know that the thrust of Johnson's paper was its claim to demonstrate a statistically significant quantitative result in answer to the question "Are UFOs Attracted to Nuclear Sites?". He didn't demonstrate this, but he did try to move the argument into the area of replicable results, and at least he understands the difference between quantitative evidence and anecdotal evidence. I'm not sure that you do. You also applauded this statistical work, by the way, before I criticised it, as the "affirmative answer" to the question. Now I feel that you are happier to revert to the anecdotal method of using selected instances to illustrate the "obvious".

>>You promoted Bruni's book as being of high quality; I
>>questioned its quality, but if you were to read more carefully
>>you would see that I limited my comment on Bruni's book to
>>matters on which I am competent to comment, specifically
>>Lakenheath- Bentwaters 1956.

<snip>

>I am not a specialist of the Lakenhath-Bentwaters case, but I am
>sure that there are some on this List. I would like to know if

>someone shares your opinion on the presentation made by
>Georgina Bruni in her book.

>What I am aware of is that a lot of confusion has been poured
>on that case.

You're not wrong there!

>For instance, when the Cometa Report cited it in 1999, in its
>presentation of important cases, Jenny Randles launched an
>ironic critic on them, in the week following its publication -
>in French and limited to the French territory[!] - calling the
>authors the "Cometa boys" and stating that they were not aware
>that she had new pilot testimonies, who had seen nothing.
>People asked her to communicate them, among whom
>Georgina Bruni and me, on this list, But Jenny refused to give
>them, for various reasons ! I waited about two years for these
>testimonies but they did not come out and after that I lost
>sight of the argument.

Well in case you don't know, I am on record as having argued
long and hard _against_ the supposed demolition of the
Lakenheath case by the UFOIN team (Clarke, Roberts, Randles and
Fuller) back then. I think I can safely claim that the main
reason you have heard a lot less than you expected to hear about
that hotly pre-trailed expose is the direct influence I had on
their plans for an imminent "Final Report" in early 2001.

I was able to show by close contextual analysis and technical
arguments that the scenario they'd arrived at had serious
inconsistencies, and that there was after all a case to be made
for a "missing aircrew" other than the 23 Squadron crews Jenny
had found. Dave Clarke eventually managed to find documentary
evidence in support of this, and to his credit accepted that
their previous dismissal of the case was no longer proven
(whatever he might believe personally). I was also very critical
of the team's unscientific attempts to explain the Bentwaters,
Lakenheath and Neatishead radar tracks as balloons, meteors,
auroral streamers etc etc. So, as far as I am concerned the case
remains open. Not bad for a debunker, eh?

You might also like to note that the pilot testimonies you want
- transcripts of original filmed interviews by Jenny as well as
numerous other taped interviews, letters, log extracts and so
on, plus a fairly exhaustive archive of dozens of other
documents on this case and a great deal of analysis - have been
uselessly taking up my webspace (now at

<http://lakenheath.mysite.wanadoo-members.co.uk>)

for nearly two years. Feel free to use it to pursue this
"important case". I wish somebody would.

>It's a comparable scenario with the 1980 case.

>It went from the theory of the confusion with a light house,
>clearly refuted by Colonel Halt, to the last (?) theory of
>Jenny Randles : bizarre effects of a powerful radar, or
>something like that, if I understand it.

As I said I am not competent to comment on the Rendlesham case
in detail as I have paid scant attention to it. But one question
we might ask ourselves is this: What else, in the context of all
the other RAF airfields in the UK, is significant about the Twin
Bases, apart from the presence of nuclear weapons, and the
Rendlesham Forest UFO?

One thing is that they are USAF-tenanted and the UFO events
involved US servicemen. Granted that rumours of an incident were
being heard locally and in the US in 1981, nevertheless it was
via USAF documents obtained under the US Freedom of Information
Act in 1983 that Col. Halt's memo came to light, then afterwards
the tape and Halt's further testimony - not via our parsimonious
official sources in the UK. The prominence of the case owes much
to the fact that it occurred at an American base and that a copy
of a document was recovered under the American FOIA.

What is significant about this? As I pointed out, Johnson's
study does not rule out the possibility that the correlation he
identifies is not with the distribution of nuclear sites per se
but rather with an associated distribution of military

facilities, with their security and reporting channels. Rendlesham arguably illustrates this. The fact that the case is connected with a nuclear weapons site may be secondary to the fact that is connected with a USAF airfield here in the UK. Naturally the logistics of the forward basing of nuclear weapons on foreign soil means that the proportion of USAF sites on UK soil that are "nuclear sites" is rather large compared to the proportion of USAF sites in general.

So there is some difficulty with trying to support a general thesis on particular examples. This is why statistical analysis is such an important part of scientific methodology in so many areas - not because of the popular misconception that it is an easy way out ("you can prove anything with statistics") but because it is the only tool subtle and difficult enough to quantify reliable conclusions in subtle and difficult issues. What is the proportion of all events on UK soil that have been associated with nuclear sites? Is there an association? And if there is, is it statistically significant? Answers to these questions are even more contentious in a UK than in a US context because of the absence of consistent and transparent official reporting and archiving.

Now you might point out that 1980 isn't the first occasion that Bentwaters has been "singled out" by UFOs. Indeed not. But the same thing applies in 1956. After 1968 the Lakenheath-Bentwaters case became iconic in world UFO circles, arguably unique among UK cases. Was this because, uniquely in all of the UK, nuclear bomber bases attracted UFOs? No, it's plain from the testimony of servicemen and other records that there were numerous similar UFO cases at a number of radar sites around the UK in this era, including interceptions; but Lakenheath and Bentwaters were American tenanted airfields, and unlike the obfuscatory system in the UK the US military UFO reporting system was formalised under AFR 200-2, operated relatively smoothly, and had a relatively efficient and accessible end-user - Blue Book.

Do you think a couple of mentions of Bentwaters in official UFO reports over the course of 6 decades is sufficient to demonstrate a pattern of clear intent with respect to nuclear weapons storage areas there? My intuition (untested, of course) is that this is actually a surprisingly small number. In fact the nearest thing to an appearance of clear intent that I know of in 1956 was the crash of a B-47 directly into a nuclear weapons storage igloo at Lakenheath, two weeks prior to the UFO events - and that was an accident! :-)

Best

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 16:23:54 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:58:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 14:33:07 -0800
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 20:54:48 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 11:37:24 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>>You might as well write that a flying pig seems a possibility
>>>for Socorro. The point is, where is any evidence for such an
>>>"experimental craft?" In 40 years, nobody has ever turned up any
>>>evidence that such a craft existed.

>>Ah, but David, you miss the point here. According to Jeromian
>>principles (as set out in the discussion of the Trindade case)
>>it's not enough just for you to point out that in forty years
>>no-one has ever turned up with evidence to *prove* the claim.
>>It's actually your responsibility to find "negative witnesses",
>>i.e. people who can show you documentary evidence that it
>>_didn't_ happen. I don't know exactly how you'd do this, but I'm
>>sure Jerry Clark could tell you.

>Ah but John, you miss the point here. A conventional human
>craft, however experimental, should have a conventional
>classification and leave a conventional trail of paperwork It
>should also be explainable using conventional physics and
>engineering principles.

<snip>

>The rest of my post was about the nonconventional aspects of
>the Socorro craft, such as it's shape, VTOL capability, and a
>silent propulsion system capable of accelerating the craft to
>supersonic speed in a matter of seconds. If we had such an
>advanced experimental craft 40 years ago, we would have a fleet
>of them now and jet aircraft would be obsolete. The absence of
>such aircraft now speaks very eloquently about who made the
>Socorro craft. It wasn't us.

>David Rudiak

David,

I agree with your arguments here, including that flying pigs
make as much sense as any of the balloon hypotheses, but where
did you get supersonic flight from? I never heard that claimed
for the Socorro UFO.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 08:28:24 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:01:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:22:42 -0800
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:15:49 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>Humm. Where did the flames come from? Still, I assume you need
>>some sort of ducts to shoot the flames from.

>A chemical rocket or jet would have left chemical residue on the
>plants and soil. The AF summary of the case said they looked for
>such residue and none was found.

Oh really? Well, there are lots of propellents that generate
water vapor or other innocuous substances, so you can't expect
them to come up with that in their tests.

Also, if it was a military experimental vehicle, is the AF going
to give out lots of reliable information to help anyone prove
it?

>The soil underneath the blue flame was vitrified (turned to
>glass), indicating great heat. Yet a mesquite bush underneath
>the flame was cut cleanly in half but not destroyed. What
>conventional chemical rocket or jet does that?

I don't know since I was not privvy to black programs of that or
this era. Of course, if it is an alien ship then they seem to
have clunky noisy technology.

>A conventional rocket capable of lifting a multi-ton object out
>of the gully would have totally fried the plant, and maybe
>Zamora along with it. (He was 50 feet or less away.)

Wow! I didn't know you were a rocket scientist! You did not
weigh the object. Impressions in the dirt can be due to a high-g
(rotten) landing. Anyway, it does seem somewhat unlikely to be a
rocket although a turbojet seems more likely. The flumes of
rockets or jets needn't be so widespread as you suggest, but a
well designed one is restricted to a narrow annulus.

>The wind and balloon obligingly came to a dead stop as soon as
>the "gondola" touched down. Otherwise the gondola would have
>been dragged across the landscape. Then the wind obligingly
went >from dead calm to hundreds of miles an hour seconds after
the >gondola roared off the ground.

Your calcs about wind force on the ballon are pretty compelling.
I must agree with you that it seems unlikely to be a balloon
based on them. The only problem I have with your analysis is the
assumption of a spherical balloon. A parawing or wing shape
(that were being tested in that time frame by NASA) would result
in less lateral force.

Heh, your calcs (not duplicated here for brevity) are draining

my interest for the balloon theory significantly!

The cable WOULD weight alot, but one can always assume the balloon is big enough to support it. You assume a number of things requiring a massive cable (the balloon MUST be hidden by altitude!, the balloon IS spherical), but thats okay.

The lateral force on the cable/balloon IS large with reasonable assumptions of wind velocity and drag.

It would be hard to hide the appearance of a cable from Zamora who was only 50 feet away! Even a mesh (like a fence), would be somewhat apparent to such a keen observer.

It would also seem to be hard to hide the large balloon although one can always armwave that it was painted blue or transparent or something.

The alledged velocity of the craft forbids any balloon or other man-made options. So we either keep the data or throw in some error band. Its your preference.

Yes, it does seem unlikely that the ballon theory would enable level flight at takeoff.

My main problems are that no such craft was ever reported in the literature, it makes no sense for "secret" craft to be tested in the public areas, they have no reason to "run away" upon Zamora's appearance, a test craft would seem to need ground crews following them. But your calcs are icing on the cake for eliminating this possiblity, hopefully once and for all.

>Don't you realize that Zamora's symbol
>is an obvious visual rearrangement of the initials in CIA, a
>theory originally proposed by Leon Davidson decades ago? Sheesh,
>what amateur detectives!

No I missed that one. That's pretty imaginative too!

>Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. In 1964 the Russians and U.S.
>have spy planes and spy satellites, but just can't give up those
>lovable, old fashioned, uncontrollable spy balloons. Just to
>make them even more impractical, they made them manned as well,
>with the gondola suspended by miles of cable.

<smirk>

>Ah, heck, enough fun already James.

Alright already! It was just a thought. I was just trying to help.

>Maybe you should move on to a
>slightly (very slightly) better "gondola supported by a really,
>really long cable to a circling jet airplane" theory. That, at
>least, gets rid of some of the cabling problems and better
>accounts for the rapid departure. And unlike a balloon, a plane
>can actually control its flight.

Naw! That's a dumb idea!

But what about a plain old VTOL aircraft? That neat James Bond backpack was from that period and some derivative (designed for longer flight) with a turbojet plus afterburner seems much more feasible than the balloon.

>How long are we supposed to go on with this blithering nonsense,
>wasting our time in the process?

We aren't forcing you,Sir. But my balloon blithering is just about over with.

>To those still seriously propose that Socorro was a
>conventional craft of our own making, I say its time to stop
>the silly speculation and actually offer something of
>substance, like real documentation. In other words, either put
>up or shut up.

I agree with this. I think the balloon theory pretty lame at this point. Can you tell me of anyone who has conceptually engineered a VTOL using then-era technology to match the

characteristics of the Socorro craft?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb.3](#)

Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 16:52:04 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:04:37 -0500
Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:52:19 -0700
>Subject: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 14:02:57 +0000 (GMT)
>From: Lawrie Williams <lawrie_williams.nul>
>To: forteana.nul
>Subj: FWD [forteana] A list of ships but no Llandoverly Castle

><http://www.genseek.net/ships.htm>

>This might be of interest. In a lot of accounts of paranormal
>events a ship is involved. Here is a web page with long lists of
>old ships. I have just been looking for the Llandoverly Castle,
>but no dice, alas.

<snip>

>Frank Edwards "Strange World" Ace Books Inc 1120 Avenue
>of the Americas New York N.Y. 10036 1964

>Keyed in from an age-browned paper back book March 31 2001 by
>Lawrie Williams who notes that this was the day b4 Roswell

>"Air Progress" (October 1967) reported:

>"7,000 mph at 25,000 ft has been confirmed by radar. Silent
>flight has been observed by credible witnesses. High-G
>acceleration after long periods of hovering is witnessed almost
>every day.....there seem to be three basic shapes, Discs,
>spheres and cigars.....the discs vary from a few feet to more
>than 200 ft across. Those seen in daylight are almost always
>described as looking metallic; frequently details such as ports,
>domes and projections are seen.....The disc shape....offers
>great poss- ibilities for high strength-to-weight, low drag and
>extreme maneuverability."

>I have a copy of this publication and can vouch for its
>authenticity.

This sighting is reported in Coral Lorenzen's book "The Great
Flying Saucer Hoax" (1962), p 234-5.

It is also reported in Loren Gross "UFOs, A History, vol. 1:
July 1947 to December 1948 ", p 24.

Both sources give the case because of the huge size of the UFO.

However, both books remark that the report is not first hand,
but the principal witness was a Mrs A.M.King of Nairobi. Also,
it is unclear how many others saw the UFO. (Shades of Trindade!)

Coral Lorenzen says she got the story from Edgar Jarrold, a
former president of the Australian Flying Saucer Bureau.

There is no indication of when Mrs King first reported this UFO.
Nor is there any contemporary newspaper account from Mombasa or
Nairobi that we know of. It would be very interesting if a UFO

of this size was reported at the time in the press. Mrs King was said to be travelling from Mombasa to Cape Town. I suspect the phrase "the craft was under intelligent control" was inserted by Frank Edwards, as it does not appear in Mrs King's own account quoted in either of the two sources above.

Does anyone know of a report of this UFO in the US press of 1947? I find it hard to believe that a UFO of this size was not reported somewhere in the contemporary press.

However, a clipping apparently does exist in Blue Book archives, but without a reference.

As to the ship, I can only say that Llandoverly (a small town in Wales) definitely has a castle. So does Stirling (in Scotland) and there was certainly a ship called "Stirling Castle" sailing during 1946 & 47. It is likely the list of ships is far from complete.

The day before Roswell? That depends whose account of Roswell you accept.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 17:21:22 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:05:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Miller

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 04:59:27 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 13:30:45 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

<snip>

>>Just "how" he appeared there I have no idea for despite
>>numerous calls to Brent yesterday, there appeared to be no
>>record of his appearance. The information below comes from
>>the Metropolitan police and not from the court system.

>>The case was transferred to Wood Green Crown Court for him to
>>next appear on 9/3/2005 (9th March). Unless there are further
>>remands etc. it is expected that his trial will take place on
>>that date.

>No record of his appearance in court after numerous calls? Now
>that's odd, isn't it? Would the court system keep this
>appearance fuzzy to preclude a circus at the courthouse
>because of the popularity of or interest in the case? Is
>remanding a case around in this fashion usual?

>Thanks for keeping us up to speed on the case, Stuart.

Hello Alfred,

The set up at Brent magistrates court is a little complicated in
so far as it is in fact three courts, Brent, and two other
ditricts of north London, all sitting separately but under the
same banner. To be sure, I had to check all three courts and I
did so more than once at different times of the day. No joy with
any of them.

I am not suggesting anything untoward at this moment though. As
effeciently organised as the court offices appeared to be,
either I or they, probably the former, may have made some kind
of mistake.

I would say on balance that the progress of the case has been
about right. There was a relatively long gap between the
accident and the defendant being charged but one would presume
that was to allow the CPS, the body that brings prosecutions in
the UK to gather evidence and to see what sort of charges they
could bring. It is a shame that they were not able to charge
Chzechowski with dangerous driving as opposed to driving without
due care as the first charge carries a potentially greater
sentence. Nevertheless, driving without due care coupled with
his DUI should, assuming he is convicted, see him disappear for
a while. I wonder though how he is pleading.

best

Stuart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Davenport

From: Peter Davenport - NUFORC <director.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 09:26:34 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:10:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Davenport

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 16:31:12 -0600
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>>Please raise your hands.

>I was flown to New York City and interviewed for the show last
>July. Mike Swords was filmed after me.

To the List:

I am led to believe that the ABC team, represented by Springs Media, Inc., has interviewed over one hundred individuals for the program. However, I do not know whether that is a hundred people in the UFO community, or whether that includes the many witnesses to UFO events, who may be in the final program.

I have met with the team on five occasions, and taped with them on four of those. I believe the final program may include a number of the best cases, the best witnesses, and the best written reports that NUFORC can provide. I'm guessing that that the producers of the program probably would prefer not to have the cases identified prematurely, but they involve airline pilots, an FAA ARTCC Supervisor, members of law enforcement, religious figures, teachers, and several others.

Although working with TV people has been, I believe, the most odious part of my 'job', since I took over the reins here from Robert J. Gribble, the Founder of NUFORC, Spring Media has proven to be the rare exception to that fact. They have been a pleasure to work with, they are exceptionally well informed on matters ufological, and they have been professional... and courteous... in every respect. I'm impressed with what they are doing, and the program may set a 'high-water' mark within the electronic media.

Peter

NUFORC

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 12:37:27 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:11:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:52:49 -0400
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:15:49 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>New Mexico was where more money was being spent on classified
>research and development per capita than in any other state.

>Of course spies, whether Soviet, Chinese, or alien
>would be interested.

At least this would account for their odd behavior of running
away from one lone cop rather than blasting him with the
standard mind wiping ray and doing an anal probe! Well, I am
sure Zamora appreciates this!

And the other oddly un-high tech thing the Socorro "alien's"
(well, Chines and Soviets are illegal aliens!) do is leave some
metal scrappings from their craft. I would think that aliens
would have superalloys which are likely self-repairing
nanostructures that would be able to resist scruffs, scrapes,
bullets, and make Julian fries as well.

>No, I don't buy the balloon explanation for Socorro.

I agree it's lameness quotient is high.

>After a lecture I gave in Las Vegas, was told by a woman
>working there for the AEC that she had in 1964 been a grad
>student at NM Tech in Socorro, and had been instructed to do
>careful analysis on the soil from the Socorro landing..in
>secret. I passed this on to Jim MacDonald who spoke with her.

Well, don't keep us in suspense! What were the results? Any
radioactivity?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 13:UFO UpDate: Sonora UFO Sightings
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:15:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Ledger

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 09:22:32 -0800
>Subject: Sonora UFO Sightings

>Fellow Listerions,

>I received some interesting correspondence from Mr. Mark Olson
>in response to my last article; with his permission I'm posting
>the gist of that here:

>Hello Mr. Warren,

>I have contacted NUFORC, NARCAP, and MUFON. I have also
>contacted any and all UFO Organizations I could find, but never
>received a response.

<snip>

Hi Mark and Frank,

NARCAP doesn't involve itself in the day to day reporting of
UAP. These have to be in close proximity to an aircraft-while
it's in the air-and reported by the pilot of same. Interest then
in this sighting increases with the distance of the UAP from the
aircraft and whether it is perceived as a danger to the AC.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Zamora & The Bean? - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 14:15:01 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:19:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Zamora & The Bean? - Ledger

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:12:23 -0600
>Subject: Zamora & The Bean?

>I came across this item while Googling various keywords from
>the Socorro/Zamora case. I wondered if anyone here had seen or
>addressed it here or elsewhere previously.

>It contains no verifiable names, but it is an intriguing story
>in light of the current debate on the topic, and includes a
>possible explanation for the craft Zamora saw...

>as found at:

><http://www.weirdload.com/nm-ufo.html>

>scroll down halfway.

<snip>

>Anyway, these guys started playing around with the design of a
>engine described in Popular Mechanics which consisted of two
>pistons on opposite ends of a rod shuttling back and forth
>between combustion chambers. Since the pistons didn't do
>anything but make a lot of hot compressed exhaust gas, it was
>considered merely an impractical toy.

<snip>

Hi Kyle,

There's nothing mysterious about the engine. It's called the DynaCam engine and has been around since before WWII. It was even considered to replace the conventional aircraft engines of the day [reciprocating radials and inlines] at the US's outbreakbreak of war in 1941 but deemed to long a changeover time. Before WWII they were employed in torpedoes using compressed air-because of the engines slim outline-but were naturally prone to leaving a trail of bubbles so battery powered torpedoes eventually took over.

See: <http://www.dynacam.com/Index.htm>

Tracking around will get you the prewar history of the thing.

Some of it's advantages are it's low level of vibration, its extremely low idle of 75-80 RPM and near lack of moving parts. The pistons, running a lobe against an inline wormgear attached to the drive shaft They run on just about anything, including propane.

They have normal exhaust however and drive a prop or ducted fan.

There is a flat opposed version of this design as well which came out in the late 70s.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 19:01:37 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:23:28 -0500
Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:52:19 -0700
>Subject: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

<snip>

The earliest published reference to this story appears to be in FSR Vol 9 no 3 which would have been in 1963. It features in Coral Lorenzen's "Flying Saucers: the startling evidence of the invasion from outer space" Signet/NAL 1966 on page 19. Coral says that Edgar Jarrold the pioneer Australian Ufologist, forwarded her a letter from the witness in 1954. However the account does not appear in the hardback edition "The Great Flying Saucer Hoax" published in 1962.

CL's account gives what purport to the witnesses own words and she says the event took place "early July" with no precise date given.

There was indeed such a ship see for example

<http://www.merchantnavyofficers.com/unioncastle3.html>

Or just type in "Llandoverly Castle" on Google

It would appear that Mrs King was on its post war maiden voyage after its reconversion back from being a hospital ship

Peter Rogerson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bueche

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 11:39:34 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:25:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bueche

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:18:49 -0800
>Subject: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>I'm curious to know how many here have been contacted by the
>producers of the show; I'm aware of Stan & Dick, any others?
>Please raise your hands.

From www.johnemackinstitute.org website:

A tentative airdate for the program featuring John Mack's last-ever interview is 8PM Eastern on Thursday, February 24, on ABC. The interview for "Peter Jennings Reports: Life in the Universe" was conducted at Mack's home in Cambridge, MA, on August 19. It marked the first time he had accepted a television interview invitation in several years.

Check local listings for updates, as the date is tentative.

Technology buffs may be interested to know that this was John Mack's only interview shot in high definition widescreen.

And to that blurb from the website I will add that I know a few other folks who took part in it, but they're not names you'd recognize so there's no cause to mention them (and no assurance they're in the final cut anyway).

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bueche

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 11:57:12 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:27:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bueche

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 06:32:01 -0600
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>Any word on who it is who fronts for the 'dark'
>side? I hope Shermer is one of them... gives me an opportunity
>to hoot and boo and otherwise carry on in an immature manner
>in the privacy of my own home.

On the 'dark' side, Richard J. McNally was interviewed. I don't
think he's a CSICOP fellow yet but he's well on his way.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 20:41:11 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:34:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough

Dear List

For the sake of completeness, I thought some of you may be interested to read some off-List emails on the Socorro "balloon" topic during its inflation and deflation over the last couple of days, giving a potted summary of how this debate evolved from my perspective, beginning with my reply to an open-minded enquiry from Ed Gehrman and including information I received from Ray Stanford as well as some suggestions offered to, and by, David Rudiak and James Smith.

MS

To Ed Gehrman, 31 January

Dear Ed

First let me emphasise - since experience on the List has shown me how easy it is to be misunderstood - that I'm just toying with these ideas to see how far they can be pushed, and if something fits then fine, if not then that's even better because then the case remains intriguing. I sense that many people don't understand how one can want to go through this sort of exercise without being a committed debunker. This is a difference of philosophy that I despair of being able to explain to them.

Anyway, I'm going to have to repeat myself for possibly the third or fourth time and point out that I never suggested that the object was the Apollo LEM (which as I recall, by the way, always used to be called the Lunar Excursion Module = LEM, though now everyone seems to be using the shorter LM, but that's irrelevant), and I'm not aware that anyone else has claimed this on-List either. Therefore the question of what the LEM pads were made of doesn't arise.

This discussion arises out of James Smith's suggestion of the possibility of a high-altitude balloon with a "gondola" suspended on a long cable, pointing out that this could -in principle - evade David Rudiak's calculations of gas volumes etc. by removing the responsible balloon from the object itself and placing it maybe way up out of plain sight. It bewilders me that writers on the List so often didn't grasp this and have carried on making objections based on a completely different scenario involving hot air balloons, vacuum chambers and heaven knows what!

Anyway, in the spirit of James's attempt to cover all bases, I tried to anticipate the objection (raised also by Don and Kyle) that this sort of arrangement would have no purpose, by suggesting that instead of a balloon gondola what was being carried was a test vehicle or a dummy of some kind, presumably associated with some unidentified aerospace engineering programme - so something LIKE a lunar or planetary landing module possibly, as had been suspected by the Air Force in 1964, but presumably NOT the Apollo LEM as such.

Why? Because a stable flying platform could be provided by a

powered aerostat at high altitude. The spooks on covert surveillance projects etc knew all about this idea in the 60s, small propellers and automatic ballast adjustments to keep the thing on station for as long as you want - days or longer. The effective weight of the test module (to call it something) dangled on a winched cable underneath can then be controlled for powered "landing tests" - effect of attitude stabiliser rockets when landing on rough terrain, or whatever interests you. Maybe you are even working on a blue-sky project for a future Mars or Venus lander design, and you'd have to think about winds etc, so an open air test might be useful, who knows - I suppose there are a zillion possibilities. The point is you can simulate free flight.

There is nothing particularly outrageous about such a possibility in principle. There could be all sorts of test designs for all sorts of different experimental programmes going on from time to time out at White Sands or elsewhere in the early '60s, only one or two of which ever graduate from the "hare-brained" stage and some of which may have gone stray - as this hypothetical balloon rig would presumably have to have done to wind up at Socorro. Just because it doesn't show up in the official NASA histories is not in my opinion proof that such a test of a dead-end design didn't happen. We all ought to know how "porous" official histories can be, and there's no reason this had to have been a mainstream NASA project anyway.

So in principle it's worth keeping in mind, even if unlikely. I don't know what directions the high-level winds were blowing, and I've never seen such information discussed. Zamora saw the UFO head off into the low-level wind, but winds at thousands of feet (James Smith had in mind a kilometer of cable - yeah maybe it's hard to believe with 1964 materials, but let's stick with it!) could have been blowing in any direction. These winds would govern the aerostat's motion if its motor failed, and perhaps they carried the rig far from its test site.

Now just suppose the "pilots" let their runaway rig down hard in the desert for a minute in order to get the hell off. They'd have to go low over the ground and then at a good moment let the winch out rapidly, so the rig would drop like an anchor whilst the balloon cable continued to pay out, now under no tension. But when Zamora roared up in a cloud of dust, maybe they changed their minds (maybe they panicked because they didn't want civilian witnesses to a classified experiment gone wrong). Then they could fire the thrusters and simultaneously reel in the cable to lift off again with the balloon taking most of their earth-weight, but now, because the balloon had drifted somewhat with the upper winds in the meantime, the rig would swing rapidly in the direction of the balloon as soon as it was again airborne. If the upper wind direction was counter to the surface wind direction (quite possible) then the rig would be yanked quite suddenly in a direction that was against or across the surface wind, and the crew could haul it up over the nearby hills, hoping to try their escape again in the privacy of Six Mile Canyon.

Of course this is all very speculative. I don't "believe" it. I don't know of any positive physical or historical evidence in favour of it. There are other reports we might bring in - La Madera, Canyon Ferry, Gary Wilcox etc etc and a whole lot of similar stories from other countries and other years. Obviously they can't all be explained in the same way. Nevertheless, it's a physically possible scenario, and my view is that it ought to be thought through and very carefully excluded if at all possible - otherwise someone like ----- or ----- will eventually latch onto it instead and use it in a much less reasonable way against you, and that way the ghost of the balloon theory will never go away.

Kind regards

Martin

To James Smith & David Rudiak, 01 Feb:

Hi guys

Some (crazy?) thoughts on the cable-suspension theory:

1) As an exercise, we assume a cable 1000m long. In the scenario described we assume that during about one minute when the "object" is landed the balloon drifts laterally with the wind aloft by about 300m (a reasonable rate of about 10 knots). The cable then makes an angle with the vertical of not much more than about 15 degrees at the moment of take-off. Neglecting air resistance and all other complications, we can then crudely (to within a few percent) treat the object on its cable like a simple isochronous pendulum whose behaviour will be independent of its mass.

2) The period of this pendulum is $2\pi \times \sqrt{L/g}$ where L is the string length and g is g, so for our model the period is quite long, about 64 seconds. At lift off the object would swing away past the equilibrium position in the direction of the upper winds in an arc of about 600m plus another 300m due to the lateral travel of the balloon during the swing. So it would reach the far end of its swing on a rising trajectory, the better part of one kilometer away from the landing spot, in around half a minute.

3) A pendulum weighing a few tons would not be much affected by the surface wind. But the unassisted ground speed of the object due to the restoring force of gravity plus the balloon displacement is only about 70 mph - certainly not 1000mph! Of course there is a possible unknown thrust component from the object's own "propulsion", attitude-rockets, whatever, and Zamora could have misjudged time and distance. But even so . . .

3) When the pendulum "bob" reaches the far end of its first swing, the ground range to the point on the ground vertically below the balloon would be about 600m, putting the balloon at an elevation of nearly 60 degrees, which is still very high indeed and for most observers is psychologically speaking near the zenith. But is it really feasible that nobody - including others alerted to look out for something that "looked like a balloon" - saw this balloon? Probably it was a few tens of meters across at 1000m and it would have to be comparable to the moon in angular diameter.

4) Maybe Zamora, by this time, was looking at the balloon. He hit the dirt and hid when the object took off, then looked up again. Perhaps the receding "LEM" was relatively insignificant by then and he transferred his attention to the much larger moon-sized balloon? Maybe this explains why Zamora did not see the LEM-pendulum swinging back? But then this balloon, still at quite high elevation and drifting slowly, wouldn't vanish in the distance as Zamora watched, and would still be there for Chavez to see when he arrived, if not before. And generally, why did nobody else in the area see this large slow balloon at any time?

5) As you say, James, an amateur private venture could fit, but why the jumpiness, and the white coveralls? What about some sort of radiological sampling outfit, designed for use on contaminated test ranges or something?

6) I'm sure there's probably a better version of this theory to be worked out and some of the difficulties could be repaired. But I still don't really buy it.

Best

Martin

To David Rudiak & James Smith

<snip>

>Even low-balling the velocity, have you bothered to ask
>yourself how the gondola could remain motionless on the ground
>without being dragged across the countryside by a wind pushing
>the balloon at 180 mph?

I have, David, as I explained in the message I forwarded [see * below]. The notion (technically implausible maybe; physically impossible, not) is that adjustment to the length of the cable can be made under control of a winch, and that this can be either allowed to either run freely or be braked. This is the

whole point of the cable idea in the first place. Given that the entire set-up has only a small negative buoyancy overall, you have to be able to let the rig drop freely to the ground in order to produce the impact force equivalent to a number of tons. So you unbrake the cable and your "LEM" hits the dirt, meanwhile the cable pays out as the balloon drifts.

<snip>

>Of course, this is all academic unless you can explain how the
>gondola could remain motionless on the ground while the big
>balloon in the air was being pushed by a wind exerting enormous
>pressure on it, wind speed having to be extremely high to
>explain the extremely rapid departure of the craft (even after
>drastically low-balling estimates of distance and raising
>estimates of departure time).

Well the free-running cable explains how the gondola stays put, until a brake is applied and winch-power is re-engaged. When this happens the cable comes under tension again and the gondola-thingy is half-dragged aloft, half-winchd aloft, and could swing freely a like pendulum. As I showed in my other message, the angular rate of a 1000m-long isochronous pendulum under gravity alone would only be about 40 knots, then add in the balloon rate in the same direction (wind in the range no more than a few tens of knots; balloon rate initially less with its load suddenly restored), a small extra acceleration at first due to reeling in the cable, and any other thrust added by thrusters on the test rig. Even assuming we could get 100 mph by adding these components up this is far short of a speed of over a thousand mph!

But it wouldn't be crazy to argue that Zamora's estimates of time and distance could be out by a factor 2, say, bringing the required speed down into the range of hundreds mph. It can be argued with, but it wouldn't be _crazy_. And the unknown nature of this hypothetical test rig with its "blue flame" exhaust allows plenty of flexibility in the model. Sure there's no historical or documentary evidence for such a balloon rig, independently of Zamora's report; but a "debunker" can counter that there's no evidence for an alien spacecraft either, independent of Zamora's report.

>>On the whole, a fun exercise.

>Fun, but totally pointless, since it leads nowhere except to
>the conclusion that the theory is absurd.

I disagree that it's pointless to demonstrate the conclusion that the theory is absurd. I think it's absolutely the point! It should be demonstrated in detail. And I think you should construct the very best balloon-type theory possible and criticise that, not be content with criticising the half-baked hot air of Larry Robinson. Because sure enough somebody, sometime, will come up with this theory if we don't, and then the controversy will start up again with ufologists on the back foot. Better to be able to point to some work and say: "Go back to sleep, I already thought of that!"

Best
Martin

To Ray Stanford, 01 Feb:

Hi Ray

. . . I'd appreciate your personal opinion about this crazy-sounding idea, which I've tried hard to make work, but frankly without much success.

Among other things it would need Zamora (and anyone else) failing to spot a gas balloon high overhead that must have subtended something like the angular diameter of the moon and couldn't have travelled far or fast. Also Zamora would have had to fail to notice a substantial cable and its attachment-point from a distance said to be about 50 feet, and also significantly misjudged time and/or distance in his description of how rapidly the object moved away. I believe you reconstructed this. I

wonder if you believe Zamora's estimate that the object was over 6 Mile Canyon when he lost sight of it was a reliable judgement? Given the lay of the land and Zamora's vantage etc is it at all possible that he could have been out by as much as a factor 2 or more? [Actually I judge that a factor 10 or more might be necessary]

Regards

Martin Shough

To David Rudiak & James Smith, 01 Feb

Gentlemen,

I got an interesting response from Ray Stanford to questions about Zamora's distance-time judgements and the winds aloft etc.

[Quote]:

...I think that there is not an icicle's chance in hell that Zamora could have mis-judged the object's distance or speed by any significant factor. Keep in mind Dr. Lincoln LaPaz's testimony about how accurate Zamora was in supplying the coordinates of a meteor he observed, for which LaPaz was seeking data to compute a trajectory. Then too, Zamora is the most cautious person I've ever interviewed about not embellishing anything or adding facts that might be wanted by an investigator that were actually unknown to him. Keep in mind, too, Zamora's absolute familiarity with the whole area, including the distance (about one mile) from where he was located over to the perlite mill, toward which the object moved absolutely against the wind at that level, at which distance the object disappeared going close to vertically upward, disappearing due to distance, above (not over the horizon), in an absolute maximum of twenty seconds from takeoff! [Zamora initially said that happened in "around ten seconds", but when I had him go over it on-site with me, we came to the conclusion the time was more than ten seconds, but absolutely not more than twenty seconds, so let's be conservative and say it took twenty seconds to disappear going up almost vertically. Over half of that time was taken for the object to travel into the west-southwest, on horizontal course, so in ten seconds and probably less, the object vanished due to distance, on that nearly vertical course!

"By the way: Upper level winds were also (as were ground-level winds that day) out of the west-southwest at the time of the Socorro event, absolutely deflating any type balloon hypothesis.

[End quote]

Of course we don't know what "upper winds" means precisely, but I'm prepared to say that if this wind info is accurate (probably is as I think Ray has been pretty careful in this case) then that is the final nail in the coffin of the balloon-suspended test rig theory. A shame really, as it was intriguing while it lasted. And a pity that so few people ever understood it while it was alive!

Best wishes

Martin

>From James Smith. 01 Feb:

Thanks for Ray's input.

May the balloon theory rest in 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 13:51:37 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:38:13 -0500
Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle -

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 12:18:51 -0000
>Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 14:15:05 -0800
>>Subject: Re: A List Of Ships But No Llandoverly Castle

<snip>

>>Now the question, was there a second ship by that same
>>name carrying passengers down the SE African coast in 1947?

>Yes, indeed there was - please see:

><http://www.clydesite.co.uk/clydebuilt/viewship.asp?id=4067>

><http://www.merchantnavyofficers.com/unioncastle3.html>

><http://www.maritimematters.com/union-castle.html>

><http://www.union-castle-line.com/home.htm>

>Peter Rogerson mentioned an article in FSR in an earlier post,
>but there is an article on-line at the excellent Project 1947
>site dated 1953 about the incident, see:

><http://www.project1947.com/shg/csi/csi1-3.html>

Thanks Joe, matter is settled. I was late for work and only did
a quick scan. There definitely was a Llandoverly Castle II.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Kenny Young - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 22:09:12 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 07:40:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Kenny Young - Miller

As a rabid believer with not the slightest inclination or pretence for the scientific method, even I am appalled by the utter drivell I have been reading in the wake of Kenny Young's death.

As he was a ufologist, his death is being linked, in some quarters on the Net, with the demise of every other individual who has ever had even the merest brush with ufology, as part of the great conspiracy to kill each and every one of us off. Even Graham Birdsall's death these days (aneurysm)is being thrown in for good measure.

For god's sake, can't people just be left alone to die in peace and with dignity.

Stuart Miller

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI'

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 22:21:17 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 15:50:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI'

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 22:19:41 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI' Observatory

<snip>

>What attracted my attention were reports of very faint extended
>patches of light in the night sky that moved at the same rate as
>the Moon at the Earth-Moon L4 and L5 points. Could these patches
>of light be debris fields consisting of very many tiny objects
>that are too small to spot even with a large optical telescope?
>If this is the case and the average separation between these
>tiny objects is about the wavelength of radio/radar waves or
>less, then their existence could be confirmed by listening for a
>radio echo.

<snip>

>Maybe others will one day do this radar search of debris in
>orbit at the L4 and L5 points around the Earth. If passive radar
>using many radio receivers spread all over the surface of the
>Earth can be used to detect the Moon about 1/4 of a million
>miles away, then we may also be able to detect much weaker
>signals coming from these two other extended objects in space at
>L4 and L5 that are equally as far away.

Hi Nick,

If you are interested in this area, you're probably aware of the work of Robert Freitas and related projects in relation to the search for extraterrestrial interstellar probes within our solar system. However, I thought it worth giving a few relevant references since his name does not appear to be in the archives of this List (something I find somewhat surprising) and some members of the list may not be aware of the literature on such work.

Rather than simply list references cut and paste from the draft chronology I've been working on, in this email I'll also include a few comments. I hope this does not upset anyone!

Two papers spring to mind as of particular relevance to your proposed project in relation to a radar search of debris in orbit at the L4 and L5 points. These are:

(a) Freitas, Robert and Valdes, Francisco "A Search for Natural or Artificial Objects Located at the Earth-Moon Libration Points" , Icarus, Volume 42 (1980), pages 442-447. That paper discusses an optical attempt to discover evidence of discrete objects (such as interstellar probes) in stable orbits about L4 and L5 made by Robert A Freitas Junior and Francisco Valdes by studying 90 astronomical photographic plates. The text of a draft of that paper is available online at:

<http://www.rfreitas.com/Astro/SearchIcarus1980.htm>

(b) Jurgens, R. (1967) "Search at Lagrangian points" [Cornell University Research Report RS-70, pp. 76-77. AFOSR Contract AF-49(658)-1156 31 January 1967]. This paper is referred to by Freitas in several of his papers and is summarised by him as follows: "An informal radar search near L4/ L5 conducted at Arecibo found no targets >10 m2 (Jurgens, 1967)."

Various other paper by Robert Freitas may also be of interest, including "The Search for ExtraTerrestrial Artifacts (SETA)" [Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, Volume 36 (1983), pages 501-506]. In that article Freitas offered the "Artifact Hypothesis" that "A technologically advanced extraterrestrial civilisation has undertaken a long-term programme of ' interstellar exploration via transmission of material artefacts". That article also suggested, if the Artifact Hypothesis is correct, that "some evidence of this extraterrestrial exploratory activity should be apparent within the confines of the Solar System". That article is available online at: <http://www.rfreitas.com/Astro/SETAJBISNov1983.htm>
http://www.setv.org/online_mss/seta83.html

One of the reasons I find it surprising that the work by Freitas does not appear to have been referred to in the archives of this List (although there are occasional references to Bracewell probes) is that the experimental search for interstellar probes is relatively respectable amongst SETI researchers - at least compared their expressed views on ufology. I would have thought that this is one of several areas in which the work done by SETI researchers and ufologists almost overlaps (particularly in relation to instrumented searches by ufologists).

Participation by ufologists in the debates relating to such areas of overlap could lead to the development of mutual respect and assistance - although I admit this might be a tad optimistic.

For example, Jill Tarter is regularly criticised on this List for allegedly having a closed mind. However, she is one of the few SETI researchers that refers to the range of potential methods of searching for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, other than merely radio frequency searches. She has commonly referred to various other methods, including the attempts by Freitas to find evidence of interstellar probes. See, for example, her discussions at the following two references:

(a) Tarter, Jill in "Extraterrestrials: Science and alien intelligence" (1985) (edited by Edward Regis) at page 179 (in Part 5) of the Cambridge University Press softcover edition. Also included as Reference 18 in the tabular Appendix entitled "Archive of SETI observing programs 1959-84" at page 193.

(b) Tarter, Jill in "Extraterrestrials: Where are they?" (1982) (edited by Michael Hart and Ben Zuckerman) at page 10 (in Chapter 2) of the Cambridge softcover second edition.

Also, Ian Ridpath (often referred to as being a British UFO skeptic or debunker) refers to such attempts in his "Messages from the Stars" (1978) [at page 165 (in Chapter 10) of the Fontana paperback edition].

By the way, Freitas is also discussed by David Darling in his online encyclopedia, "The Encyclopedia of Astrobiology, Astronomy and Spaceflight" (2003) in the entries entitled "Freitas, Robert" and "SETV (Search for Extraterrestrial Visitation)" and "extraterrestrial probe". The relevant entries are available online at:

<http://www.daviddarling.info/encyclopedia/F/Freitas.html>

<http://www.daviddarling.info/encyclopedia/S/SETV.html>

<http://www.daviddarling.info/encyclopedia/E/etprobe.html>

In relation to the possibility of radio signals from L4 and L5, I assume that you're also familiar with Duncan Lunan's hypothesis that Long Delayed Echoes ("LDEs") in the 1920s indicated a station-keeping probe from Epsilon Bootes lay in either the L4 or L5 Lagrange points in the Moon's orbit around the Earth. That hypothesis was published in Lunan's book "Man and the Stars" (1973) and has been commented upon in many books since then, including by Jack Stoneley and A T Lawton in their "Is Anyone Out There?" (1974) at pages 11-12, 24-26 (in the Introduction), 113-131 (in Chapter 7) of the Star Books

paperback edition and by Ronald Bracewell in his "The Galactic Club" (1974) at page 132 (in the Reader's Guide) of the Heinemann softcover edition. Again, David Darling's online encyclopedia, "The Encyclopedia of Astrobiology, Astronomy and Spaceflight" (2003), has a relevant entry (entitled "Lunan, Duncan Alasdair (1945-)"). The relevant entry is available online at:

<http://www.daviddarling.info/encyclopedia/L/Lunan.html>

Kind Regards,

Isaac Koi

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: PRG/X-Conference 2005 Press Release - 02-03-05

From: **Stephen Bassett** <aradigmRG.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 18:01:53 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 15:56:47 -0500
Subject: Re: PRG/X-Conference 2005 Press Release - 02-03-05

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

X-Conference 2005 Press Release - February 3, 2005

Washington, DC - The January/February 2005 issue of the peer-reviewed Journal of the British Interplanetary Society (JBIS) published an article titled Inflation-Theory Implications for Extraterrestrial Visitation. Dr. James Deardorff was the lead author along with Dr. Bernard Haisch, Dr. Bruce Maccabee and Dr. Harold Puthoff. The paper reassesses the extraterrestrial hypothesis in light of the new physics and includes references to the posture and actions of the U.S. Air Force. It is an important development, and PRG is pleased two of the paper's authors (Drs. Deardorff and Maccabee) will present on the implications of their findings. It is also notable a Space.com article, ET Visitors: Scientists See High Likelihood, Jan 14, 2005 by Leonard David, received millions of hits after the article was a top-story link at the Drudge Report website for several days. The paper can be downloaded at:

www.paradigmclock.com/X-Conference/Graphics/JBIS.pdf

Including Drs. Deardorff and Maccabee, PRG is announcing four more speakers for the 2nd Annual Exopolitics Expo (X-Conference), scheduled for April 22-24, 2005 at the Hilton Washington, DC North/Gaithersburg. The other two are researcher/activist David Sereda and exopolitical pioneer Michael Salla, PhD. The conference website is:

www.x-conference.com

The X-Conference is a unique event which focuses on the political, governmental and social aspects relating to extraterrestrial-related phenomena. It is produced by PRG as part of the ongoing activist movement seeking to end the truth embargo. Approximately 28 lecturers and panelists will present. New for this year:

James Deardorff, PhD is a prolific researcher of extraordinary range who embodies the legacy of James E. McDonald. He began his studies at Reed College in Portland, Oregon in 1946-47 and then switched to Stanford University, where he majored in physics earning his bachelor of science in 1950. He attended UCLA receiving a second bachelor of science in meteorology in 1951. After a 4-year stint in the Navy Dr. Deardorff went on to achieve an MS (1956) and PhD (1959) in Meteorology. After postgraduate work he took a position at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder, CO, in 1962. There he migrated into the study of laboratory and numerical modeling of turbulent thermal convection, and boundary-layer turbulence and diffusion. After a few years at NCAR he became a senior scientist, enjoying a successful, 16-year research career. A list of the published research papers during this career is provided in an expanded curriculum vitae. After NCAR Jim took a position at Oregon State University in 1978 as a research professor in the Department of Atmospheric Sciences. It was in Oregon that Dr. Deardorff became interested in extraterrestrial-related phenomenon and by the late 1970s had decided the

evidence pointed conclusively towards the ETH. By 1985 his research interests had irrevocably turned to the ETH and its implications for society, and around this time he had the first of five sightings. So in 1986 he took early retirement from OSU. Writing papers and research grant proposals and attending to associated administrative duties no longer seemed as important as exploring extraterrestrial-related phenomenon and trying to raise public awareness. By 1987 he had written three peer-reviewed papers dealing with this new area of interest:

David Sereda is a social and environmental activist with a broad range of interests. As with many others, his interest in extraterrestrial-related phenomena was sparked in 1968 by a strong sighting of a large, classic disc-shaped object hovering in a clear sky with hundreds of witnesses shouting with excitement and pointing upwards in amazement. After 20 minutes of watching this object, David saw it disappear. This event created a life-long interest in extraterrestrial-related phenomena which combined with interests in space, religion, philosophy, astronomy and science and led to a of Martyn Stubbs, who taped and cataloged over 400 hours of live NASA mission broadcasts, and professional photographer Michael Boyle, David conducted an investigation of NASA and the Stubbs 1990s space shuttle mission video footage. The results of that investigation led to the development of the book and documentary film, Evidence, The Case for NASA UFOs. His most recent project is a documentary about actor/producer Dan Aykroyd's interest and advocacy regarding extraterrestrial-related phenomena.

Returning from last year:

Bruce Maccabee, PhD studied physics at Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Worcester, Mass (B.S.) and then at The American University, Washington, DC (MS, PhD, physics). In 1972 he commenced his long career at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, presently headquartered at Dahlgren, Virginia. He has worked on optical data processing, generation of underwater sound with lasers, various aspects of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) using high power lasers and is presently involved in a program related to Homeland Security. Bruce has been active in extraterrestrial-related phenomena research since late 1960s when he joined the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP) and was active in research and investigation for NICAP until its demise in 1980. He became a member of MUFON in 1975 and was subsequently appointed to the position of State Director for Maryland, a position he still holds. In 1979 he was instrumental in establishing the Fund for UFO Research and was the chairman for 13 years. He presently serves on the National Board of the Fund. Dr. Maccabee is the author or coauthor of about three dozen technical articles and more than a hundred UFO articles over the last 30 years, including many which appeared in the MUFON Journal and MUFON Symposium proceedings. He wrote the last chapter of The Gulf Breeze Sightings by Edward and Frances Walters (Morrow, 1990). He wrote the UFO history chapter of the book UFOs: Zeugen und Zeichen, published in Germany in 1995. He is co-author with Edward Walters of UFOs Are Real, Here's The Proof, (Avon Books, 1997), he is the author of The UFO/FBI Connection (Llewellyn Books, May, 2000) and the author of the novel, Abduction in My Life (Granite Publishing, 2001). He is listed in Who's Who in Technology Today and American Men and Women of Science.

Michael Salla, PhD (Australia) lost his status at American University and his projects were denied renewal as a direct result of his participation in X-Conference 2004. This is just one more disgrace in a long history of head-in-the-sand denial by the entire American academic community regarding extraterrestrial-related phenomena. Michael has the courage and integrity to follow the information wherever it leads. American University is perfectly situated to be a leader in the development of exopolitics. The opportunity was and is there to break new ground, to make a difference. American University took a pass. Michael is a pioneer in the development of exopolitics, the scholarly study of the main actors, institutions and processes associated with an extraterrestrial presence that is not acknowledged to the general public or the mass media by government authority. His interest in exopolitics evolved out of his investigation of the sources of international conflict and its relationship with the undisclosed extraterrestrial presence. He cites evidence of multiple extraterrestrial races currently engaging humanity and the planet in a variety of ways. His book Exopolitics: Political Implications of the Extraterrestrial Presence (Dandelion Books, 2004) presents a comprehensive study

of the political implications of the extraterrestrial presence. His forthcoming book, *The Challenge of Exopolitics* (Dandelion Books 2005) analyzes challenges in educating the general public about exopolitical issues. He has a PhD in Government from the University of Queensland, Australia, and an MA in Philosophy from the University of Melbourne, Australia. He has conducted research and fieldwork in the ethnic conflicts in East Timor, Kosovo, Macedonia, and Sri Lanka, and organized peacemaking initiatives involving mid to high level participants from these conflicts.

Other speakers already announced include: Richard Dolan, Ann Druffel, John Greenewald, Jr., Dr. Lynne Kitei, MD, Paul Davids, Charles James Hall, Michael S. Heiser, PhD, Jaime Maussan, Richard Sauder, PhD and Alfred L. Webre, JD.

Full speaker information is posted in the Speaker section at: www.x-conference.com.

Contact:
Stephen Bassett
202-215-8344

Paradigm Research Group
E-mail: ParadigmRG.nul
URL: www.paradigmclock.com
Cell: 202-215-8344
4938 Hampden Lane, #161
Bethesda, MD 20814

2nd Annual Exopolitics Expo - The X-Conference
Hilton Washington DC North/Gaithersburg
www.x-conference.com
Tapes/DVDs available at: www.lostartsmidia.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

UFO Groups Clash Over Credibility

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 21:01:50 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 16:10:53 -0500
Subject: UFO Groups Clash Over Credibility

Source: The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel,

<http://www.jsonline.com/news/racine/feb05/298527.asp>

02-02-05

Alienation: UFO groups clash over credibility

Paranormal center owner files police complaint
accusing rival group of watching, stalking her

By Jennie Tunkieicz
jtunkieicz.nul

Burlington - Mary Sutherland, owner of the Burlington UFO and Paranormal Center, says she is being watched.

But it's not by little green men or even ghosts. Those kinds of close encounters she would welcome.

Sutherland thinks a human, perhaps associated with a rival UFO group in Wisconsin, is stalking her. She reported her concerns to police this week.

Burlington police are investigating the suspicious circumstances that have nothing to do with the increased UFO activity in the area that Sutherland says she has documented. Her downtown store features everything from alien kitsch, such as inflatable green goblins to published research on UFOs and paranormal activities.

She learned of the possible stalking when someone forwarded to her a Web link to an unidentified group that is attempting to debunk Sutherland's work and the photos on her own Web site. The group questions why UFOs make nightly appearances over Sutherland's store, yet no one else reports such sightings.

What frightened Sutherland was the rival group's claim that "our group spent good money and hired a professional to do surveillance on Mary & the Burlington UFO every night (all night) from Jan. 22nd through Jan. 30th," according to the posting.

For a woman who looks for UFOs, who seeks out places where there has been paranormal activity and who goes looking for ghosts, the "stalker" crossed the line.

"When I read that they paid someone to be out there and watch me, that scared the heck out of me," Sutherland said Wednesday.

Then, just like a UFO in the night sky, the group's Web site disappeared Tuesday after Sutherland posted a message letting people know she had contacted police.

Work was criticized

Jennifer Hoppe of Sheboygan, who has been associated with UFO Wisconsin, a group interested in UFO sightings across the state, just happened to be reading Sutherland's Web site Tuesday

morning when Sutherland posted the Web page that is critical of her work. Hoppe sent Sutherland an instant message suggesting she answer the group's questions. Hoppe then found her name on Sutherland's Web site.

"I had nothing to do with the accusations from the Web site," Hoppe said. "I sent her an instant message saying that those were pretty good questions and asking, 'Are you going to answer them?' Apparently, she isn't."

Hoppe and her husband ran UFO Wisconsin for three years. Part of their mission was to try to get people to take UFOs seriously, she said. But she said she can't take Sutherland's photos seriously, and she wonders why there have been no reports to police about UFO sightings. "The reason people don't take UFO research seriously is because of people like Mary," Hoppe said. "There have been legitimate cases in the world that defy logic. What responsible, respectable professional is going to research that when people like Mary are blathering this hokey-pokey crap as the truth?"

Burlington activity questioned

Pat Champeau, owner of Background Plus Detective Agency in Sheboygan, had participated in Sutherland's web site, but recently asked for her contact information to be removed from the site.

Champeau questioned how there can be so much alleged activity in Burlington.

"It is outlandish," Champeau said. "There are five million places to land, and it's always over her business. It's nuts."

Sutherland said she has no idea who is behind the unidentified Web site, but she challenges all of her detractors to come to Burlington and do their own research.

"I welcome anyone to come down here and take pictures," Sutherland said. "Come here at 3 a.m. and see what is lighting up the sky."

There is also a legitimate reason why people have not been calling the police about UFO sightings or paranormal activity, she said.

"I have a UFO center. Doesn't it make sense if you see a UFO to come to me? If you see paranormal activity, you don't go to the police, you would go to a paranormal center, it only makes sense," Sutherland said.

Store opened last year

Sutherland said she has been researching UFO and paranormal activities for more than 20 years. She opened a virtual UFO and paranormal center and started hosting a Web radio show in Burlington four years ago. Last spring, she turned her collectibles and doll shop into the Burlington UFO and Paranormal Center.

The bulk of the store is devoted to research on everything from ancient races and burial mounds to UFOs. She has a library and a video viewing room to watch documentaries that she has made of people who have seen UFOs and who have been abducted by aliens. Isn't space, the final frontier, big enough for all UFO enthusiasts?

Sutherland believes it is.

"It shouldn't have to be this way," Sutherland said.

The Web site is:

www.burlingtonnews.net/burlington_ufo_center

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 01:07:29 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 16:12:39 -0500
Subject: Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern

Well with things heating up again and with Britain's UFO disclosures, India and China charging forth with more research as well as more Mexico info and finally the upcoming ABC special on UFOs keep a fair weather eye out for offbeat UFO stories that put the field into the oddball category.

The news wires are hot now with UFO stuff and that 's good but old timers know how one serious UFO story will be followed by a flood of less than reputable stories.

Be on your toes.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Colvin

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 23:08:42 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 17:20:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Colvin

'Steve' wishes to remain anonymous.

-Terry

Socorro is also home to Langmuir Labs where a lot of research is done on lightning and thunderstorm electrification.

Much of this research involves the sending up of instrumented weather balloons from a nearby by mountain top to conduct studies of the storms and to take measurements.

Unlike the 150-300 gram balloons we sent up at FHU [Fort Huachuca, Arizona], these balloons are 1000-3000 grammers and are quite large. The instruments come down by parachute after the balloon pops at altitude but the balloon material will drift down as well.

Windflow patterns during thunderstorm season in NM [New Mexico] can be light all of the way up so the balloon packages can come down not far from the release point. We've seen our balloons come down on FHU after going up to 20-30km up.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 01:21:38 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 17:36:24 -0500
Subject: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?

What'll Be The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?

I just hope this new special isn't going to be some watered down look at UFOs.

I hope Jennings and his staff have really done their homework, scoured through data that hasn't seen the light of day yet and breaks new ground in UFOlogy.

I'm hoping that those of you who were asked to participate hit ABC with the kitchen sink as you do on this list and in your books, lectures etc.

I'd hate to see an examination of UFOlogy and have him claim that people see UFOs, there are UFO reports, the government has investigated UFOs, no one has a definitive conclusion.

We know all that already and so does the public.

For this special to really stand out it's got to have something worthy of the ABC News name tagged onto it. Not just this guy is a UFO researcher and this guy is a UFO researcher- researcher who researches ad nauseum.

And no we don't need a 'here is the data let the public decide' because the public at large already has decided.

No, we need something new. Pro or con. Dispels falsehoods and validates truths. Gray-area investigation won't cut it anymore.

Is Jennings brave enough? Sure as heck is.

Is ABC brave enough? Dunno.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 3](#)

MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 22:40:04 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 18:50:01 -0500
Subject: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World

Source: The Financial Times

<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/02ee9662-7589-11d9-9608-00000e2511c8.html>

02-03-05

MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World
By Cathy Newman and Jean Eaglesham

The X-Files have been opened: in a victory for ufologists everywhere, the man from the ministry not only admits he has an open mind about the existence of extra-terrestrial lifeforms but also keeps a careful tally of UFO sightings.

Following a request under the Freedom of Information Act by the Financial Times, the Ministry of Defence has revealed it remains "totally open-minded" about the possibility that life exists beyond Earth.

The MoD has released a detailed log of reported unidentified flying object sightings. "Strange lights were seen in the sky" in Whitstable, Kent, just over two weeks ago - the same night a member of the public reported a "flying saucer" over Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire and a "sighting" at Chatteris, Cambridgeshire.

More exotic alien encounters were recorded last year. "A square red object, pinkish at the front" was spotted in Strathclyde, Ayr, on January 2; a "chewy mint shaped" object was seen in the night sky above Nelson, Lancashire, in May; and a "large black object" was identified in Rhyl, Clwyd, in February.

A diligent ufologist from Surrey gave a detailed eye-witness account in May, noting that "grooves and windows could be seen and no room for humans to fit within it". The same month "a bright, pulsing, spider-looking object" appeared at King's Lynn, Norfolk, and the MoD was even contacted by someone from Sri Lanka in March puzzled by an orange "ring doughnut".

A letter from the MoD's directorate of air staff explains that it examines all UFO sightings it receives "solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance". It adds: "Only a handful of reports in recent years have warranted further investigation and none revealed any evidence of a threat."

But, in an aside that will hearten conspiracy theorists, the letter stresses that the MoD "remains totally open-minded" as to "the question of the existence or otherwise of extra-terrestrial lifeforms".

This approach may explain why the MoD has not always confined its work on extraterrestrials to recording sightings. In 1950, a working party set up by the MoD "to investigate the flying saucer phenomenon" reported to the joint technical intelligence committee.

The MoD letter does not detail verbatim the spy chiefs' reaction to this report on alien life forms. But they presumably decided the spooks would be better employed in the cold war - the letter states that the intelligence committee decided the working party should be dissolved.

The government also refused to back a 1978 attempt by the Grenadian delegation to the United Nations to establish an international working group to evaluate UFO reports, the letter states. "The British delegation did not think that such an agency was appropriate to the function of the UN." The MoD admitted the documents are a fraction of the thousands of records of alleged alien visits.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

MoD Reveals 88 Sightings In '04

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 22:42:53 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 06:33:46 -0500
Subject: MoD Reveals 88 Sightings In '04

Source: The Independent - London, UK

http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/this_britain/story.jsp?story=607253

02-03-05

The truth is out there: declassified reports of UFO sightings reveal 88 sightings last year

By Robert Verkaik, Legal Affairs Correspondent

Details of Britain's most recent UFO sightings are revealed in previously secret documents disclosed to The Independent.

The files, released under the Freedom of Information Act, show that, last year, the Ministry of Defence's UFO unit received 88 reports from military staff and members of the public worried about unexplained objects in our skies.

The classified files help to complete a picture of the scale of UFO sightings first revealed by this paper last month. These updated "X-files" show the most recent observations were made on 15 January this year following two separate reports from Chatteris, Cambridgeshire, and Whitstable, Kent. The reports refer to "strange lights seen in the sky".

Other sightings give more detail. A report from Devizes in Wiltshire on 24 September last year records an object that: "Looked liked a big ball of fire coming down from the sky with a tail and sparks coming off the end of it." Another, from Somerset the week before, states: "The object looked like a great bright light and was really intense, like a ball of fire coming down from the sky, rapidly moving towards the ground."

Although such reports might be discounted as meteor showers or other astronomical phenomena, other sightings are not so easy to dismiss. A report from Surrey on 20 May last year describes a UFO as having "grooves and windows" but no room for humans. Even the MoD inspector notes that the "witness had seen the object so clearly".

Many of the other sightings refer to UFO's changing colour, speed and shape. The most common colours are yellow, orange or black.

A report from Goole, East Yorkshire, recorded in April last year, noted: "The object looked like a boomerang and was stationary over a power station. An aircraft was circling the object."

In the same month, a UFO observer from Seaforth, Merseyside, noted: "I saw a UFO with a cluster of four bright lights in a ring shape on it. Three beams of white light shone upwards and disappeared."

These latest files to be declassified by the MoD are not as complete as reports from mid-1976 and 1977 released last month.

Hundreds of documents previously kept secret by the Ministry of Defence's special UFO department, known as S4F, detail many reports of a possible visit by extraterrestrial life-forms. One is made by an RAF pilot and two NCOs at RAF Boulmer, Northumberland.

In July 1977 Flt-Lt A M Wood reported "bright objects hanging over the sea'. The MoD document adds that the RAF officer said the closest object was "luminous, round and four to five times larger than a Whirlwind helicopter". The UFOs were reported to be three miles out to sea at a height of about 5,000ft.

The officer, whose report is supported by Cpl Torrington and Sgt Graham, said: "The objects separated. Then one went west of the other, as it manoeuvred it changed shape to become body-shaped with projections like arms and legs." The report describes Flt-Lt Wood as "reliable and sober".

That account was deemed so sensitive to the national interest that the MoD had delayed its release for an extra three years. But under the Freedom of Information Act, which came into force on 1 January, the file has been declassified

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Seattle's Museum Of Mysteries

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 22:47:47 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 06:40:45 -0500
Subject: Seattle's Museum Of Mysteries

Source: Highways West

http://highwayswest.com/archives/2005/02/seattles_museum.htm

February 02, 2005

Seattle's Museum Of Mysteries

Looking for a weird diversion in Seattle? On Broadway in the Capitol Hill neighborhood, you'll find a chamber of curiosities within a small basement shop. The brown awning outside says "Museum of the Mysteries," and this Seattle Post-Intelligencer article explains what it's all about:

If for some reason you miss the museum's name on the brown awning outside, just look for the purple-clad dwarf inhabiting the stairwell The space downstairs can be underwhelming. You may find either one of the museum's co-directors, Philip Lipson or Charlette LeFevre, manning the front desk. Pay the \$3 suggested donation and go inside to see ... a room lined with shabby bookshelves.

It's a bit like the dusty basement of an eccentric aunt or uncle. Those old bookcases hold some pretty neat stuff -- and if you just let your guard down, you could get sucked into all the ghost stories, UFO tidbits and Bigfoot info.

You can listen to an interview with Kenneth Arnold, the man credited with starting the U.S. flying saucer frenzy in 1947, when he spotted a formation of strange, shiny craft zooming around Mt. Baker. Or you can play with ghostbusters' equipment used by the Amateur Ghost Hunters of Seattle Tacoma.

The real attractions of the little museum can be found on its schedule of events. On the first Friday of every month, "Seattle Inventors and Basement Scientists showcase their weird science!" (Bring a potluck dish.) On Saturday night, Feb. 12, drop by for an evening of mystery related to Seattle's own doomed movie star, Frances Farmer. (Why did Nirvana's Kurt Cobain warn that "Frances Farmer Will Have Her Revenge on Seattle?" You just might find out. On April 8, the eleventh anniversary of his strange death, there's a night dedicated to the mysteries of the late Mr. Cobain himself.) And don't miss the Sasquatch Symposium in June.

In an upcoming ABC documentary on the paranormal, news anchor Peter Jennings interviews Seattle UFO researcher Peter Davenport inside the Museum of the Mysteries. So if you want to avoid the crowds, go before Seattle's weird little museum is featured on national television.

And don't forget the oxygen bar ... or the organic donuts! The museum is open Monday-Thursday from 11:30 a.m. to 9 p.m., stays open until midnight on Fridays and Saturdays. Sunday hours are 1 p.m.-8 p.m. You'll find it at 623 Broadway E. in Seattle's funky Capitol Hill neighborhood.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 00:32:14 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 06:46:39 -0500
Subject: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

Source: PRWeb.Com

<http://www.prweb.com/releases/2005/2/prweb204713.htm>

Conservative Radio Host Won't Discuss Controversial
News Story on Show
=09

But he was among the first to get Meier's book, in 2001, warning of U.S. attack on Iraq, recent BBC, Drudge, Frontline news stories, etc.

Los Angeles, CA (PRWEB) February 3, 2005 -- A heated controversy is already erupting between Michael Horn, the U.S. researcher who represents the UFO case of Billy Meier, from Switzerland, and noted conservative talk show host Dennis Prager. At the center of the dispute, is Horn's assertion that discussion of the amazing story, now splashing across news sites and airing on stations all over the world, isn't taking place on some conservative shows here in the U.S. that, Horn thinks, should welcome controversial but well-documented stories.

<http://www.prweb.com/releases/2005/2/prweb203910.htm>

While interest in Horn's recent appearance on one show resulted in over 250,000 hits to his website, he's gotten a rather chilly reception from the shows that, Horn thinks, are more comfortable with maintaining the status quo, based on narrow political and/or religious thinking, at a time in history when such thinking contributes more to our problems than to solving them.

But Horn points out that his frustration may be understandable when people learn that noted talk show hosts, like Prager and Michael Medved, were actually among the very first people, in 2001, to receive a copy of "And Yet They Fly!" containing Meier's accurate warnings about events that hadn't occurred yet, like the U.S. attack on Iraq, the increase in Islamic terrorism, the spread of Mad Cow disease, etc. Horn thinks that people should know that these hosts, and thousands of other people, still have this book sitting on their bookshelf and, may be unaware or, worse, uninterested that it not only contains the amazing proof of foreknowledge of events, it also contains warnings of calamitous things still to come=85should humanity not heed the warnings. "This either true or not true, there's really nothing in between. And, if it's true, there is no bigger story in all of history. The problem facing the media is how to the question the credibility of a controversial guest who sent you information about events=85before they occurred."

"I also understand," Horn added, "why ideologues or zealots of any stripe are avoiding Meier if their primary justification for war or policing the world emanates from their belief in an unproven divine right to do so. Both Prager and Medved, as well as other self-described religious, conservative radio hosts, are well-known supporters for the president's going to war, which many people view as an unconscionable act of unprovoked aggression sold under the guise of an imminent threat to the nation. But my concern is that, in 1981, Meier clearly warned of

catastrophic destruction befalling the U.S., our own country, as a result of just these types of aggressive military policies, and further elaborated chillingly about it in 1987. Because Meier's record of accuracy is well beyond the ability of any radio host to summarily dismiss on the air, they avoid dealing with the information."

<http://nexusmagazine.com/articles/Henoch%20Prophecies.html>

Asked if he thought that someone like Michael Moore would be more receptive to the story, Horn said, "Look, don't even get me started on Michael Moore and those on the far-left who don't control the airwaves anyway. And I'm not as interested in trying to change Mr. Prager's mind as I am in putting the case before his audience, and other conservative audiences, and letting them challenge it and decide on its validity themselves. Why should information of such potentially monumental importance to their lives, and their survival, be hidden from them, especially when these hosts have been privy to it for many years?"

"This could be the ultimate 'if we only knew then what we know now' story and the problem is that we do know now and important people in a position to do something about it, perhaps to even help re-write our future history, are not taking that opportunity. It may never come again," said Horn.

The DVD "The Meier Contacts -- The Key To Our Future Survival" and book "And Still They Fly!" are available by visiting www.thefly.com

Released in 2004, both sources contain Meier's specific warnings for the events that occurred after publication, as well as for current and future events.

For more information contact:

Michael Horn
Authorized American Media Representative
The Billy Meier Contacts
310-745-9009
www.theyfly.com

Copyright 1997-2004, PR Web=99. All Rights Reserved

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:07:03 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:17:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 11:16:03 -0400
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 06:32:01 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>Hall, Friedman, Swords, and Clark... the 'force' seems well
>>represented. Any word on who it is who fronts for the 'dark'
>>side? I hope Shermer is one of them... gives me an opportunity
>>to hoot and boo and otherwise carry on in an immature manner in
>>the privacy of my own home. <g>

>In a bulk mailing from Skeptic, Shirmer lists the Peter Jennings
>special as one of his appearances. Don Schmitt was also
>interviewed in Roswell last July. There were interviews at MUFON
>in Denver in July as well. What a collection of outtakes there
>must be.

>Stan Friedman

Stan,

That bodes ill for the quality of the program. I had thought they were above the usual 'sampler' of every kook or idiot that chances along, every uninformed debunker, every colorful character, in favor of serious discussion of the hardcore data. Let us hope they did some serious editing.

I personally bent the producer's ear about the history of UFO documentaries, how bad they generally were, and why. And I have been in touch regularly with the staff since then, supplying them with all kinds of solid information, documents, leads to good witnesses, etc. They will certainly hear from me loud and clear if this turns out to be another hodgepodge,

Meanwhile I am hoping for the best but will expect the worst.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:10:47 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:18:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? - Hall

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:19:30 +0000
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 04:59:27 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

>>No record of his appearance in court after numerous calls? Now
>>that's odd, isn't it? Would the court system keep this
>>appearance fuzzy to preclude a circus at the courthouse because
>>of the popularity of or interest in the case? Is remanding a
>>case around in this fashion usual?

>>Thanks for keeping us up to speed on the case, Stuart.

>Unlikely. Apart from a brief notice in newspapers at the time
>there has been very little follow up to this event in the
>British media. I can't see any great conspiracy about what
>appears to be a bureaucratic oversight. Of course, some people
>want to see a conspiracy in everything!

John,

You mean like the conspiracy of the Brazilian government to
conceal from the world that the January 1958 Trindade Isle
photos really were fakes and no one on deck saw the UFO?

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 06:16:08 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:19:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:19:30 +0000
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 04:59:27 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

><snip>

>>No record of his appearance in court after numerous calls? Now
>>that's odd, isn't it? Would the court system keep this
>>appearance fuzzy to preclude a circus at the courthouse because
>>of the popularity of or interest in the case? Is remanding a
>>case around in this fashion usual?

>>Thanks for keeping us up to speed on the case, Stuart.

>Unlikely. Apart from a brief notice in newspapers at the time
>there has been very little follow up to this event in the
>British media. I can't see any great conspiracy about what
>appears to be a bureaucratic oversight. Of course, some people
>want to see a conspiracy in everything!

My - we stoop to suck our explications from inventive if
diseased thumbs, My Rimmer. I asked a few harmless questions
and you drew "conspiracy in everything!" (replete with
exclamation...) from the obviously polluted and intelligence
robbing atmosphere you must be forced to fretfully breath. Move
out into the country while you still have a few to rub together
for a spark, Sir.

Moreover, I don't invent my concern regarding fidelity,
justice, and ufological forthcomingness, Sir, it is thrust upon
and I am driven to it. I'm a 'reaction' and not a 'cause',
Mr. Rimmer. My intellectual enemies created me, not I them.

It's an understandable reaction to the cognitive foot on your
intellectual neck, or consider the evolving fate of the British
Empire, and in its turn (and for the same reasons) the Empire of
the United States.

Don't trifle, Mr. Rimmer.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:21:50 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:21:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:50:13 -0000
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 19:51:45 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>The Rendlesham-Bentwaters 1980 case is in the article of Donald
>>Johnson, along with a series of significant cases.
>>Again, this part - the direct evaluation of significant cases -
>>is capital in this debate on Ufos and nuclear sites.
>>Bentwaters happens to be one of them.

>Hi Gildas,

>I'm aware that the Woodbridge-Rendlesham Forest case is cited
>by Johnson, in passing, as an example of a UFO being reported
>near a place where nuclear weapons are stored. However that is
>only an anecdote. We all know that the thrust of Johnson's paper
>was its claim to demonstrate a statistically significant
>quantitative result in answer to the question "Are UFOs
>Attracted to Nuclear Sites?". He didn't demonstrate this, but he
>did try to move the argument into the area of replicable
>results, and at least he understands the difference between
>quantitative evidence and anecdotal evidence. I'm not sure that
>you do. You also applauded this statistical work, by the way,
>before I criticised it, as the "affirmative answer" to the
>question. Now I feel that you are happier to revert to the
>anecdotal method of using selected instances to illustrate the
>"obvious".

<snip>

Martin,

Only an anecdote? What is your definition, please? We have the
recorded testimony of Col. Halt who was there and personally saw
the light beams directed downwards into the atomic weapons area.
He so stated to me, and he so stated in a public talk in
Maryland that we have on videotape.

I interviewed Col. Halt at great length for The UFO Evidence,
Vol. II. Many of the other cases are similarly unambiguous,
which is why I raised the issue in the first place about the
importance of defining what constitutes a datum. That was
greeted with a very hostile response on your part. Statistical
analysis of UFO data is greatly to be desired, but the
methodology and definitions also are vitally important. The
direct eye-witness cases of close proximity association with
atomic sites need to be given far more weight than distant fly-
bys.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:38:36 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:23:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Hall

>From: Peter Davenport - NUFORC <director.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 09:26:34 -0800
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>I am led to believe that the ABC team, represented by Springs
>Media, Inc., has interviewed over one hundred individuals for
>the program. However, I do not know whether that is a hundred
>people in the UFO community, or whether that includes the many
>witnesses to UFO events, who may be in the final program.

>I have met with the team on five occasions, and taped with them
>on four of those. I believe the final program may include a
>number of the best cases, the best witnesses, and the best
>written reports that NUFORC can provide. I'm guessing that that
>the producers of the program probably would prefer not to have
>the cases identified prematurely, but they involve airline
>pilots, an FAA ARTCC Supervisor, members of law enforcement,
>religious figures, teachers, and several others.

>Although working with TV people has been, I believe, the most
>odious part of my 'job', since I took over the reins here from
>Robert J. Gribble, the Founder of NUFORC, Spring Media has
>proven to be the rare exception to that fact. They have been a
>pleasure to work with, they are exceptionally well informed on
>matters ufological, and they have been professional... and
>courteous... in every respect. I'm impressed with what they are
>doing, and the program may set a 'high-water' mark within the
>electronic media.

Peter,

This has also been my experience with Springs Media, and I have
done a lot of TV in my time to the point of becoming very
cynical about the media. This experience is why I am cautiously
optimistic about the program. They have, indeed, concentrated on
tracking down serious witnesses and I, too, led them to top
quality witnesses and cases. They were making a strong effort to
follow up on my leads, and occasionally would report back a
success or a failure. So I know they were trying hard.

The potential problem lies in what else they do; what context
they place the good cases in. I once had the experience of being
on the NBC evening news with Tom Brokaw (although I was filmed
at home and never saw Brokaw). They identified me as Robert
Hall, and singled me out for flaky background music and a Cold
War fears environment visually. It's all in the presentation,
and you are at the mercy of the editors as to whether you will
be displayed as just another kook, or a sensationalist who is
countered by the debunkers with no chance to refute them.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 06:50:58 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:24:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court? -

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 17:21:22 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 04:59:27 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

>>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 13:30:45 +0000 (GMT)
>>>Subject: Dr. John Mack's Death Driver In Court?

><snip>

>>>Just "how" he appeared there I have no idea for despite
>>>numerous calls to Brent yesterday, there appeared to be no
>>>record of his appearance. The information below comes from
>>>the Metropolitan police and not from the court system.

<snip>

Thank you Stuart. Intelligent thoughtful answers to presumed
thoughtful questions. What a delightful change from the usual
"klasskurtzian rimmeralism" of select persons off the
continent.

Hoping that justice is served, I'm interested who his
representation is, if he will get reasonable sentence,
ultimately, on the facts of the case, and ask that if he was DUI
wouldn't that, of needs, cross the line from "without due care "
into "dangerous driving"?

Thank you for taking the time to keep up with this, forgetting
it may be fertile ground, indeed, for a balanced journalist to
do same.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Shirley C. Fickett Passes

From: Loren Coleman <lcoleman.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 08:26:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:28:24 -0500
Subject: Shirley C. Fickett Passes

Shirley C. Fickett was the Dame of Ufology in the Pine Tree State, Maine's version of 'Betty Hill'.

Fickett wrote a widely shared document, The Maine UFO Encounter: Investigation Under Hypnosis, about an expert physician-hypnotist who explores the lost time element when a UFO beam of light hits a car.

The Dr. Herbert Hopkins-David Stephens case involved MIBs, as well as lost time, and it became the case that most people outside Maine associated with Fickett's name.

Fickett investigated other of the state's ufology encounters, as an associate of the International UFO Bureau

Her collaboration with Berthold Schwarz was noted in his books.

Below is the formal media obituary published today.

- Loren Coleman
Portland, Maine

<http://pressherald.maintoday.com/obits/?o=14393>

Portland, Maine
Portland Press Herald

Thursday, February 3, 2005

Shirley Caroline Fickett, 82

PORTLAND - Shirley Caroline Fickett, 82, a local artist passed, away on Wednesday, Feb. 1, 2005 after a long illness.

She attended Portland schools and married the late Richard E. Fickett. They resided in the North Deering area of Portland.

She and her husband owned and operated the Driftwood Art Gallery & Gift Shop for many years before returning to her old homestead in Ellsworth. The Gallery was a place where local artists, both young and old, were welcomed to display their work and receive positive, enthusiastic support from Shirley.

She was very well known for her surrealistic paintings. Her style was unlike any other artist and it most always led the viewer to stop and take notice.

During the 1960s, to help promote her Gallery and other local artists, Shirley would set up art shows in the lobbies of area movie theaters and banks. She also made arrangements with the Poland Spring House to display paintings in their lobby. All the art work was changed monthly so different artists could have a chance to get their work on display.

Shirley loved driftwood and created unusual gifts from it. There were lamps, floral arrangements on the driftwood and even

ceramic dishes that she specially molded to fit onto the wood. Many unique items could be found in her shop that was known for being different.

Shirley was also very active in psychic phenomena and UFO research. She loved to have gatherings at the Art Gallery where topics of the unexplained would be discussed and debated. People were drawn to her knowledge on the unusual subject matter. She was a free lance writer and had many articles published in magazines and newspapers.

Shirley will be deeply missed.

She is survived by four children, Sharon Cleaves of Windham, Richard Fickett of Windham, Randall Fickett of Auburn, and Leanne Brainerd of Cumberland; nine grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren. Also surviving are two sisters, Pat Dunbar of Sullivan, and Donna Jean Diphilippo of Windham; and two brothers Courtney Campbell of Ellsworth, and Mike Harris of Rumford.

Private funeral services will be held. Spring interment will be in Farris Cemetery, Cumberland.

Those who wish may make donations in her memory to:

The IRIS Network Serving The Blind

189 Park Ave.

Portland, Maine 04102

Arrangements are by Dolby Funeral Chapel, Windham.

Shirley Caroline

Fickett

FICKETT, SHIRLEY CAROLINE - 82, Feb. 1, 2005. Private funeral services will be held. Spring interment, Farris Cemetery, Cumberland. Arrangements by Dolby Funeral Chapel, Windham.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 09:32:59 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:30:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 12:37:27 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:52:49 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 12:15:49 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>New Mexico was where more money was being spent on classified
>>research and development per capita than in any other state.

>>Of course spies, whether Soviet, Chinese, or alien
>>would be interested.

>At least this would account for their odd behavior of running
>away from one lone cop rather than blasting him with the
>standard mind wiping ray and doing an anal probe! Well, I am
>sure Zamora appreciates this!

>And the other oddly un-high tech thing the Socorro "alien's"
>(well, Chines and Soviets are illegal aliens!) do is leave some
>metal scrapings from their craft. I would think that aliens
>would have superalloys which are likely self-repairing
>nanostructures that would be able to resist scruffs, scrapes,
>bullets, and make Julian fries as well.

>>No, I don't buy the balloon explanation for Socorro.

>I agree it's lameness quotient is high.

>>After a lecture I gave in Las Vegas, was told by a woman
>>working there for the AEC that she had in 1964 been a grad
>>student at NM Tech in Socorro, and had been instructed to do
>>careful analysis on the soil from the Socorro landing..in
>>secret. I passed this on to Jim MacDonald who spoke with her.

>Well, don't keep us in suspense! What were the results? Any
>radioactivity?

Frankly I don't know. I don't think she was looking for
radioactivity. It wasn't that long before Jim's death. Ann
Druffel might have noted something in the files.. I suspect the
USAF was looking for radioactivity... NM being in the midst of
much nuclear activity.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 07:36:54 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:32:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 22:09:12 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

>As a rabid believer with not the slightest inclination or
>pretence for the scientific method, even I am appalled by the
>utter drivel I have been reading in the wake of Kenny Young's
>death.

>As he was a ufologist, his death is being linked, in some
>quarters on the Net, with the demise of every other individual
>who has ever had even the merest brush with ufology, as part of
>the great conspiracy to kill each and every one of us off. Even
>Graham Birdsall's death these days (aneurysm)is being thrown in
>for good measure.

>For god's sake, can't people just be left alone to die in peace
>and with dignity.

I applaud this even if an appeal to God is ludicrous (and a large
part of our extant problems to date, IMO).

Still, it is not for entertainment value that many persons are
compelled of late to suspicion of their systems, or look askance
at them as the future unfolds, events transpire, and deaths
occur... with our arms a little more than merely akimbo... We
don't seek our distrust. We have it thrust upon us.

This thing we're in is hot and getting hotter as we speak...
I've a sense for something upcoming, and it ain't all bad,
though I'm sure some will think so. It's tough not to read
signs in every cloud formation, errant image or any bird that
sings. It's all a grist for entropy's mill, where lies
ironically come to highlight truth and make it more obvious, but
the future continues to accelerate its tireless approach,
regardless. Ye-hah! What a ride!

Maybe it's all entertainment, after all.

alienview.nul -:-|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 08:48:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:34:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 08:28:24 -0800 (PST)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:22:42 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>It would be hard to hide the appearance of a cable from
>Zamora who was only 50 feet away! Even a mesh (like a
>fence), would be somewhat apparent to such a keen observer.

>It would also seem to be hard to hide the large balloon although
>one can always armwave that it was painted blue or transparent
>or something.

David and James...

I'll ask this, again of Dr. Rudiak...

What was the nature of Zamora's eyesight - David Rudiak's
professional specialty?

He lost his glasses (and sunglasses) at an inopertune time, so
what could he see or not see, accurately?

Has anyone ever checked this? Have they?

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Zamora & The Bean? - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 4:24:27 -1000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:36:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Zamora & The Bean? - Goldstein

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:12:23 -0600
>Subject: Zamora & The Bean?

>I came across this item while Googling various keywords from the
>Socorro/Zamora case. I wondered if anyone here had seen or
>addressed it here or elsewhere previously.

>It contains no verifiable names, but it is an intriguing story
>in light of the current debate on the topic, and includes a
>possible explanation for the craft Zamora saw...

>as found at:

><http://www.weirdload.com/nm-ufo.html>

>scroll down halfway.

>-----

>Lonnie and the Bean

<snip>

>I found nothing on this in the UpDates Archive.....

>Any comments?

Hi Kyle,

This story is just that, a story with no evidence on a flakey
conspiracy website. There is no way to tell if there is any truth.

Don Ledger supplied you with an aircraft powerplant design but I
don't think it sounds like what the story describes.

Josh

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 09:35:43 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:38:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmberg

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 11:57:12 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 06:32:01 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

><snip>

>>Any word on who it is who fronts for the 'dark'
>>side? I hope Shermer is one of them... gives me an opportunity
>>to hoot and boo and otherwise carry on in an immature manner
>>in the privacy of my own home.

>On the 'dark' side, Richard J. McNally was interviewed. I don't
>think he's a CSICOP fellow yet but he's well on his way.

Let's see which of them sneers, which of them smirks, and which
of them snarls. There's our hindmost in the discussion. It was
evidence that Nickel lost to Friedman in their recent debate.

Wendy Connors has a recording of some of the ufological
principals of the 50s, pro and con, on a program where the only
one to get angry is Dr. Menzel. He got mad that the weaknesses
of his arguments were pointed out to him. Not a reason to get
mad unless you have an axe to grind.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Kenny Young - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 10:01:12 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:39:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Kenny Young - Clark

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 22:09:12 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

>As he was a ufologist, [Kenny Young's] death is being linked,
>in some quarters on the Net, with the demise of every other
>individual who has ever had even the merest brush with ufology,
>as part of the great conspiracy to kill each and every one of us
>off. Even Graham Birdsall's death these days (aneurysm)is being
>thrown in for good measure.

>For god's sake, can't people just be left alone to die in peace
>and with dignity.

Amen, brother. But asking paranoids and crazies to cease and
desist in the name of sanity and decency is like trying to stop
the tide from rolling.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Warren

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 09:48:54 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:41:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Warren

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 13:00:13
>Subject: Re: Sonora UFO Sightings

>>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 09:22:32 -0800
>>Subject: Sonora UFO Sightings

>>Fellow Listerions,

>>I received some interesting correspondence from Mr. Mark Olson
>>in response to my last article; with his permission I'm posting
>>the gist of that here:

>>Hello Mr. Warren,

>>I have contacted NUFORC, NARCAP, and MUFON. I have also
>>contacted any and all UFO Organizations I could find, but never
>>received a response.

><snip>

>NARCAP doesn't involve itself in the day to day reporting of
>UAP. These have to be in close proximity to an aircraft-while
>it's in the air-and reported by the pilot of same. Interest then
>in this sighting increases with the distance of the UAP from the
>aircraft and whether it is perceived as a danger to the AC.

Good Day Don,

One of the images captured on video was of a UFO "following a
passenger liner".

Frank

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

UFOs Are Out There Say Real X-Files

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 10:43:13 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:43:42 -0500
Subject: UFOs Are Out There Say Real X-Files

Source: Evening Standard - London, UK

<http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/articles/16353133>

02-03-05

UFOs Are Out There Say Real X-Files

By Mark Prigg
Science Correspondent
Evening Standard

Britain's secret X-files have revealed a flurry of UFO activity in the last two weeks, it was revealed today.

The Ministry of Defence logs, released under the Freedom of Information Act, include a sighting of "strange lights in the sky" two weeks ago in Whitstable. On the same night a "flying saucer" was spotted over Stoke on Trent, and also in Staffordshire and Cambridgeshire.

Other sightings give more detail. A report from Devizes in Wiltshire on 24 September last year records an object that "looked liked a big ball of fire coming down from the sky with a tail and sparks coming off the end of it".

Another, from Somerset the week before, states: "The object looked like a great bright light and was really intense, like a ball of fire coming down from the sky, rapidly moving towards the ground."

Even MoD chiefs admit they are flummoxed by some sightings. A report from Surrey last May describes a UFO as having "grooves and windows" but no room for humans. The MoD inspector notes that the "witness had seen the object so clearly".

The files show that last year the MoD's UFO unit received 88 reports from military staff and members of the public worried about unexplained objects in our skies. The most common colours for a UFO are yellow, orange or black.

A Ministry of Defence document released with the files reveals that the MoD "remains totally open-minded" as to "the question of the existence or otherwise of extra-terrestrial lifeforms". The Ministry said the documents are a fraction of the thousands of records of alleged alien visits.

Copyright 2005 Associated New 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Scientists Discuss UFOs

From: **Stig Agermose** <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 11:09:28 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:46:57 -0500
Subject: Scientists Discuss UFOs

Source: Iowa State Daily, Iowa State University

<http://www.iowastatedaily.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2005/02/03/4201ae0bb8613>

02-03-05

Iowa State Daily
Online Edition

Visitors... From Space

By Katie Piepel
Daily Staff Writer

If the National UFO Reporting Center is correct, aliens visited the United States 148 times in January.

Once again, a scientific space advancement has stirred up debate over the existence of extraterrestrial beings.

January marked the landing of the European Space Agency's Huygens probe on the creamy, mud-like surface of Titan, Saturn's largest moon.

Guillermo Gonzalez, assistant professor of physics and astronomy, says Titan is not suitable for life, even though it shares similarities with Earth.

"It's too cold for Titan to have carbon dioxide in gas form, and it's too cold on Titan to have water as a liquid or as a gas," he says. "Titan is much, much colder than Earth ever was, so that means most things that are liquids or gases in Earth's atmosphere or oceans today are in solid form on Titan."

Gonzalez says there was a time when he believed in extraterrestrial life and UFO sightings, but it was during his years as a graduate student that he started to see things differently.

"I just started looking into all the factors you need to have life, especially complex life, on a planet," he says. "When you start listing all the factors and multiplying them out, it turns out that the probabilities become very small very quickly."

But Steven Kawaler, professor of physics and astronomy, says the idea that intelligent life is common in the universe is something he finds very difficult to ignore.

"Given what we've learned over the last 200 years about the development of life on Earth - chemistry, biochemistry, astronomy and so on - it looks like the process that produces life on Earth is a fairly common process," he says.

Although Gonzalez says he is confident that Earth is the only planet in our galaxy able to sustain life, the possibility of extraterrestrial intelligence existing outside of our galaxy is something he cannot deny.

"I'm not ready to say that we're alone just because we don't know the probability as well enough," he says.

Kawaler, however, says that since we have not proven this galaxy gives life only to humans, it is still open for debate.

"If you wanted to say we are the only intelligent, technologically capable civilization in the galaxy, the only way you could deal with that is to prove it wrong," he says. "And to prove it wrong you have to find another intelligent, technologically capable civilization in the galaxy. That hasn't happened yet, but people are looking."

Over the years, the media have portrayed extraterrestrials as unpleasant, eerie creatures conspiring against planet Earth in hopes of overtaking our civilization and using up our resources, like in the 2002 film "Signs" or in Orson Welles' infamous radio dramatization of "War of the Worlds."

Kawaler says evil aliens make good stories, but not a lot of sense.

"If they have the technology to solve problems that we think are absolutely insoluble, like how to travel faster than the speed of light, they really don't need to come to Earth," he says. "[Instead] it would be out of curiosity to see how we work."

Bob Hopp, senior in mechanical engineering and vice president of the Ames Science Fiction and Fantasy Association, says he believes in the idea of extraterrestrial intelligence and agrees with Kawaler that aliens have no need to visit Earth.

"It seems plausible that they would come to take our planet for its resources, [but] it also seems plausible that, when they're advanced enough to get to us, they'd be advanced enough to not need anything that we have," he says.

Hopp says despite the physical representations we see in the media, he thinks aliens would not have human characteristics.

"I don't think there's any reason to believe that they would be humanoid," he says. "I imagine that the biggest reason that they look humanoid in movies is that we need actors to play them."

If extraterrestrial intelligence does exist in our universe, Gonzalez says, we do not yet have the capabilities to find it.

"The other galaxies are so far away from us that we couldn't detect their signals if they are there," he says. "But I think we're getting a better handle on the probabilities every year as we learn more about stars and star formation and planetary processes. I think within maybe 20 to 30 years we'll be able to say, with much greater confidence, whether or not we're alone in the entire universe."

Whether the idea seems plausible or not, Gonzalez and Kawaler agree it won't be long until the big question can finally be answered: Are we alone?

Famous UFO Cases

- The 1947 "Roswell Incident" - The U.S. Air Force discovered the remains of a "flying disc" near Roswell, N.M. The Air Force said the object was part of Project Mogul, a top-secret government experiment involving weather balloons.

- The 1982 Hudson Valley Sightings - Between 1982 and 1995, the Hudson River Valley of New York was home to more than 7,000 documented sightings of "boomerang-shaped" objects moving over New York and Connecticut. The UFOs were said to be as big as a football field. This is one of the most widely witnessed and investigated cases in history.

- The 1997 "Phoenix Lights" sightings - a cluster of lights were seen in the sky over Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico. Hundreds of witnesses reported seeing a gigantic triangular-shaped object with many lights. Military personnel said the event was caused by "military flares" from an Air Force A-10 aircraft.

- The 2000 Illinois UFO Sighting - Four police officers and more than a dozen others reported seeing a triangular-shaped object

flying low over Highland, Ill. The officers traced the object.

Copyright 2004, Iowa State Daily

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 14:23:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:50:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Aldrich

I was contacted by a number of researchers at Springs Media. About a dozen colleagues and UFO witnesses whom I know of were also contacted for information or interviews. I will let these people identify themselves if they so desire.

I was asked about early UFO history, possible FOIA requests, the 1948 AMC Estimate of the Situation, and UFO incidents involving nuclear facilities.

I sent Springs Media a copy of the Sign Historical Group proposed research projects we prepared for the SCI/FI channel/CFI.

Unlike a certain other network with a black eye concerning document authentication, these researchers wanted to know where they could verify everything I sent them.

I think one can safely say that investigative reporting, if not dead, is severely wounded. I had hoped to give ABC a number of cases which were tough nuts to crack and which could use the vast resources of large media news. They were interested in cases which had already been well researched and vetted.

If this special comes off as represented to me, it will be a highly significant event. However, it will not go much beyond where ufologists, with very limited resources, have gone. This is not a complaint because the media researchers have some of the best material currently available, rather it is recognizing exactly what the current investigative journalistic situation is with regard to this field.

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947
<http://www.project1947.com/>
P. O. Box 391
Canterbury, CT 06331
(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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Kenneth Young Obituary

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 11:26:43 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:54:47 -0500
Subject: Kenneth Young Obituary

Source: The Cincinnati Enquirer

<http://news.enquirer.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050203/NEWS0104/502030373/1060/news0102-03-05>

Kenneth Young, 38, TV graphic designer

He worked on local cable shows

By Rebecca Goodman
Enquirer staff writer

ANDERSON TOWNSHIP - Kenneth Harold Young, a graphic designer and producer for the Telecommunications Board of Northern Kentucky, died Monday of complications of leukemia at Mercy Hospital Anderson. He was 38.

"Scarcely a person could watch cable TV without seeing some of Kenny's graphic work," said John Stephenson of Fort Mitchell, former superintendent of public instruction for Kentucky and former chairman of the Telecommunications Board's Community Program Center.

Born in Cincinnati on Dec. 28, 1966, Mr. Young graduated in 1984 from Norwood High School, where he was active with the media center. He worked for the Community Program Center, which produces religious, public access and government programs for Kenton, Campbell, Boone, Grant, Gallatin, Owen and Pendleton counties.

He had a passion for UFOs and produced several programs re-creating sightings. He also played the piano at nursing homes. And he loved his dog, Boo. "Everywhere he went, he took that dog with him," Stephenson said.

Mr. Young, who had been fighting leukemia for the past 10 years, "saw the big picture of life because he understood the little things in life," Stephenson said. "Many of us knew Kenny was in pain, but we also knew that Kenny did not want to stop the show for his pain."

Survivors include: his mother, Carol Waller Young Boettger of Anderson; a brother, Gary McCarty of Laurel, Miss.; and a sister, Cindy Porter of Florence.

Visitation is 1 p.m. today at Chambers & Grubbs Funeral Home, 8461 U.S. 25 South in Florence, followed by the funeral at 2 p.m. Interment will be at Walton Cemetery.

Memorials: Leukemia Lymphoma Society, Southern Ohio Chapter, 105 W. Fourth St., Cincinnati, OH 45202.

Copyright 1995-2005 The Cincinnati Enquirer

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

New England Couple's Mystery

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 11:49:02 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:57:51 -0500
Subject: New England Couple's Mystery

Source: Litchfield County Times - New Milford, Connecticut

http://www.zwire.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=13884762&BRD=2303&PAG=461&dept_id=478976&rfi=6

02-03-05

A Norfolk Couple's Mystery: What Was That Ball of Light?

By: Asa Fitch

NORFOLK - At about 10:30 on the evening of Jan. 2, Drew Quale and his wife, Sally, were with a friend at their weekend home on North Colebrook Road, packing up their car for a trip to Bronxville, N.Y., when they say they saw a brightly-lit orb hovering above a 10-acre field nearby.

The object zigzagged over the dark landscape, sometimes slowly, sometimes quickly, darting "randomly like a hummingbird" from just above the field to 100 feet in the air, according to a report the Qualess submitted to www.ufoevidence.org.

For about 45 minutes, Mrs. Quale took pictures of the object with her digital camera, following it from the backyard as it ranged over a copse of pine trees in the middle of the field and behind a crabapple tree on one edge of the field. The Qualess were from 200 to 300 yards away from the object. It made no noise.

About 45 minutes later, at about 11:15 p.m., the Qualess decided they ought to leave. It was a Sunday, and they had to make it to Bronxville, a town in Westchester County, that night and go to work the next morning. As they were leaving, they drove to the other side of the field and into an ancient driveway, noting that the shape and intensity of the object didn't change. They left while the object was still visible.

"We were afraid to venture close to it because we just didn't know what it was and thought it might be dangerous," the report says. "We've never seen anything like this before, and [this has] been our weekend home for over 20 years."

Mrs. Quale, a public information officer for the Bronxville School District, said the object appeared to be about the size of a basketball. The Smith College graduate said she has explored the possibility that it was ball lightning, a vaguely-understood natural phenomenon in which a ball of electrical energy appears and moves horizontally through the air. She now doubts that was what she saw because it stayed so long, even after the Qualess left. It remains a mystery, she said.

"It was like someone had a mouse and was moving a cursor," Mrs. Quale said. "It was like you might move the cursor this way and that way and click on the word you wanted to correct. We thought it was so weird we didn't want to go out there."

Mr. Quale, a Harvard Law School graduate and a senior partner with the Seventh Avenue law firm of Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP, was quoted in Norfolk Now, the community newsletter that

first reported the story, as saying, "We still have no idea what it was."

Though the object looks like a full moon in pictures, Mrs. Quale said she was certain it was not the moon or any other celestial body. The sky was overcast that night, she said, and everything was black except for the ball of light.

"It was absolutely black, because there was cloud cover and no moon and no stars, and if you looked out at the field with the eye you couldn't see anything but this white light," she said.

A meteorologist at the Western Connecticut State University confirmed that the sky was overcast the night of Jan. 2. Records compiled from a weather station at the Great Mountain Forest in Norfolk show that at 10:31 p.m. the temperature was 35.6 degrees Fahrenheit, and the humidity was at 97 percent, which is very high. The wind was calm to mild, and a very light rain fell sporadically between 8:30 and 11 p.m. that day.

Sixty percent of the moon's surface was illuminated on Jan. 2 in Norfolk, but the moon didn't rise that night until 11:31 p.m., 15 minutes after the Quales left, according to data from the U.S. Naval Observatory. The Quales' strange encounter is certainly not the first of its kind in the region, though the Quales appear to be decidedly more credible than the average UFO spotter.

UFOs of all brands—from hot-dog-shaped ships with blue spotlights emanating from portholes to a small, star-shaped craft hovering above Main Street in Winsted—have been reported in Litchfield County on Web sites like www.nuforc.org and www.ufoevidence.org.

One story described a "mothership" visiting Litchfield center in 1971. Another reported a "bizarre star" that moved quickly across the sky in Washington in 2002.

One recent report bears a striking resemblance to what the Quales say they saw. On Sept. 7 of last year at 8:30 p.m., a 50-year-old quality assurance technician from Torrington reported seeing an orb whisk across the sky from the balcony of his second-story apartment. The man, an "amateur astronomer from a very young age," wrote that he saw a globe moving slowly through the air for some time before darting away quickly and disappearing.

It "appeared to be illuminated from within," according to an account on www.nuforc.org. "At the last before it faded from view, it was very dimly lit and looked like a crystal ball. It looked transparent, like a globe or sphere. From the time it moved quickly till it faded out could have only been a second or two. This quick movement probably covered 10 degrees of sky."

The man reported seeing the object again a week later, on Sept. 12, and then again another week later. The object looped back and forth and then zipped away.

"It was a very unusual zigzag type of pattern," the man wrote in a report on www.ufoevidence.org, where he also posted a diagram of the object's trajectory. "It did this zigzag type pattern about four times before flying off."

c. Litchfield County Times 2005

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Freeman

From: Kelly Freeman <Khfflsciufu.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 15:13:18 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:59:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Freeman

>From: Peter Davenport - NUFORC <director.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 09:26:34 -0800
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>Although working with TV people has been, I believe, the most
>odious part of my job, since I took over the reins here from
>Robert J. Gribble, the Founder of NUFORC, Spring Media has
>proven to be the rare exception to that fact. They have been a
>pleasure to work with, they are exceptionally well informed on
>matters ufological, and they have been professional... and
>courteous... in every respect. I'm impressed with what they are
>doing, and the program may set a 'high-water' mark within the
>electronic media.

Peter, EBK and List,

It would be interesting to see how the other television
networks, print media, etc. react, or don't react to this
program. If it turns out to be another NOVA-type program with
clever editing and soundbites that would misrepresent the true
nature/reality of the UFO problem, we could be in for a long
year ahead. But, of course, that remains to be seen.

For those of you who have been interviewed, did representatives
of Spring Media/ABC News give you any indication of what
prompted them to take a "fresh look" at the UFO enigma?

Just curious.

Kelly

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Secrecy News -- 02/03/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 15:15:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:01:24 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 02/03/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 13
February 3, 2005

** A COURT TELLS CIA NO
** CIA, JFK AND GEORGE JOANNIDES
** HPSCI HEARING
** IRANIAN LASER ISOTOPE SEPARATION RESEARCH
** RESTRICTING GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA (CRS)

A COURT TELLS CIA NO

A federal court yesterday rejected a move by the Central Intelligence Agency to block a Freedom of Information Act request from the ACLU for CIA records concerning the treatment of detainees held in U.S. custody or "rendered" abroad to countries known to employ torture.

The court said the CIA claim that such records were "operational files" that are exempt from search and review under the Freedom of Information Act is unsustainable.

"I hold that defendant CIA has failed to satisfy the statutory prerequisites for invoking the operational files exemption, and hence may not avoid the requirements imposed by FOIA," wrote Judge Alvin K. Hellerstein of the Southern District of New York in a February 2 ruling:

<http://news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/cia/acludod20205opn.pdf>

CIA's now-rejected argument in favor of exemption is presented here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/cial20804.pdf>

It would be hard to overstate the contribution made by the ACLU to overcoming government recalcitrance on the subject of torture. Through its Freedom of Information Act litigation, the organization has energetically helped to fill some of the void left by a slack, nearly dormant system of congressional oversight.

"Somewhere in the upper reaches of this Administration, a process was set in motion that rolled forward until it produced scandalous results," said Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT) yesterday, referring to the shifting government policy on torture.

"We may never know the full story, because the Administration has circled the wagons and stonewalled on requests for information. What little we know we owe to leaks, to the initiative of the press, to international human rights organizations, and to a few internal Defense Department investigations, and to Freedom of Information Act litigation," Leahy said.

CIA, JFK AND GEORGE JOANNIDES

CIA resistance to disclosure is not limited to documents on torture, or Nazi war crimes, or any other topical area, nor is it specifically focused on protecting intelligence sources and methods. Secrecy is the unexamined rule at CIA, not the exception, which is why the Agency routinely finds itself committed to rationally indefensible claims that various sets of records cannot be publicly released.

Such is the case, after all these years, with respect to at least one aspect of the assassination of President Kennedy.

After an extended dispute, the CIA continues to withhold records on the late George E. Joannides, a CIA employee in the Miami station at the time of the JFK assassination. It is now known that he handled anti-Castro psychological operations, including one involving Lee Harvey Oswald. Some 150 heavily redacted pages on Joannides were released by CIA in December.

For related background, see this 2003 letter in the New York Review of Books:

<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/16865>

Having previously denied the fact, "The CIA now admits that it has records about George Joannides's operational actions in late 1963 when the Cuban students under his guidance were gathering and publicizing information about Oswald," said Jefferson Morley, the researcher (and Washington Post writer) who has pursued the Joannides files through the Freedom of Information Act.

"The CIA will not say how many such records it has. Even more remarkably, the CIA says that it will not release these assassination-related documents in any form."

"Some friends say they expect there is a relatively innocent explanation for the actions of Joannides and the CIA; others have a more sinister interpretation. All agree that the CIA should obey the law, in this case the 1992 JFK Assassination Records Act, which mandates 'immediate' disclosure of all relevant JFK documents. Yet the CIA still stonewalls in federal court 41 years after the fact," Mr. Morley wrote in an email.

HPSCI HEARING

The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence held its first open hearing of the year on February 2 on the topic "Global Threats to U.S. Interests in the 21st Century."

The non-governmental witnesses represented a spectrum of opinion ranging from the American Enterprise Institute to the Rand Corporation. The witnesses' prepared statements are available here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_hr/index.html

IRANIAN LASER ISOTOPE SEPARATION RESEARCH

The scope and progress of Iranian research into laser isotope separation -- a technology that would be useful for uranium enrichment -- are traced in a new bibliography of published scientific literature on related subjects by Iranian scientists.

The bibliography is the latest in a series of such compilations of produced by independent researcher Mark Gorwitz. One hopes and presumes that something similar or better is generated somewhere in the U.S. intelligence community. But who knows?

See "Iranian Laser Isotope Separation-Related Research" by Mark Gorwitz here:

<http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/iran/gorwitz.pdf>

RESTRICTING GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA (CRS)

The embarrassing revelation that several conservative commentators were on the payroll of government agencies has focused attention on the statutory restrictions that limit agency public relations and propaganda activities.

The Congressional Research Service, which cannot be accused of propagandizing the public since it will not permit direct public access to its products, issued a review of the subject yesterday.

See "Public Relations and Propaganda: Restrictions on Executive Agency Activities," February 2, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/RL32750.pdf>

Also yesterday, several Democratic Senators introduced what they call the "Stop Government Propaganda Act" (S. 266). See:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/congress/2005/s020205.html>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to secrecy_news-request.nul with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI'

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 17:16:03 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:02:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI'

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 22:21:17 -0000
>Subject: Re: Russia & Uzbekistan Construct 'SETI' Observatory

<snip>

Hello Isaac,

I for one am very interested in this area and particularly those related to the phenomenon. I thank you for posting the applicable URLs. It will take some time to digest them however.

David O Darling is no stranger to this list or others nor is his work in this area unknown to most. I confess though that the Freitas, both Robert and Valdes have escaped my noticer.

Again thanks,

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 14:08:31 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:04:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern - Hatch

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 01:07:29 EST
>Subject: Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern

>Well with things heating up again and with Britain's UFO
>disclosures, India and China charging forth with more research
>as well as more Mexico info and finally the upcoming ABC special
>on UFOs keep a fair weather eye out for offbeat UFO stories that
>put the field into the oddball category.

>The news wires are hot now with UFO stuff and that 's good but
>old timers know how one serious UFO story will be followed by a
>flood of less than reputable stories.

Hi Greg:

I think some of this is self-generated.

Crackpots see renewed interest by the media, and crawl out of the woodwork with their stuff. The lazier media throw that into the mix indiscriminately. I've come to expect it. I do not see much of a pattern, just human nature.

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 22:33:42 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:05:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 23:08:42 -0700
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>'Steve' wishes to remain anonymous.

>-Terry

>Socorro is also home to Langmuir Labs where a lot of research is
>done on lightning and thunderstorm electrification.

>Much of this research involves the sending up of instrumented
>weather balloons from a nearby by mountain top to conduct
>studies of the storms and to take measurements.

>Unlike the 150-300 gram balloons we sent up at FHU [Fort
>Huachuca, Arizona], these balloons are 1000-3000 grammers and
>are quite large. The instruments come down by parachute after
>the balloon pops at altitude but the balloon material will drift
>down as well.

>Windflow patterns during thunderstorm season in NM [New Mexico]
>can be light all of the way up so the balloon packages can come
>down not far from the release point. We've seen our balloons
>come down on FHU after going up to 20-30km up.

And this has what, exactly, to do with the Apr. 24, 1964 Socorro
UFO sighting?

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Close Encounters With The Human Imagination

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 14:33:57 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:08:06 -0500
Subject: Close Encounters With The Human Imagination

Source: The Times of London - UK

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,542-1469712,00.html>

2-04-05

Pie in the sky

Flying saucers are close encounters with the human imagination

UFOs do not exist. It is official. The minutes of the Ministry of Defence's Flying Saucer Working Party of 1961 were published yesterday. In the earthbound prose of official reports, they recommend no more public money should be spent on chasing UFOs.

Typical of the land-based bureaucrats to shoot down these wonderful figments of imagination. The MoD report cruelly debunks UFOlogy, close encounters of the first or any kind, little green men with eyes on stalks, and a popular form of romance on page and screen. Astronomers now agree that there is no evidence for the visitation of Earth by aliens, and that the obsession with UFOs has delayed legitimate research into the possibility of intelligent life elsewhere.

But this has not stopped frequent reports of sightings of UFOs to the MoD. The epicentre of sightings is Ayrshire. Last year there were 11 reports of flying discs from West Kilbride alone. This is a fine seaside town, looking out over the Firth of Clyde. Could the frequency of reported UFOs be the solid Scotch mist flying in from Arran? Prestwick is an underused airport, with unexpected landings and take-offs. Ayrshire was the home of the romantic Robbie Burns.

But UFOs are imaginative literature, not astronomy. Lucian wrote Munchausenesque parodies of UFOs 1,900 years ago. And ever since, writers have been using space to scare us, or to create parables of how we could improve real-time life on the only planet that we inhabit. Man has been looking up at the stars since the Babylonians. Even the MoD cannot blame us if we occasionally let our imagination run wild.

Copyright 2005 Times Newspapers Ltd.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

NH Man's UFO Beliefs Attract Plenty Of Interest

From: **Stig Agermose** <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 14:52:43 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:10:10 -0500
Subject: NH Man's UFO Beliefs Attract Plenty Of Interest

Source: The Concord Monitor - Concord, New Hampshire

<http://www.concordmonitor.com/apps/pbcs.dll/misc?Url=/sections/services/about.pbs>

02-03-05

'I'm just looking in the sky'

Man's UFO beliefs attract plenty of earthly interest

By Allison Steele
Monitor staff

TILTON - Go ahead, call Paul Spera crazy. He's used to it. Whenever Spera talks about the lights he sees flashing and circling in the sky, most people dismiss him as a goofball.

And really, Spera doesn't fault them for it. He knows how it sounds to people who haven't seen signs of extraterrestrial life themselves. But he is sure the lights he sees aren't airplanes or satellites, and he knows there are plenty of people out there who agree with him.

"Saying you believe in it or you don't believe in it is like saying you believe in the Sears Tower," said Spera, 36, who lives in Tilton. "UFOs are real, there's no doubt about that. Now we just have to figure out what they are."

Spera, a musician and bartender who is currently unemployed, said he has been seeing UFOs for almost 20 years. Last year, he and his girlfriend started videotaping the sightings to prove it to people, and they have culled more than two hours of footage. Spera has a Web site, http://www.jerrypippin.com/UFO_Files_paul_spera.htm, dedicated to his observations, and he has corresponded with people from all over the world who have had similar experiences.

Last month, Spera sent a letter to the Monitor, telling of earthly encounters with multiple spacecrafts.

"Many people in this community have known what is happening here for years, and no matter what you do, you can't stop the truth from coming out," Spera said in the letter. "Extraterrestrial contact has been made."

Spera's letter generated tremendous interest. It was one of the most widely read items in months on the Monitor's Web site. Since his letter was published, Spera has heard from people who want to know more about his experiences. They often ask questions he can't answer. Why have the lights from alien craft appeared to him so many times, and why are they here? He doesn't know.

Spera is well aware of most people's attitude toward tales of extraterrestrial contact. Hollywood movies and supermarket tabloid stories about little green men don't help, he said.

But like many who describe firsthand accounts of extraterrestrials, Spera does not believe his stories will be

dismissed forever. He said it's just a matter of time before the rest of the world catches up with what he and others believe.

"There's thousands of books about this, thousands of people with pictures and videos and all kinds of evidence," he said. "If I'm crazy, and I'm hallucinating, so is my video camera."

Spera's mother told him when he was a child about a UFO she had seen decades before. He always thought she was nuts, he said, until one night in the late 1980s when he was 18. While driving along a road he saw a triangular formation of lights blinking high above Lake Michigan in the spot where his mother had seen them long ago. The lights remained for 12 hours, he said, changing colors from green to red, and many people in the neighborhood called the police and local news outlets.

"Pretty much everybody in my family was scared except me," he said. "I was interested in finding out what it was."

Spera and his family moved to Pittsfield when he was 23 and opened a restaurant that he managed for several years. Shortly after moving to New Hampshire, Spera saw more unexplainable sights, most notably a red spherical light, 30 feet in diameter, that he said descended right in front of him while he was on Catamount Mountain.

When he started researching extraterrestrial sightings, he learned that North Country residents Betty and Barney Hill were among the first in the country to report contact with aliens. More research led him to sightings elsewhere in the state, and from there, he started watching the skies.

"It became more of a hobby," he said.

Spera now lives with his girlfriend, Tara Landry, and plays guitar in a blues and rock band. When he and Landry started dating about five years ago, she didn't believe his stories. But then she had her own sighting, and now, from the back yard of their apartment, they often watch together for lights beaming from sources they can't identify.

On the videos they've made, lights can be seen darting through the sky. They circle in unpredictable patterns, flash in colors, pass behind trees and swoop around the moon and clouds. They certainly don't look like planes, but it's difficult to tell how large they are or anything else about them.

Spera wrote to the Monitor on a whim, not expecting the newspaper to print his letter. His distrust of the media's handling of other-worldly sightings was confirmed by the headline that appeared over his letter: "Extraterrestrials have contacted me."

Spera said he has never been personally contacted by anything. When he said in his letter that "contact has been made," he meant with the planet.

"When you say contact, I think of a phone call, some direct communication," he said. "I've never talked to an alien, I've never seen an alien, I've never been on a spaceship, none of that. What I'm doing is what anyone can do: just looking in the sky."

Spera believes that more people will come around to his point of view as time goes on. But for that to happen, it will take more people coming forward as he has - accepting the certain ridicule that comes with mentioning UFOs.

"Just like anyone else, I have my own opinion, and I'm not going to force that opinion on anyone," he said. "I'm not here to make anybody believe or not believe. I don't care what people think - it makes no difference to me. It doesn't change the fact that it's the truth."

(Allison Steele can be reached at 224-5301, ext. 314, or by e-mail at asteele.nul)

Concord Monitor Online,
P.O. Box 1177,
Concord NH

03302

Phone: 603-224-5301 | E-mail:

webmaster.nul

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World - Boone

From: Evolbaby.nul
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 19:28:04 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:11:43 -0500
Subject: Re: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World - Boone

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 22:40:04 -0800
>Subject: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World

>Source: The Financial Times

><http://news.ft.com/cms/s/02ee9662-7589-11d9-9608-00000e2511c8.html>

>02-03-05

>MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World
>By Cathy Newman and Jean Eaglesham

Well I guess this knotches the British Government and press up to the level of level-headedness that the U.S. has yet to reach.

I've been saying this for years that the pressure is on to such a degree that the big breaking UFO news is not going to come from the U.S. where freedom of speech, a free press, and vaunted chest thumping rhetoric about being a government for the people is about to be put in check with a capital C.

Why? Because of the internet governments and peoples around the world are rapidly seeing for themselves that the U.S. has been playing a cat and mouse game regarding UFOs for decades and those in other governments are realizing they've been played for fools.

Europe and Asia know that they could have made billionaires had they the information that the U.S. has allowed to be suppressed.

They know our government is run by profiteers not pioneers and will use whatever means necessary to get the edge on the competition and use 'global security' as a bs flag of solidarity.

230+ years ago the British were seen as the suppressors of freedom under then King George. The American Colonists the vanguard of freedom. The world marvelled as we beat the big bully and we promised to build a country based on the rights of the people.

Now we're seen as the big bully and the rest of the world as some new freedom fighter for truth. Funny how the script gets flipped.

I suspect any day, any time, a foreign power or collective of foreign powers to start hammering the press and the U.S. regarding UFOs.

They know we've got the goods and aren't about to share them and now that the tools to uncover these truths are rapidly expanding it's just a matter of time before somebody of great courage breaks the silence.

That's when the sparks are gonna really fly because one spilled

bean leads back to the bag.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:16:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:16:06 -0500
Subject: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time

Source: The Times of London - UK

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1469190,00.html>

02-04-05

How Britain's X-Files Said That UFOs Were Just A Waste Of Time

By David Charter

Secret committee dismissed reports of flying saucers more than 50 years ago

The truth is out there somewhere... but it has taken the Ministry of Defence 54 years to release secret papers ruling out the existence of UFOs.

Minutes of the Government=92s Flying Saucer Working Party have finally been made public in answer to the ultimate request under the Freedom of Information Act =97 do aliens exist?

In the document, marked "Secret" and "Discreet", officials rejected sightings of UFOs by RAF personnel as well as a series of reports of "luminous bodies" by members of the public.

The working party concluded: "We consider that no progress will be made by attempting further investigation of uncoordinated and subjective evidence and that positive results could only be obtained by organising throughout the country, or the world, continuous observation of the skies by a co-ordinated network of visual observers, equipped with photographic apparatus and supplemented by a network of radar stations and sound locators.

"We should regard this, on the evidence so far available, as a singularly profitless enterprise. We accordingly recommend very strongly that no further investigation of reported mysterious aerial phenomena be undertaken, unless and until some material evidence becomes available."

With that, the Flying Saucer Working Party dissolved itself in June 1951, never to meet again.

But in the absence of any details of its deliberations, UFO sightings have continued unabated over Britain as shown by the recent release of reams of reports from members of the public. The latest MoD document shows that 91 sightings were recorded last year in places as far afield as Peterborough in Cambridgeshire ("four dull red lights"), Paignton in Devon ("long single black cylinder") and Honley in West Yorkshire ("looked like a jellyfish flying in the sky").

Last September was a busy month for UFOs, with a "silver disc" in Glossop, Derbyshire; a "bright light at first then looked like a box kite" in Barry, South Wales; "two silvery objects pulling apart and moving together" in Holywell, Flintshire; and "a great bright light like a big ball of fire" over Iwerne

Minster in Somerset.

The area with the most frequent mysterious activity has been West Kilbride, on the southwest coast of Scotland. The MoD received a dozen reports during the year of increasingly dramatic visitations, from "one sphere" on April 2, "five bright spheres" on May 30 to "at least 25 yellow spheres flying in groups of five" on November 26.

None of them would have passed the stringent examination of the Flying Saucer Working Party, however, which was quick to dismiss the flurry of reports in 1950 which followed early publicity surrounding an original "flying saucer" in the United States in 1947.

Although the group praised a "careful and accurate" observation by a locomotive fireman of a luminous body travelling at high speed over Derby, it was "undoubtedly a meteorite".

The evidence of a Flight Lieutenant Hubbard, an experienced pilot, was also discounted in trenchant terms. Hubbard reported "a flat disc, light pearl grey in colour... executing a series of S-turns and oscillating". But the working party concluded: "We conclude that Flight Lieutenant Hubbard was the victim of an optical illusion or that he observed some quite normal type of aircraft and deceived himself about its shape and speed."

Britain=92s UFO spotters are as unimpressed with the Government=92s disclosures as officials were then with Flight Lieutenant Hubbard. Judith Jafar, the chair of the British UFO Research Association, said: "It is a pointless exercise because the Government is not going to release any files that are contentious in any way. The files they are releasing now are not going to take us anywhere that we have not been before."

However, in a letter accompanying the release of the report, the MoD states: "The MoD does not have any expertise or role in respect of UFO/flying saucer matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 10:55:07 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:18:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Bourdais

>From: Peter Davenport - NUFORC <director.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 09:26:34 -0800
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>Although working with TV people has been, I believe, the most
>odious part of my 'job', since I took over the reins here from
>Robert J. Gribble, the Founder of NUFORC, Spring Media has
>proven to be the rare exception to that fact. They have been a
>pleasure to work with, they are exceptionally well informed on
>matters ufological, and they have been professional... and
>courteous... in every respect. I'm impressed with what they are
>doing, and the program may set a 'high-water' mark within the
>electronic media.

Hello Peter,

Thank you for this good information.

To my surprise, I was also contacted, last september, by Liby Kreutz of Springs Media, who had noted that I had a copy of William Moore's speech at the MUFON Symposium of 1989.

I lent it to them, together with the printed text in his Focus magazine.

It was a very courteous contact and, yes, they gave me back the video, alson promising to send me a copy of the program in exchange. I hope it's going to be a good one.

Gildas Bourdais

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 11:48:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:20:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:50:13 -0000
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>I'm aware that the Woodbridge-Rendlesham Forest case is cited
>by Johnson, in passing, as an example of a UFO being reported
>near a place where nuclear weapons are stored. However that is
>only an anecdote. We all know that the thrust of Johnson's paper
>was its claim to demonstrate a statistically significant
>quantitative result in answer to the question "Are UFOs
>Attracted to Nuclear Sites?". He didn't demonstrate this, but he
>did try to move the argument into the area of replicable
>results, and at least he understands the difference between
>quantitative evidence and anecdotal evidence. I'm not sure that
>you do. You also applauded this statistical work, by the way,
>before I criticised it, as the "affirmative answer" to the
>question. Now I feel that you are happier to revert to the
>anecdotal method of using selected instances to illustrate the
>"obvious".

Hello Martin

What I have been saying is that the Johnson's paper is quite interesting, both for the statistical study and for the summary on observations over nuclear sites. You labored to demonstrate that the statistical study is "flawed", but, without being an expert, I see that some of your arguments are arguable in turn.

Anyway, let's admit that the statistics, although it yields a positive result, is not a decisive, "final" proof of Ufo interest for nuclear activities. But, this is not as important as the examination of the best cases, one by one, and there are many. Rendlesham-Bentwaters of 1980 is one. It is not "anecdotal" ! The 1950 series over Oak Ridge is another one. I counted about 80 pages about it in the 1,600 pages FBI File.

It's all very well explained in the book of Bruce Maccabee "UFO-FBI Connection. The Secret History of the Government's Cover-Up" (2000). The best cases, quite significant for national defense, are probably those of the 60's and 70's revealed notably in the book "Clear Intent". According to a more recent inquiry, at Minot AFB, on October 24, 1968, a Ufo was seen during 45 minutes over a Minuteman missile site. security alarms were activated. An outdoor silo door was opened, which weighted 20 tons ! There are some twenty witnesses on that case, which lasted several hours in all. In such a case, there is no need of a long statistical study to realize that it is of very high significance. There was a "message", there, and I bet that it was understood.

Now, thank you for your information on the 1956 Lakenheath case. But I am not sure of you conclusion : was there a Ufo, or not ?

Gildas

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 4](#)

Re: Media UFO Pattern Revealed? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 12:56:47 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 08:23:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Media UFO Pattern Revealed? - Dickenson

03 Feb. 2005 Evening news-round-up on BBC Radio4 'middle-class channel'. A "whoo whoo" intro which could've been a trailer for trashy ghost story - but it wasn't.

After heavy sarcasm from presenter Eddie Mair (a skilled, if rather bitchy BBC hit-man) came actor-like voices - old woman, child, village idiot - gabbling about "seeing things" - confusingly over-lapped, contradictory and ridiculous. The overall impression was of slightly mad people competing with one another in wild claims.

It was a specially recorded piece (using actors?) to represent what? And why?

Apparently this was the BBC's coverage - and the only "detailed" UK radio reporting I've heard so far - of FOI release(s) of MoD files of unidentified sightings - mostly from qualified and responsible people. But why the propaganda?

The item - heavily biased ridicule & disinformation - shows what we can expect in UK: a public convinced that all sightings are "ridiculous" - convinced by big media (mostly controlled by Whitehall and the corporates - but not necessarily by Gov't).

Once again - why?

Some earlier refs that might give a clue:

Don Ledger - Look Out For The Media UFO Pattern

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/jan/m27-019.shtml>

Frank Warren - MoD Reveals 88 Sightings In '04

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/feb/m04-001.shtml>

cheers

Ray D

~~~~~  
"Perceptions" <http://www.perceptions.couk.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

UFO Beliefs Attract Plenty Of Earthly Interest

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:19:37 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:19:37 -0500
Subject: UFO Beliefs Attract Plenty Of Earthly Interest

Source: The Concord Monitor - Concord, New Hampshire

<http://www.concordmonitor.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050203/REPOSITORY/502030313/1031>

02-03-05

[Images at Site]

'I'm just looking in the sky'
Man's UFO beliefs attract plenty of earthly interest

By
Allison Steele
Monitor staff

TILTON - Go ahead, call Paul Spera crazy. He's used to it. Whenever Spera talks about the lights he sees flashing and circling in the sky, most people dismiss him as a goofball.

And really, Spera doesn't fault them for it. He knows how it sounds to people who haven't seen signs of extraterrestrial life themselves. But he is sure the lights he sees aren't airplanes or satellites, and he knows there are plenty of people out there who agree with him.

"Saying you believe in it or you don't believe in it is like saying you believe in the Sears Tower," said Spera, 36, who lives in Tilton. "UFOs are real, there's no doubt about that. Now we just have to figure out what they are."

Spera, a musician and bartender who is currently unemployed, said he has been seeing UFOs for almost 20 years. Last year, he and his girlfriend started videotaping the sightings to prove it to people, and they have culled more than two hours of footage. Spera has a Web site:

http://www.jerryppippin.com/UFO_Files_paul_spera.htm

dedicated to his observations, and he has corresponded with people from all over the world who have had similar experiences.

Last month, Spera sent a letter to the Monitor, telling of earthly encounters with multiple spacecrafts.

"Many people in this community have known what is happening here for years, and no matter what you do, you can't stop the truth from coming out," Spera said in the letter. "Extraterrestrial contact has been made."

Spera's letter generated tremendous interest. It was one of the most widely read items in months on the Monitor's Web site. Since his letter was published, Spera has heard from people who want to know more about his experiences. They often ask questions he can't answer. Why have the lights from alien craft appeared to

him so many times, and why are they here? He doesn't know.

Spera is well aware of most people's attitude toward tales of extraterrestrial contact. Hollywood movies and supermarket tabloid stories about little green men don't help, he said.

But like many who describe firsthand accounts of extraterrestrials, Spera does not believe his stories will be dismissed forever. He said it's just a matter of time before the rest of the world catches up with what he and others believe.

"There's thousands of books about this, thousands of people with pictures and videos and all kinds of evidence," he said. "If I'm crazy, and I'm hallucinating, so is my video camera."

Spera's mother told him when he was a child about a UFO she had seen decades before. He always thought she was nuts, he said, until one night in the late 1980s when he was 18. While driving along a road he saw a triangular formation of lights blinking high above Lake Michigan in the spot where his mother had seen them long ago. The lights remained for 12 hours, he said, changing colors from green to red, and many people in the neighborhood called the police and local news outlets.

"Pretty much everybody in my family was scared except me," he said. "I was interested in finding out what it was."

Spera and his family moved to Pittsfield when he was 23 and opened a restaurant that he managed for several years. Shortly after moving to New Hampshire, Spera saw more unexplainable sights, most notably a red spherical light, 30 feet in diameter, that he said descended right in front of him while he was on Catamount Mountain.

When he started researching extraterrestrial sightings, he learned that North Country residents Betty and Barney Hill were among the first in the country to report contact with aliens. More research led him to sightings elsewhere in the state, and from there, he started watching the skies.

"It became more of a hobby," he said.

Spera now lives with his girlfriend, Tara Landry, and plays guitar in a blues and rock band. When he and Landry started dating about five years ago, she didn't believe his stories. But then she had her own sighting, and now, from the back yard of their apartment, they often watch together for lights beaming from sources they can't identify.

On the videos they've made, lights can be seen darting through the sky. They circle in unpredictable patterns, flash in colors, pass behind trees and swoop around the moon and clouds. They certainly don't look like planes, but it's difficult to tell how large they are or anything else about them.

Spera wrote to the Monitor on a whim, not expecting the newspaper to print his letter. His distrust of the media's handling of other-worldly sightings was confirmed by the headline that appeared over his letter: "Extraterrestrials have contacted me."

Spera said he has never been personally contacted by anything. When he said in his letter that "contact has been made," he meant with the planet.

"When you say contact, I think of a phone call, some direct communication," he said. "I've never talked to an alien, I've never seen an alien, I've never been on a spaceship, none of that. What I'm doing is what anyone can do: just looking in the sky."

Spera believes that more people will come around to his point of view as time goes on. But for that to happen, it will take more people coming forward as he has - accepting the certain ridicule that comes with mentioning UFOs.

"Just like anyone else, I have my own opinion, and I'm not going to force that opinion on anyone," he said. "I'm not here to make anybody believe or not believe. I don't care what people think - it makes no difference to me. It doesn't change the fact that it's the truth."

Allison Steele can be reached at 224-5301, ext. 314
or by e-mail at asteele.nul

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 3:24:45 -1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:28:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 00:32:14 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

>Source: PRWeb.Com

><http://www.prweb.com/releases/2005/2/prweb204713.htm>

>Conservative Radio Host Won't Discuss Controversial
>News Story on Show

>But he was among the first to get Meier's book, in 2001, warning
>of U.S. attack on Iraq, recent BBC, Drudge, Frontline news
>stories, etc.

>Los Angeles, CA (PRWEB) February 3, 2005 -- A heated controversy
>is already erupting between Michael Horn, the U.S. researcher
>who represents the UFO case of Billy Meier, from Switzerland,
>and noted conservative talk show host Dennis Prager. At the
>center of the dispute, is Horn's assertion that discussion of
>the amazing story, now splashing across news sites and airing on
>stations all over the world, isn't taking place on some
>conservative shows here in the U.S. that, Horn thinks, should
>welcome controversial but well-documented stories.

><http://www.prweb.com/releases/2005/2/prweb203910.htm>

>While interest in Horn's recent appearance on one show resulted
>in over 250,000 hits to his website, he's gotten a rather chilly
>reception from the shows that, Horn thinks, are more comfortable
>with maintaining the status quo, based on narrow political
>and/or religious thinking, at a time in history when such
>thinking contributes more to our problems than to solving them.

>But Horn points out that his frustration may be understandable
>when people learn that noted talk show hosts, like Prager and
>Michael Medved, were actually among the very first people, in
>2001, to receive a copy of "And Yet They Fly!" containing
>Meier's accurate warnings about events that hadn't occurred yet,
>like the U.S. attack on Iraq, the increase in Islamic terrorism,
>the spread of Mad Cow disease, etc. Horn thinks that people
>should know that these hosts, and thousands of other people,
>still have this book sitting on their bookshelf and, may be
>unaware or, worse, uninterested that it not only contains the
>amazing proof of foreknowledge of events, it also contains
>warnings of calamitous things still to come=85should humanity not
>heed the warnings. "This either true or not true, there's really
>nothing in between. And, if it's true, there is no bigger story
>in all of history. The problem facing the media is how to the
>question the credibility of a controversial guest who sent you
>information about events=85before they occurred."

<snip>

The problem with the media is that they have to put up with people like Michael Horn shilling for known frauds like Billy Meier. It's pathetic that in 2005 I still have to hear BS from the bozo of Switzerland.

Josh

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 07:35:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:31:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 10:01:12 -0600
>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 22:09:12 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

>>As he was a ufologist, [Kenny Young's] death is being linked,
>>in some quarters on the Net, with the demise of every other
>>individual who has ever had even the merest brush with ufology,
>>as part of the great conspiracy to kill each and every one of us
>>off. Even Graham Birdsall's death these days (aneurysm)is being
>>thrown in for good measure.

>>For god's sake, can't people just be left alone to die in peace
>>and with dignity.

>Amen, brother. But asking paranoids and crazies to cease and
>desist in the name of sanity and decency is like trying to stop
>the tide from rolling.

First there was a dodgy and contrived information void and then
there were many of the "paranoids and crazies" alluded to. The
"paranoids and crazies" don't create the void, many only
innocently try to fill it. It may be that you blame the victim
a little here, Sir.

If there were more openness and forthcomingness from our
governments, institutions, and agencies ...if it was more "of
the people, by the people and for the people"... there would be
substantially less "paranoids and crazies," I suspect.

Not a cause... a reaction.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

UFO Over Santa Rosa Argentina

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 08:47:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:33:53 -0500
Subject: UFO Over Santa Rosa Argentina

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
February 4, 2005

Source: Planeta UFO
Date: 02.03.05

UFO OVER SANTA ROSA

On February 3, 2005, the time being 21:45 hrs. a UFO was seen crossing the skies of the capital of the Argentinean Pampa.

The UFO was yellowish-brass in color, its estimated size being twice as large as a first-magnitude star and moved from NE to SE some 30 degrees over the horizon and toward the West. This object was recorded during part of its transit for approximately 3 minutes by members of the "CIUFOSLAPAMPA" group.

Subsequently, another object was detected some 35 degrees over the horizon and toward the west, following a north/south trajectory. After moving along at a constant luminosity, the object unexpectedly increased its size for some 30 seconds, as in the earlier case, before vanishing completely.

[*] Readers of Inexplicata will remember Santa Rosa as the site of a number of cattle mutilations in 2002 and the site of still unexplained draining of a number of swimming pools and water storage facilities that year.

Translation (c) 2005 Scott Corrales, IHU
Special Thanks to Raul Oscar Chavez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 14:40:30 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:37:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 09:32:59 -0400
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 12:37:27 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>>After a lecture I gave in Las Vegas, was told by a woman
>>>working there for the AEC that she had in 1964 been a grad
>>>student at NM Tech in Socorro, and had been instructed to do
>>>careful analysis on the soil from the Socorro landing..in
>>>secret. I passed this on to Jim MacDonald who spoke with her.

>>Well, don't keep us in suspense! What were the results? Any
>>radioactivity?

>Frankly I don't know. I don't think she was looking for
>radioactivity. It wasn't that long before Jim's death. Ann
>Druffel might have noted something in the files.. I suspect the
>USAF was looking for radioactivity... NM being in the midst of
>much nuclear activity.

Gentlemen,

On page 180 of The UFO Evidence, Volume II, you can read all
about it. Here is a quote from the text:

The woman [at the time a radiological chemist with the Public
Health Service] had done analyses on the plant fluids exuded
from the scorched greasewood and mesquite plants, and told
McDonald, 'There were a few organic materials they couldn't
identify,' but most of the sample was just sap. According to
McDonald, 'Shortly after she finished her work, Air Force
personnel came and took all of her notes and materials and told
her she wasn't to talk about it any more.'

[End Quote]

Of somewhat more interest was that the woman was at the landing
site on April 25 and reported that there was a patch of fused
sand, that had melted and resolidified, right under the landing
area. Of even more interest is the fact that these
physical-chemical analysis reports are absent from the Blue
Book files and have never been made public. Why not, especially
if they show nothing extraordinary?

This is an example of oxymoronic secret science. No real science
is done when the results of laboratory analysis are concealed
from the public and from scientific peers. Some tiny insider
elite may know the real story of Socorro, but science is nothing
if not laid out for all to see and findings such as this

thoroughly examined and their implications fully understood and disseminated.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 09:36:44 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:38:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Clark

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:07:03 +0000
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 11:16:03 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 06:32:01 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>Meanwhile I am hoping for the best but will expect the worst.

My sentiments, too, Dick and Stan. It strikes me as improbable that so conservative an institution as ABC News will go out on a limb to defend the proposition that UFOs are actually a legitimate question.

My guess is that for the first part of the show, we'll be titillated with a few intriguing cases, but by the end of the program, we'll all be reassured that we have nothing to lose sleep over and that orthodox assessments cover all.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 16:07:27 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:48:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Shough

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 09:32:59 -0400
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 12:37:27 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>After a lecture I gave in Las Vegas, was told by a woman
>>>working there for the AEC that she had in 1964 been a grad
>>>student at NM Tech in Socorro, and had been instructed to do
>>>careful analysis on the soil from the Socorro landing..in
>>>secret. I passed this on to Jim MacDonald who spoke with her.

>>Well, don't keep us in suspense! What were the results? Any
>>radioactivity?

>Frankly I don't know. I don't think she was looking for
>radioactivity. It wasn't that long before Jim's death. Ann
>Druffel might have noted something in the files.. I suspect the
>USAF was looking for radioactivity... NM being in the midst of
>much nuclear activity.

Hello Stan

Was this the same woman referred to in Ch 6 of Ray Stanford's
Socorro Saucer?

She is said to have talked to Jim McDonald (who wrote to Richard
Hall, who passed a copy to Ray) and to you also.

She was described as "a radiological chemist with the Public
Health Service in Las Vegas" as of 1968.

As far as I can make out this woman is the source for the story
of "a patch of vitrified sand" at the site. She said her sample
and notes were removed by AF people afterwards.

Ray Stanford was also told by three Socorro Police Department
sources that an AF investigator removed a piece of "bubbly
looking rock" from the area. Ray himself was not certain that
the rock and the vitrified sand were the same thing.

I can't find any reference to radioactivity being detected.

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 16:11:09 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 09:50:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:21:50 +0000
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:50:13 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 19:51:45 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>>The Rendlesham-Bentwaters 1980 case is in the article of Donald
>>>Johnson, along with a series of significant cases.
>>>Again, this part - the direct evaluation of significant cases -
>>>is capital in this debate on Ufos and nuclear sites.
>>>Bentwaters happens to be one of them.

>>Hi Gildas,

>>I'm aware that the Woodbridge-Rendlesham Forest case is cited
>>by Johnson, in passing, as an example of a UFO being reported
>>near a place where nuclear weapons are stored. However that is
>>only an anecdote. We all know that the thrust of Johnson's paper
>>was its claim to demonstrate a statistically significant
>>quantitative result in answer to the question "Are UFOs
>>Attracted to Nuclear Sites?".

<snip>

>Martin,

>Only an anecdote? What is your definition, please? We have the
>recorded testimony of Col. Halt who was there and personally
>saw the light beams directed downwards into the atomic weapons
>area. He so stated to me, and he so stated in a public talk in
>Maryland that we have on videotape.

Hello Dick

My dictionary defines an anecdote as "a short account of an incident", which in everyday usage is deployed (unless merely for amusement) to illustrate or exemplify some general assertion or other. This describes exactly the status of the reference to Rendlesham in the Johnson paper. Even in common usage it is understood that an anecdote is very different from a general proof. In terms of scientific method, I'm sure you know as well as anybody the very common distinction made between "anecdotal evidence" and _quantitative_ "scientific evidence". You should understand that this use of the term anecdotal is not pejorative in respect of the content of the anecdote, and in fact makes _no claim at all_ about the reality-status of the event. It is about the suitability of the evidence for quantitative purposes. The same item can be anecdotal in one context and a scientific datum in another.

My point of view is practical and realistic: 60 years of anecdotes, told by witnesses ranging from the ordinary to some of the most impressive possible - world-class astronomers, meteorologists, meteoriticists, aerospace experts - have not proved sufficient to persuade more than a small minority of scientists. Against this background Col. Hall's certainty that beams were deliberately shone on the weapons store by a UFO is not going to carry the argument.

Now remember that the context here is not Col. Hall but a claimed statistical association between the distribution of nuclear sites and the density of UFO reports.

>I interviewed Col. Halt at great length for The UFO Evidence,
>Vol. II. Many of the other cases are similarly unambiguous,
>which is why I raised the issue in the first place about the
>importance of defining what constitutes a datum.

What constitutes a datum in terms of the study cited is just a report in the UFOCAT database attached to a sighting location that happens to be within the administrative boundary of a given US county. If you are saying that this could be a rather insensitive type of procedure with some potential for statistical ambiguity, then I don't think we are in disagreement.

>That was
>greeted with a very hostile response on your part. Statistical
>analysis of UFO data is greatly to be desired, but the
>methodology and definitions also are vitally important.

What have I been talking about, if not methodologies and definitions? Apologies if I was abrasive, but that was precisely because I interpreted your comments to imply an impatience with all this fancy finagling, and a deprecation of the importance of the statistical claim made, when it was you who had referred us approvingly to the NCP project page in the first place.

Howsoever, evidently we do agree a) that properly designed statistical analysis is desirable, and b) that the Johnson study is not properly designed statistical analysis. That study mixes all types of reports, whereas you object that only certain types of reports associated with nuclear sites should be admitted:

"To my way of thinking," you say, "if Joe Six-Pack reports seeing a light source fly past a high-security site high in the sky, that's a weak datum. If one or more employees of that site report a low-level, geometrically shaped (ellipse or oval) luminous object approaching and maneuvering (turns, etc.) near a weapons storage area at low altitude, that's a strong datum. We have a lot of the latter type of report, and those are the ones that should be examined. The weak reports only introduce 'noise.'" (UpDates, 20 Jan 2005)

I think this would be potentially a more interesting approach. But from a methodological point of view you have to be careful that you are not introducing a selection bias by defining ahead of time what is noise and what is not. The point of our analysis ought to be to statistically demonstrate that a suspected signal is actually there, not to pre-select the data in such a way as to make sure that we only have "signal" in our analysis to start with! This might be like testing an assertion that lightning strikes especially favour oak trees by excluding all reports of strikes near poplar trees and juniper bushes, and any that are not near any kind of shrub at all, because they are irrelevant to your special interest in oak trees!

There seem to be those who already know that UFOs have a special interest in nuclear sites, they don't (personally) need statistical analysis. But as you say in your article on the NCP page there are reports that raise the possibility of an association, which is in need of careful statistical study. I agree with you. The first thing anyone learns from reading about statistics is that chance can generate numerical clusters and associations which appear, on the face of it, to be special associations but which turn out not to be special after all, but rather typical. We don't know the answer ahead of time.

So, to find out: If we go through the data and select only the

strong, high-strangeness cases of close range objects manoeuvring with intent, so as to exclude the "noise", we will have to exclude the weaker cases from our group of 164 test counties_and_ from our 164 control counties (using the Johnson model for illustration). What we are going to be left with is all the strong, strange, close-range manoeuvring objects in both groups, with objects showing an "intent towards" (or a close-range association with) a broad range of objects and situations - cars, houses, aircraft, lone pedestrians, what have you - and what would then have to be shown is that a properly randomised sample of CEIs, 2s, 3s and 4s contains an excess of cases suggesting "intent towards" nuclear materials. But this evidence does not exist yet. Does an excess occur? In the present context - which is the Johnson study - it is not possible to ask the question.

>direct eye-witness cases of close proximity association with
>atomic sites need to be given far more weight than distant fly-
>bys.

Ah, I dealt with point already above.

One other thing. Going back to your previous post you say "However, I don't buy the trained observers at technical sites argument. They don't spend their time outdoors staring at the sky." I've discussed this issue elsewhere, but I think you miss at least part of the point. In the context of the case offered by Johnson (which is after all the only statistical evidence on the table) the point is that the distribution of reactors and warheads might be expected to correlate with military facilities and all that goes with that. The "all that goes with it" is not just perimeter guards at the nuclear site, and not just the concentration of educated and technically aware persons there (favouring a larger proportion of better quality Unknowns), but the level of monitoring by other agencies, the reporting arrangements and everything else implicit in the security infrastructure, and the way in which such arrangements are plugged into centralised file archives by multiple routes, so that duplicate reports survive in FBI or CIA or AFOSI files. I can't prove these factors affect the data, but I don't think we can guarantee that they don't.

Regards,

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 12:36:03 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 10:21:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Ledger

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 09:48:54 -0800
>Subject: Re: Sonora UFO Sightings

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 13:UFO UpDate: Sonora UFO Sightings
>>Subject: Re: Sonora UFO Sightings

>>>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 09:22:32 -0800
>>>Subject: Sonora UFO Sightings

>>>I received some interesting correspondence from Mr. Mark Olson
>>>in response to my last article; with his permission I'm posting
>>>the gist of that here:

>>>I have contacted NUFORC, NARCAP, and MUFON. I have also
>>>contacted any and all UFO Organizations I could find, but never
>>>received a response.

>><snip>

>>NARCAP doesn't involve itself in the day to day reporting of
>>UAP. These have to be in close proximity to an aircraft-while
>>it's in the air-and reported by the pilot of same. Interest then
>>in this sighting increases with the distance of the UAP from the
>>aircraft and whether it is perceived as a danger to the AC.

>One of the images captured on video was of a UFO "following a
>passenger liner".

Hi Frank,

I believe you are referring to the Kaufman, Texas video. There's
also one showing something approaching an airliner form almost
head-on then passes by on the airliners reight side. The
vidiographer is apparently too shy to accept questions about the
video. My interest was forwarded to him along with my email
information, but he never contacted me.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 5](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 6:44:45 -1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 14:04:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Goldstein

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 11:48:08 +0100
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:50:13 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

><snip>

>It's all very well explained in the book of Bruce Maccabee "UFO-
>FBI Connection. The Secret History of the Government's Cover-Up"
>(2000). The best cases, quite significant for national defense,
>are probably those of the 60's and 70's revealed notably in the
>book "Clear Intent". According to a more recent inquiry, at
>Minot AFB, on October 24, 1968, a Ufo was seen during 45 minutes
>over a Minuteman missile site. security alarms were activated.
>An outdoor silo door was opened, which weighted 20 tons ! There
>are some twenty witnesses on that case, which lasted several
>hours in all. In such a case, there is no need of a long
>statistical study to realize that it is of very high
>significance. There was a "message", there, and I bet that it
>was understood.

>Now, thank you for your information on the 1956 Lakenheath case.
>But I am not sure of you conclusion : was there a Ufo, or not ?

Gildas,

Can you please post all the information on the 1968 Minot AFB case?

Thank you,

Josh

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special? - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 12:26:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 11:10:46 -0500
Subject: Re: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special? - Maccabee

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 01:21:38 EST
>Subject: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?

>What'll Be The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?

>I just hope this new special isn't going to be some watered down
>look at UFOs.

>I hope Jennings and his staff have really done their homework,
>scoured through data that hasn't seen the light of day yet and
>breaks new ground in ufology.

>I'm hoping that those of you who were asked to participate hit
>ABC with the kitchen sink as you do on this list and in your
>books, lectures etc.

<snip>

>No, we need something new. Pro or con. Dispels falsehoods and
>validates truths. Gray-area investigation won't cut it anymore.

>Is Jennings brave enough? Sure as heck is.

>Is ABC brave enough? Dunno.

Maybe. I was not interviewed. However, I know that in years
(long) past ABC was more "pro" than con.

I was on Good Morning America in 1979 with J. Allen Hynek after
the investigation of the New Zealand sightings showed there was
no conventional explanation. Hynek had good relations with ABC
back in those days.

In the days of 'Gulf Breeze Bubba' I think ABC was the only
major news organization to send a camera crew to GB to film (if
possible) Bubba. And they were successful.

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Leather As A Countermeasure? - Menkin

From: **Mike Menkin** <mmenkin.nul>
Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 16:37:02 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 11:45:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Leather As A Countermeasure? - Menkin

[Non-Subscriber Post]

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 13 Jan 2005 16:56:37 -0500
>Subject: Re: Leather As A Countermeasure?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 12 Jan 2005 12:26:01 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Leather As A Countermeasure?

><snip>

>>>This is speculative at this point, but it seems there are three
>>>or four reports floating around, including, believe it or not,
>>>from UFO implant researcher and remover Dr. Roger Leir, that
>>>leather "can stop telepathic" stuff from aliens.

><snip>

>>I know nothing about this topic at all and I'm in no position to
>>comment on the experiences you refer to, but it does occur to me
>>that leather is skin. Isn't this what we all have on our heads
>>anyway?

>Good point, however, our group, which experiences mind/body
>effects similar to those reported by UFO abductees, is rather
>interested in possible countermeasures. Conventional
>countermeasures to electromagnetic and acoustic signals do not
>work for everyone, and do not work except for very short periods
>of time. Most of the time they don't work at all. (We consider
>those short and limited scope successes as possibly decoying.)

>So if we hear three or four reports of success, using a common
>material, we pass them around for our group to try. I CC'd this
>to Errol at his personal email address mainly because of his
>interest in the paranormal in general. It pays to keep those
>with large numbers of contacts informed about new information,
>as sometimes they come across happenings we're unaware of.

Hello Eleanor,

You said electronic countermeasures don't work, but they do. I
have people who have successfully worn thought screen helmets
for over five years, including children. See:

aliensandchildren.org

I now have videos of aliens and alien space craft, yes, you can
see they are craft, made by a woman who wears a thought screen
helmet, which she has worn successfully for over 9 months. This
is stated on my website. Call me at 425-417-1628 or 425-653-
5979. I will provide you with more information, you can even
talk to some people who have successfully worn the helmet.

Leather does not stop microwave transmission, at least in the

800 MZ range.

If you wrap a leather hat around a cell phone, it still works, but if you wrap a leather hat with eight sheets of velostat in it, the cell phone does not work. It's a simple test anybody can perform.

If anybody you work with wants to try a helmet, please have them call me and I will send them one for free. All information is confidential.

I have an abductee in Toronto who has worn a helmet successfully for over a year, and about four more people in Canada with thought screen helmets.

Michael Menkin

<http://www.stopabductions.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special? - LeClair

From: **Aaron LeClair** <saucer.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 13:58:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 11:47:53 -0500
Subject: Re: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special? - LeClair

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 01:21:38 EST
>Subject: The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?

>What'll Be The Result Of The ABC UFO Special?

>I just hope this new special isn't going to be some watered down
>look at UFOs.

<snip>

So far it sounds like the usual. Independent interviews where issues can be skirted, few rebutals, no open table debates where the experts are all flown in at the same time. It would be strange if the show deals with anything new. Usually shows really drum up anything unique they have. I Haven't seen anything like that yet.

It doesn't sound like this show will be biased (neither did NOVA's, but it was). Even if it is unbiased, it will probably be biased toward looking unbiased. Therefore the end will be a draw, rather than have any side being a winner. Excuse the semantical contradiction above.

The end result won't matter much, like my speculation here I guess.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 19:07:40 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 11:53:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time

>Source: <http://tinyurl.com/547s9>

>How Britain's X-Files Said That UFOs Were Just A Waste Of Time

>By David Charter

>Secret committee dismissed reports of flying saucers more than
>50 years ago

>The truth is out there somewhere... but it has taken the
>Ministry of Defence 54 years to release secret papers ruling out
>the existence of UFOs.

I wonder if there's some journalists' union rule, or something,
that says every story about UFOs has to begin with "the truth is
out there"? Such a demonstration of a total lack of originality
doesn't really give you the impression that this is cutting-edge
investigative journalism, does it?

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:10:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:10:53 -0500
Subject: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

Source: ABC News

<http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=468496>

02-04-05

The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

Two-Hour Primetime Special Aairs Thursday, Feb. 24 at 8 p.m.

Almost 50 percent of Americans, according to recent polls, and millions of people elsewhere in the world believe that UFOs are real. For many it is a deeply held belief.

For decades there have been sightings of UFOs by millions and millions of people. It is a mystery that only science can solve, and yet the phenomenon remains largely unexamined. Most of the reporting on this subject by the mainstream media holds those who claim to have seen UFOs up to ridicule.

On Feb. 24, "Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs =97 Seeing Is Believing" takes a fresh look at the UFO phenomenon. "As a journalist," says Jennings, "I began this project with a healthy dose of skepticism and as open a mind as possible. After almost 150 interviews with scientists, investigators, and with many of those who claim to have witnessed unidentified flying objects, there are important questions that have not been completely answered =97 and a great deal not fully explained."

"Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs =97 Seeing Is Believing" airs Thursday, Feb. 24 from 8-10 p.m. ET on ABC. The program will be broadcast in High Definition.

This two-hour primetime special reports on the entire scope of the UFO experience =97 from the first famous sighting by Kenneth Arnold in 1947 to the present day. The program draws on interviews with police officers, pilots, military personnel, scientists and ordinary citizens who give extraordinary accounts of encounters with the unexplained. Also included are the voices of professional skeptics about UFOs, including scientists who are leading the search for life forms beyond earth elsewhere in the universe.

The program explores the facts behind the enduring mystery of the incident at Roswell, N.M., and looks into the strange stories of alien abductions. Among the UFO cases presented:

Minot Air Force Base, N.D., October 1968 =97 Sixteen airmen on the ground and the crew of an airborne B-52 witness a massive unidentified object hovering near the base.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1997 =97 Hundreds witness a huge triangular craft moving slowly over the city.

St. Clair County, Ill., January 2000 =97 Police officers in five adjoining towns all independently report witnessing a giant craft with multiple bright lights moving silently across the sky

at a very low altitude.

Today if you report a UFO to the U.S. government you will be informed that the Air Force conducted a 22-year investigation which ended in 1969 and concluded that UFOs are not a threat to national security and are of no scientific interest. But as one of the world's leading theoretical physicists says in the program, "You simply cannot dismiss the possibility that some of these UFO sightings are actually sightings from some object created by =85 a civilization perhaps millions of years ahead of us in technology."

"Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs =97 Seeing Is Believing" is produced by PJ Productions and Springs Media for ABC News. Mark Obenhaus and Tom Yellin are the executive producers.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

HypeCouncil Banner Ad For Peter Jennings UFO

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 03:10:57 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:12:21 -0500
Subject: HypeCouncil Banner Ad For Peter Jennings UFO

Hello all:

I just got the message below offering me 15-cents per click if I put up a banner ad on my website, promoting the upcoming Peter Jennings UFO special.

See <http://www.hypemakers.net/abcnews/> to view the banners (scroll to bottom of page).

I think I'll pass. My slot machine has a ton of quarters in it, and the fridge is full of fancy beers. [burp!]

- Larry

----- Original Message -----

Subj: Advertising for UFO Special
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 16:22:47 -0800
From: Karin Chamberlain <karin.nul>
To: <larryhatch.nul>

Dear Larry-

HypeCouncil is an online publicity and company working with ABC News to promote Peter Jennings' upcoming special report, UFO's: Life in the Universe. This highly-anticipated report will investigate the unexplained phenomena around the world that so many people believe is proof of the existence of UFOs.

We are looking for banner placement on your site until the broadcast date, 02-24-05, and are offering \$0.15 per unique click up to \$500. Plus, we will give you a \$25 bonus if you sign up and place a banner by 9am PST Monday, 2-7-05. If you are interested, please visit <http://www.hypemakers.net/abcnews/> to register and view the banners (scroll down to the bottom of the page).

If you would like to discuss other rates, please reply with them, along with the unit size you are able to use, where it will be placed on the page, verification of your traffic (a link to or screenshot of your stats), and whether you have impressions tracking available.

Thank you again, and I look forward to working with you on this.

Karin Chamberlain

HypeCouncil

<http://www.hypemakers.net/abcnews/>
<<http://www.hypemakers.net/abcnews/>>

If you no longer wish to be contacted by The Hype Council about our Advocacy campaigns, please go to www.hypemakers.net/delete
<<http://www.hypemakers.net/delete>>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmberg

From: **Alfred Lehmberg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 09:03:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:34:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmberg

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 09:36:44 -0600
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:07:03 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>>Meanwhile I am hoping for the best but will expect the worst.

>My sentiments, too, Dick and Stan. It strikes me as improbable
>that so conservative an institution as ABC News will go out on a
>limb to defend the proposition that UFOs are actually a
>legitimate question.

>My guess is that for the first part of the show, we'll be
>titled with a few intriguing cases, but by the end of the
>program, we'll all be reassured that we have nothing to lose
>sleep over and that orthodox assessments cover all.

Indeed, Edward R. Murrow, Walter Cronkite, Mike Wallace, and
Larry King (et sig al) have taken righteous issue with UFOs in
the past 50 years... well into prime time... and it was if their
microphones were never on. I'm hoping that it's different this
time. My feeling is that it will be different this time.

Thinking back to that Larry King live special... I was glued to
the set for it. I 'knew' ET was going to show itself that
night... 'knew' it!

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 09:20:22 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:37:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 3:24:45 -1000
>Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

>>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 00:32:14 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

>>Source: PRWeb.Com

>><http://www.prweb.com/releases/2005/2/prweb204713.htm>

>>Conservative Radio Host Won't Discuss Controversial
>>News Story on Show

<snip>

><snip>

>The problem with the media is that they have to put up with people
>like Michael Horn shilling for known frauds like Billy Meier.
>It's pathetic that in 2005 I still have to hear BS from the bozo
>of Switzerland.

I don't know man... that's Kal Korff's consumptive take... and
I'm compelled to contrariness just on that fact alone.
Moreover, Horn seems to be coming at all this from an unusual
direction besides...

I think the enmity may be misplaced. Horn seems to have answers
for his critics, and it may be many of them have backed down.
I'm not postilizing... I'm postulating.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 07:41:15 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:40:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 3:24:45 -1000
>Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

<snip>

>The problem with the media is that they have to put up with
>people like Michael Horn shilling for known frauds like Billy
>Meier. It's pathetic that in 2005 I still have to hear BS from
>the bozo of Switzerland.

Hi Josh:

Do I see something new?

Now, Meier has gone beyond flying saucer photography, beyond
contacts with sexy space blonds or whatever, and is now
predicting the future like a prophet or a swami ..

We learn that Meier predicted the US invasion of Iraq, mad cow
disease etc. after the fact. Islamic terrorism? That's like
predicting the tides.

Regardless, I see this as another example of what I call 'BS
inflation'. Having gathered a cult following, the chief BS
artist has to keep them titillated or his membership (and
revenues) fall off.

The old UFO photos and palliatives from Semjase get stale, and
his audience always wants cheap thrills. As the claims get
wilder and wilder, some followers shake their heads and wander
away.

In compensation, Meier has to throw the net wider and that's
where the shills come in.

The source (www.prweb) only costs \$119, about 92 Euros to hoot
up any public relations "article" you care to pay for:

<http://www.prwebdirect.com/catalog.php>

\$119 is 'entry level' BS. Larger splorts cost more.

'Horn' sounds like he actually believes all this stuff.
Interesting name in this context regardless.

Stig: Good catch! Just where did you find the 'press release'?

Best wishes

- Larry

PS: I think 'satanist' Anton LaVey was much more entertaining,
but that's just 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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Boone

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 11:07:15 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:42:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Boone

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 09:36:44 -0600
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:07:03 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>>Meanwhile I am hoping for the best but will expect the worst.

>My sentiments, too, Dick and Stan. It strikes me as improbable
>that so conservative an institution as ABC News will go out on a
>limb to defend the proposition that UFOs are actually a
>legitimate question.

>My guess is that for the first part of the show, we'll be
>titled with a few intriguing cases, but by the end of the
>program, we'll all be reassured that we have nothing to lose
>sleep over and that orthodox assessments cover all.

>Jerry Clark

Y'know, this may be a blessing in disguise for if ABC does a
half edged job and we get another ho-hum look at UFOs we'll at
least have solid proof that the mainstream news' outlook on the
subject has a new foundation in blandness.

Then, the only constant law in physics will take place:

Murphy's Law.

Ten minutes after the special airs and we get that old "UFOs
remain as much an enigma today as when they appeared 50 years
ago..."

A fleet of alien spacecraft will appear over the entire earth
and millions will be abducted, dogs will start talking, cats
will use their claws to scratch out complex mathematical
patterns depicting multi-dimensional star travel and everyone's
four-year-old will sprout antennae and begin debating super
string theory.

Well maybe not so dramatic but you get the picture.

Best,

Greg

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 08:23:07 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:01:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hatch

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 16:11:09 -0000
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:21:50 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>There seem to be those who already know that UFOs have a
>special interest in nuclear sites, they don't (personally) need
>statistical analysis.

<snip>

Hello Martin, Richard and all:

Personally, I don't have a dog in this horse race even though
some of my work may have added to the discussion.

I'm not convinced that the best statistical analysis would
support an 'intent' or interest in nuclear facilities or not. I
would love to see something convincing either way of course.

Lost in all this, is the possibility that UFOs, whatever they
may be, are more interested in something near to nuclear
establishments.

Greasy spoon restaurants come immediately to mind.

Can anyone think of a nuclear facility, be it a power plant, a
weapons storage facility or just about anything of the kind
(remotely placed missile silos excepted) that does not have a
greasy spoon restaurant (GSR) a short drive away?

Come to think of it, many if not most UFO sightings took place
within a few miles (if not a few blocks) of a GS beanery .. even
with NO nuclear connection.

What do Socorro, NM and Alamogordo have in common? Greasy spoon
restaurants. B&B Hill passed several GSR just prior to their
reported abduction. I could probably pull thousands of similar
cases from the database, all near some GSR or another.

I give no credence to G. Adamski, but he actually ran a GSR
and reported sightings from there.

I have been cataloging UFO sightings since 1980 or so, just as
the best cases (as I now see them) seemingly vanished from the
data.

What also happened by that time? One thing I can say at least:
Greasy spoon restaurants pretty much all went out by business by
the 1980s, replaced by fast food chains with better (if more
boring) standards of cleanliness.

GSRs vanish. UFOs vanish. Is it all coincidence?

Something to think about [Burp!]

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Kenny Young - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 10:25:43 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:03:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Kenny Young - Clark

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 07:35:23 -0600
>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 10:01:12 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

>>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 22:09:12 +0000 (GMT)
>>>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

Alfred,

>>>For god's sake, can't people just be left alone to die in peace
>>>and with dignity.

>>Amen, brother. But asking paranoids and crazies to cease and
>>desist in the name of sanity and decency is like trying to stop
>>the tide from rolling.

>First there was a dodgy and contrived information void and
>then there were many of the "paranoids and crazies" alluded to.
>The "paranoids and crazies" don't create the void, many only
>innocently try to fill it. It may be that you blame the victim a
>little here, Sir.

It's paranoid and crazy to fill an information vacuum with sinister
claims based on ignorance and imagination.

In my long involvement in this subject, I have seen the death of
just about every single personality of note (Jessup and
McDonald, as two examples of particular prominence) ascribed by
somebody or other to mysterious circumstances, as if ufologists
couldn't die just like ordinary people from a variety of
ordinary causes - in Mr. Young's tragic case leukemia, in
Jessup's and McDonald's suicide after personal struggles with
acute depression.

I have seen zero evidence that anybody is killing ufologists,
and it's discouraging to see that this particularly fairytale
lives on. It may be too much to ask paranoids and crazies not to
be paranoid and crazy, but I would hope they'd at least make the
attempt.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 17:07:03 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:04:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 16:25:28 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 17:50:05 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemm

Cathy, Martin

I was most of the way through a long reply to you when the computer through me off because I told it I wasn't going to buy it a Valentine card, so perhaps computers do have feelings after all.

Very quickly. Personal agency is linked to humans and other animals with complex nervous systems, that would include ET quasi animals. In the future it might just include super computers (and of course my own nice and much treasured computer!) We don't expect to see it in such things as rocks and clouds.

Some versions of the ETH, such as _ufo reports are generated by fusion power spaceships from Mars_ would be finite and testable and fit into scientific naturalism, but unknown beings from unknown locations having unknown powers and motivations wouldn't. Ufologists should not assume that just because reports cannot be explained easily in terms of well known phenomena they should be ascribed to ETs or more exotic variants.

Changes in explanation of natural phenomena from personal agencies to mechanical forces don't seem to be because of specific refutation but rather from changes in general world view which might be linked to social changes.

It's interesting that Cathy mentions laboratory experiments in restricted sensory environments because many anomalous personal experiences seem to occur in just such circumstances (dark rooms, night, lonely roads, ganzfield experiments etc)

Apologies for only be able to send this rushed summary, but you all know computers.

Peter

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

We Need A Memorial

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 12:07:17 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:06:09 -0500
Subject: We Need A Memorial

We need a memorial acknowledging those who have contributed so much to Ufology and have passed on.

In the past year we've lost so many good people that there should at least be a website acknowledging their contributions.

I don't know if any of you guys with big websites have one so if there is it would be nice to point to it.

This way, history will know of the unsung.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Close Encounters With The Human Imagination -

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 17:55:42 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:07:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Close Encounters With The Human Imagination -

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 14:33:57 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Close Encounters With The Human Imagination

>Source: The Times of London - UK

><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,542-1469712,00.html>

>2-04-05

>Pie in the sky

>Flying saucers are close encounters with the human imagination

>UFOs do not exist. It is official. The minutes of the Ministry
>of Defence's Flying Saucer Working Party of 1961 were published
>yesterday. In the earthbound prose of official reports, they
>recommend no more public money should be spent on chasing UFOs.

<snip>

What disgraceful garbage! The Thunderer has become the The
Blunderer, and here cements a sad reputation for falling
woefully Behind the Times.

MS

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 18:12:35 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:09:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 11:48:08 +0100
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 15:50:13 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

><snip>

>>We all know that the thrust of Johnson's paper
>>was its claim to demonstrate a statistically significant
>>quantitative result in answer to the question "Are UFOs
>>Attracted to Nuclear Sites?". He didn't demonstrate this, but he
>>did try to move the argument into the area of replicable
>>results, and at least he understands the difference between
>>quantitative evidence and anecdotal evidence. I'm not sure that
>>you do. You also applauded this statistical work, by the way,
>>before I criticised it, as the "affirmative answer" to the
>>question. Now I feel that you are happier to revert to the
>>anecdotal method of using selected instances to illustrate the
>>"obvious".

>What I have been saying is that the Johnson's paper is quite
>interesting, both for the statistical study and for the summary
>on observations over nuclear sites.

If that was what you had said, Gildas, I think we would have had less disagreement. But you actually claimed that "there is a UFO surveillance of nuclear activities, both military and civilian". You said it was already "one of the best established data in ufology, worldwide, since the 1940s" and that this should be our first (and presumably only) hypothesis when considering the significance of Johnson's result. (23 Jan) Can you not appreciate that there is something contradictory in first making this claim, and then saying that you were placing reliance (at least in part) on the Johnson paper to establish its validity?

You said "the statistical analysis... seems clear to me, establishing higher percentages in the counties with nuclear plants and facilities." You did then, I agree, add the caveat that "the statistical approach is not the main point" (though of course it is the main point of the article in question) and that "the study of credible documents and testimonies is much more revealing, and spectacular, as the article shows". But you immediately quote Johnson's statement that "the UFOCAT 2002 database lists 289 reports at sites coded as 'missile' or 'nuclear' facilities." (Jan 25)

Well of course this another statistic. I indicated why it might turn out to be the case that 289 reports out of 172,000 is not a significant proportion. As you yourself concede, statistics is a "dangerous" game, and reliance on raw headline figures might be misleading. So 0.17% or about 1 in every 600 reports in UFOCAT has a connection with a "missile" or a "nuclear" acitivity? What is the expectation value, on the null hypothesis that there is no association? Does the UFOCAT value

differ? If it does, is the difference formally significant? The point is that we can't answer these questions, because the analysis hasn't been done.

>You labored to demonstrate
>that the statistical study is "flawed", but, without being an
>expert, I see that some of your arguments are arguable in turn.

But which ones? And which are not arguable? So far you have not made any intelligible criticism of any of them, except to respond in the spirit of "I don't agree with that" or "I don't see why" or "well it seems different to me". These are not cogent arguments.

>Anyway, let's admit that the statistics, although it yields a
>positive result, is not a decisive, "final" proof of Ufo
>interest for nuclear activities.

Yes, let's.

>But, this is not as important
>as the examination of the best cases, one by one, and there are
>many. Rendlesham-Bentwaters of 1980 is one. It is not
>"anecdotal" !

I refer you to my recent post in answer to Dick Hall, explaining the meaning of "anecdotal" in the context of quantitative statistical method.

>The 1950 series over Oak Ridge is another one. I
>counted about 80 pages about it in the 1,600 pages FBI File.

>It's all very well explained in the book of Bruce Maccabee "UFO-
>FBI Connection. The Secret History of the Government's Cover-Up"
>(2000).

I'm familiar with quite a bit of this material (though to my shame I have not read Bruce's book) and I agree that mixed in with a lot of low-definition cases there are some that are very intriguing, not to say weird. I don't know what was going on at Oak Ridge. But I'm not very surprised that the FBI documentation is voluminous. It's natural that suspicious events around a site like Oak Ridge at this time would have sparked official concern, and the instant a risk was perceived very close attention would have been paid to all subsequent reports. Individuals at Oak Ridge would likely also be sensitized to the need for vigilance and conscientious reporting of strange sightings. The same imperatives probably would not apply in Dullsville, Alabama, or any of the other zillion regions of the globe where the FBI did not have such an intensive presence or such an alarming weight of responsibility.

>The best cases, quite significant for national defense,
>are probably those of the 60's and 70's revealed notably in the
>book "Clear Intent".

I've read those reports too, and Clear Intent was a notable book. It certainly looks like there was something strange going on around Malmstrom.

>According to a more recent inquiry, at
>Minot AFB, on October 24, 1968, a Ufo was seen during 45 minutes
>over a Minuteman missile site. security alarms were activated.
>An outdoor silo door was opened, which weighted 20 tons ! There
>are some twenty witnesses on that case, which lasted several
>hours in all. In such a case, there is no need of a long
>statistical study to realize that it is of very high
>significance. There was a "message", there, and I bet that it
>was understood.

I'm not familiar with this case. At the risk of tempting you to paint me as a debunker of the purest pelicanist persuasion, let me ask: Does the List have a collective opinion on the verity of this story? Is it properly documented? Is the source known, and authoritative? Have those 20 witnesses independently and openly verified the claim, or are they at least identified? Are there any official records?

Now it may be that these questions have positive answers, and then I would ask: Is it significant that the silo door weighed 20 tons and yet still opened? Is it not the case that silo doors

weigh whatever they weigh consistent with being designed to open, without ET assistance? Surely the implied mystery, if there is one, is not that the doors opened but that they did so when they shouldn't have done. Is it certain that the silo door was opened "by the UFO"? If an electronic or mechanical glitch opened the doors, would not security alarms sound? And what was the nature of this UFO that reportedly stayed over the silo for 45 minutes? If there were no silo door-opening, would this be considered, on its own account, a strong report of high quality and high strangeness?

I say all this not because I have any opinion about this particular case but to show why I think general conclusions based on particular cases can be contentious. An objective person, asked to believe on the strength of this that UFOs have been engaged in systematic "surveillance" of nuclear activities, rightly has a whole lot of particular questions. You have to be realistic and accept that the answers to these questions are often foggy. And if, in this case, the answers are all crisp and clear (unlikely, I'd hazard, given the mixture of official secrecy and witness discretion usual in such cases) the inquirer will then say, "OK, but that's just one instance," and you'll have to drag in the next case, and the next after that, and so on, and this parade of particular instances will get you exactly nowhere.

"Well, what can we do about that?" you might counter, "It isn't our fault if people can't see the obvious in front of their noses." But it is our fault, if we choose not to use, or choose to misuse, the very tool that science has supplied for getting reliable answers to questions in just this sort of situation: statistics. A properly designed demonstration of a significant and unexplained association between good Unknowns and any independent variable would always be scientifically valuable, whether it's nuclear sites or geological fault lines or population-density. It would lift the debate out of the mire of individual instances and contentious and subjective judgments. There would be some clear facts and figures to talk about. We might then know whether 289 incidents out of 172,000 is or is not a significant proportion.

>Now, thank you for your information on the 1956 Lakenheath case.
>But I am not sure of you conclusion : was there a Ufo, or not?

Do you mean "was there an ET spaceship, or not?" If so, I can't answer that question. If you mean "are the several reports all conventionally explainable?" my opinion (for whatever that's worth to you) is that, based on the information we have, they are not. As for the incident of the UFO "tail-chase" of the interceptor, which is what I imagine you have mainly in mind, I think that on balance the prima facie case that existed in 1968, based on the Blue Book reports and Perkins' letter, was not conclusively ratified by the RAF evidence from 1978 but equally was not fatally damaged by the RAF evidence post-1996. There are reasons to infer that the located pilots were not involved in the same phase of the incident, and there is even unassailable evidence that other aircraft were involved, which makes this inference more attractive.

In other words there's sufficient wiggle-room for the "canonical scenario" to still be valid. I don't believe (yet) in the theory that this was confabulated later from garbled memories of a confused night. Personally I'm inclined to think that Perkins and BOI-485 between them told a basically accurate story about what was genuinely believed to be happening by those on the spot in the RATCC radar room at the time. Unfortunately the very best efforts by a number of people over the years, in the US and the UK, have failed to find any trace of the original detailed reports, audio tapes, scope photos and track tracings that could prove it. You have to decide for yourself whether or not that means that "there was a UFO", depending on your terms of reference.

Regards

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 15:11:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:13:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 14:40:30 +0000
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 09:32:59 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 12:37:27 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>>Well, don't keep us in suspense! What were the results? Any
>>>radioactivity?

>>Frankly I don't know. I don't think she was looking for
>>radioactivity. It wasn't that long before Jim's death. Ann
>>Druffel might have noted something in the files.. I suspect the
>>USAF was looking for radioactivity... NM being in the midst of
>>much nuclear activity.

>On page 180 of The UFO Evidence, Volume II, you can read all
>about it. Here is a quote from the text:

>The woman [at the time a radiological chemist with the Public
>Health Service] had done analyses on the plant fluids exuded
>from the scorched greasewood and mesquite plants, and told
>McDonald, 'There were a few organic materials they couldn't
>identify,' but most of the sample was just sap. According to
>McDonald, 'Shortly after she finished her work, Air Force
>personnel came and took all of her notes and materials and told
>her she wasn't to talk about it any more.'

>[End Quote]

>Of somewhat more interest was that the woman was at the landing
>site on April 25 and reported that there was a patch of fused
>sand, that had melted and resolidified, right under the landing
>area. Of even more interest is the fact that these
>physical-chemical analysis reports are absent from the Blue
>Book files and have never been made public. Why not, especially
>if they show nothing extraordinary?

>This is an example of oxymoronic secret science. No real science
>is done when the results of laboratory analysis are concealed
>from the public and from scientific peers. Some tiny insider
>elite may know the real story of Socorro, but science is nothing
>if not laid out for all to see and findings such as this
>thoroughly examined and their implications fully understood and
>disseminated.

Dick, once again you have made a claim unsupported by any
evidence about secret science:

1. Many great scientists have done outstanding science in secrecy.. think Glenn Seaborg, Enrico Fermi, Luis Allvarez as the tip of the iceberg... all were Nobel-ists.

2. In the second place, it is clear that it is Air Force Policy not to admit to flying saucer reality.Should they advertise in the papers... "wanted scientific analysis of possible trace effects produced by flying saucers?" We are looking for any scraps of info that might help us understand the technology... call this toll free number....

3. The woman in question was local and available and talented. The point of her work was to provide rapid information... not to submit a paper for a scientific journal to be sent all about for "Peer review" and eventually to be published or maybe not. Classified research is done to provide information rapidly to help in problem solving... not for publish or perish. For all we know several others may have done small pieces of somewhat related research. The USAF certain;y had plenty of very talented people in New Mexico and elsewhere to look at the big picture

In short then, plenty of real science is done when the results are concealed from the public. There are plenty of scientific peers working in secrecy.

Remember, one can't tell one's friends without telling one's enemies. Secrecy is an important way of protecting our security.

Is all classified research first rate? Of course not. Is all unclassified research first rate, even if published in a peer reviewed journal? Of course not.

I was fortunate in my 14 years of work on classified programs to work with a number of outstanding scientists and engineers. We had access to exotic materials, topnotch instrumentation, advice from very sharp people.

How much time did you work on scientific programs, classified and unclassified, to provide a basis for your conclusions? I asked you this before... no answer then.

You have been on the outside and the shades are drawn. How can you make a judgement in this matter?

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 11:30:36 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:15:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 08:48:36 -0500
>Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:34:04 -0500
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2005 08:28:24 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 12:22:42 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>It would be hard to hide the appearance of a cable from
>>Zamora who was only 50 feet away! Even a mesh (like a
>>fence), would be somewhat apparent to such a keen observer.
>>It would also seem to be hard to hide the large balloon although
>>one can always armwave that it was painted blue or transparent
>>or something.

>David and James...I'll ask this, again of Dr. Rudiak...
>What was the nature of Zamora's eyesight - David Rudiak's
>professional specialty?

>He lost his glasses (and sunglasses) at an inopertune time, so
>what could he see or not see, accurately?
>Has anyone ever checked this? Have they?

What's with the badgering tone?

The important point is not that Zamora dropped his glasses, but
when he dropped them and for how long. What did he report seeing
when he had his glasses on and glasses off?

According to Stanford's book, he had approached with his car to
within 50 feet of the object, took a few more steps towards it,
perhaps getting to about 35 feet away, and that's when the thing
started to take off with a roar. He ran back toward's his car
glancing several times over his shoulder. He bumped his car,
fell, and lost his glasses at this point.

Note that until then, he was wearing his glasses the entire
time, including his close approach to the vehicle. He saw the
ensigna on the side of the craft as he was approaching, not
after he lost his glasses, as erroneously reported in the A.F.
summary. Thus if there was a cable above the craft, Zamora would
have easily seen it.

After he lost his glasses, Stanford wrote that Zamora ran
perhaps another 50 feet. When the craft became silent and
started to move away, Zamora quickly ran back to his car,
retrieved his glasses, and watched with his glasses on as the
craft disappeared in the distance.

The only part Zamora didn't see with his glasses was the craft
moving away initially. But unless his eyesight without
correction was extremely poor, he should have had no problem
seeing the trajectory of the white oval blob as it moved away
initially until he retrieved his glasses.

All Stanford has to say about the glasses is that they were prescription. From the photo of Zamora, his eyes through his glasses may be slightly minified, meaning that he would be a little bit, but not severely nearsighted. Without knowing the prescription, I can't say much more.

As for his acuity with his glasses on, the law in most states is that one can't even get a driver's license unless acuity is at least 20/40 while wearing a correction. I would think traffic cops would be held to a higher standard of acuity than the bare minimum since they might have to testify in court as to details of a case in dispute.

Zamora's eyesight with or without his glasses has nothing to do with some of the more important details of the case, such as the complete silence of the craft as it rapidly zipped away or the fact that it was flying against the wind. No conventional propulsion system or balloon can account for such details.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 20:39:27 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:16:55 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special - Aldrich

Here is a little more on the program:

<http://abcnews.go.com/Primetime/story?id=468496&page=1>

Tom Tulien and I interviewed the primary witness on the Minot B-52 case several years ago. His story was fantastic, but later interviews by Tom Tulien and others showed that crewmen supported the story and gave their observations from their positions on the aircraft. (Aside: This case is discussed in several UFO books, but with the wrong date, and the significance of the case is not communicated to the reader.)

Radar photographs of the UFO exist and were analyzed by various official and unofficial sources. The Strategic Air Command intelligence officer who analyzed the radar photographs kept a set for himself and was also interviewed by Tom.

This case is not a USAF "unknown" rather it has a silly official explanation which amused some of the crewmembers during their interviews.

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947
<http://www.project1947.com/>
P. O. Box 391
Canterbury, CT 06331
(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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Harney

From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 17:23:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:18:55 -0500
Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Harney

Magonia Supplement No. 54 is now published and the html edition is available at

<http://magonia.mysite.wanadoo-members.co.uk/ms54.htm>

John Harney

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:35:41 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:20:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 19:07:40 +0000
>Subject: Re: Britain's X-Files Said UFOs Were Waste Of Time

>>Source: <http://tinyurl.com/547s9>

>>How Britain's X-Files Said That UFOs Were Just A Waste Of Time

>>By David Charter

>>Secret committee dismissed reports of flying saucers more than 50 years ago

>>The truth is out there somewhere... but it has taken the
>>Ministry of Defence 54 years to release secret papers ruling out
>>the existence of UFOs.

>I wonder if there's some journalists' union rule, or something,
>that says every story about UFOs has to begin with "the truth is
>out there"? Such a demonstration of a total lack of originality
>doesn't really give you the impression that this is cutting-edge
>investigative journalism, does it?

For once we agree. That and the Little Green Men. It's the
journalistic equivalent to the radio and TV woo-woo noises. Last
night's SDI dealt with journalism and the phenomenon.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

ABC UFO Aftermath

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:11:14 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:27:14 -0500
Subject: ABC UFO Aftermath

Well we know the special will be a ratings rocket.

We know probably every living being with a TV set will tune in and sit on the edge of their seats as Peter Jennings walks them through the UFO field.

If the special sheds new light or a favorable light on those of you who've sacrificed to bring the truth to the fore,

What will the aftermath be like?

I mean primarily the news industry aftermath?

I figure with all the antagonistic right wing talk show folks who believe the only explanation for UFOs is that it's a Satanic plot to deceive the world, will tear Jennings a new one.

If the special is spoken on by the liberal media, they'll only accept evil government conspiracies.

Can't win fer losin' I guess.

What also gets me is how Limbaugh rags on about the liberal media and if I recall the media was run by conservatives since day-one. It took well into the 60s for minorities and women to get some semblance of representation but according to these right wing wackos the media has been owned and controlled by commie loving maniacs since Tesla put the first plug in.

Bottom line is this special should reveal more about the fears and hidden agendas of many an institution as well as those of our fellow man.

Will other news agencies pick up the torch to shed new light or to chase after Jennings and others bringing the subject to the fore like those scenes in the old Frankenstein movies.

I can't wait.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 13:17:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:29:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Kenny Young - Lehmborg

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 10:25:43 -0600
>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 07:35:23 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Kenny Young

<snip>

>>First there was a dodgy and contrived information void and
>>then there were many of the "paranoids and crazies" alluded to.
>>The "paranoids and crazies" don't create the void, many only
>>innocently try to fill it. It may be that you blame the victim a
>>little here, Sir.

>It's paranoid and crazy to fill an information vacuum with sinister
>claims based on ignorance and imagination.

<snip>

Still, I think you blame the victim to some extent. That void
begs to be filled regardless. Is it the fault of those who would
fill it or the fault of those who created what must be filled.

It's a little like punishing a hungry man for trying to make
some kind of bread.

alienview.nul - :| :-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 6](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - McCoy

From: G T McCoy <gtmccoy.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 10:05:08 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 14:25:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - McCoy

Hello, all,

I'm still around lurking, out in the ether of cyberspace.I

I have said this before:

Early spring is not the time of year you can safely fly balloons in the Southwest. It was early April when my old DC-7, weathervained into the wild west winds of Windslow AZ.

This was an aerial tanker firebomber, it weighed about 92,000 lbs., at the time. The Wheel chocks were in place, by the way.

You would have to be insane to balloon in the Southwest at that time of year... Zamora saw something - it wasn't a Balloon.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:33:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:11:33 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>Source: ABC News

><http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=3D468496>

>02-04-05

>The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>Two-Hour Primetime Special Aairs Thursday, Feb. 24 at 8 p.m.

>Almost 50 percent of Americans, according to recent polls, and
>millions of people elsewhere in the world believe that UFOs are
>real. For many it is a deeply held belief.

SNIP

>Phoenix, Ariz., March 1997 =97 Hundreds witness a huge triangular
>craft moving slowly over the city.

It will be interesting to see if they stay with the 8:30 PM
triangle sighting (multiple witnesses) or if they jump to the
10 pm "flare" sighting made the most news because of the videos.

Wonder if they will mention the Mexico Surveillance flight
sighting of nearly a year ago for which the initial radar
detection is unexplained, but the FLIR lights could be ground
heat sources (oil burnoff fires?)

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:14:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 11:30:36 -0800
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 08:48:36 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:34:04 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

<snip>

>>David and James...I 'll ask this, again of Dr. Rudiak...
>>What was the nature of Zamora's eyesight - David Rudiak's
>>professional specialty?

>>He lost his glasses (and sunglasses) at an inoportune time, so
>>what could he see or not see, accurately?
>>Has anyone ever checked this? Have they?

>What's with the badgering tone?

>The important point is not that Zamora dropped his glasses, but
>when he dropped them and for how long. What did he report seeing
>when he had his glasses on and glasses off?

>Zamora's eyesight with or without his glasses has nothing to do
>with some of the more important details of the case, such as the
>complete silence of the craft as it rapidly zipped away or the
>fact that it was flying against the wind. No conventional
>propulsion system or balloon can account for such details.

David,

This is the point of my "badgering tone" - what was the nature
of Lonnie Zamora's eyesight? Isn't that an important "detail"
(not minutiae, Dr. Maccabee)?

When one's witnessing anecdote is based primarily on
observation, I would think that an investigation would zero in
on the eyesight of the person relaying information he or she
saw. Everything else is peripheral (no pun) to that.

The devil's, again, in the details.

(By the way, I'm not an advocate of the balloon hypothesis, but
rather the experimental craft hypothesis. The balloon thing was
intertwined into the argument because the NASA information was
confluent with LEMs, balloons, and other tested flying and
landing thingies.)

Rich Reynolds

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 11:52:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:15:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 07:41:15 -0800
>Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

<snip>

>Now, Meier has gone beyond flying saucer photography, beyond
>contacts with sexy space blonds or whatever, and is now
>predicting the future like a prophet or a swami ..

>We learn that Meier predicted the US invasion of Iraq, mad cow
>disease etc. after the fact. Islamic terrorism? That's like
>predicting the tides.

If you were to look into it, like I've been doing, you'll find
that "after the fact" doesn't belong there. That's wishful
thinking.

I've remained silent on the Meier case for quite a while, not
referring to all the supportive evidence for the case, because
ebk called for silence, a year or two back.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

'A Word To The Wise'

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 19:56:15 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:20:35 -0500
Subject: 'A Word To The Wise'

'A Word To The Wise' Or Kiss Of Death For The Old Farts

An excerpt from a group (typos, maybe intentional, included)

[Start Quote]

I dont care bout Area 51 crash sight, back in the good ole" days! I dont want to see another flying sauser looking like an "cup and saucer" silver and parked between two trees! I don't care bout lights in Arizona!

That is such old news and make no dif... its either believed or NOT! No [-one?] will change their minds bout it over some new evidence found in shoe box 41 years after the fact!

I have been checking out site, lord, time to up date!!

I live in Washington st, known on one site as area 98 well ... welcome to area 342#

[End Quote]

Author (androgynously named "melody") has a point.

And, when you look back to Rich Reynolds' piece:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/jan/m30-030.shtml>

(which I applauded at the time and now)

And my thread:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/forteana/message/103313>

begun 27 Jan 05 (concerning anomalous "suicides" and "accidental" deaths at significant points of investigations) and their reception by the "old guard" - it could make one wonder what, of real importance, is actually being investigated?

Cheers

Ray D

~~~~~  
"Perceptions" <http://www.perceptions.couk.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 20:02:18 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:23:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 15:11:15 -0400
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>Dick, once again you have made a claim unsupported by any
>evidence about secret science:

Stan,

If you would pay attention to what I say, you wouldn't keep going off on the tangent of technology development done in secret. I gave you a specific example of what I was talking about. Do you care to defend that as legitimate science?

>1. Many great scientists have done outstanding science in
>secrecy.. think Glenn Seaborg, Enrico Fermi, Luis Allvarez as
>the tip of the iceberg... all were Nobel-ists.

>2. In the second place, it is clear that it is Air Force Policy
>_not_ to admit to flying saucer reality.Should they advertise in
>the papers... "wanted scientific analysis of possible trace
>effects produced by flying saucers?" We are looking for any
>scraps of info that might help us understand the technology...
>call this toll free number....

This seems a mite sarcastic to me, Stan. I would expect anyone interested in doing true science to make thei findings available to peers for review, and disseminate the results. The fact that military agencies and governments sometimes don't behave scientifically is my entire point. They hide information and manipulate the truth for private and often dubious reasons. You seem unable to grasp the simple, philosophical point I am making.

>3. The woman in question was local and available and talented.
>The point of her work was to provide rapid information... not to
>submit a paper for a scientific journal to be sent all about for
>"Peer review" and eventually to be published or maybe not.
>Classified research is done to provide information rapidly to
>help in problem solving... not for publish or perish. For all we
>know several others may have done small pieces of somewhat
>related research. The USAF certainly had plenty of very talented
>people in New Mexico and elsewhere to look at the big picture

If they did and have kept it secret from the public for 60 years, is that science? Or is that a serious abuse of what science is supposed to be?

>In short then, plenty of real science is done when the results
>are concealed from the public. There are plenty of scientific
>peers working in secrecy.

Our difference appears to be a semantical one over the meaning of the word 'science.' Yes, people can find things out in secret.

>Remember, one can't tell one's friends without telling one's
>enemies. Secrecy is an important way of protecting our security.

And boy is it ever overdone! To the point of stifling good
scienytific research and causing tremendous duplication of
effort.

>Is all classified research first rate? Of course not. Is all
>unclassified research first rate, even if published in a peer
>reviewed journal? Of course not.

>I was fortunate in my 14 years of work on classified programs to
>work with a number of outstanding scientists and engineers. We
>had access to exotic materials, topnotch instrumentation, advice
>from very sharp people.

Yes, and what became of it all? Any worthwhile hardware?

>How much time did you work on scientific programs, classified
>and unclassified, to provide a basis for your conclusions? I
>asked you this before... no answer then.

No answer because it is totally irrelevant to anything under
discusison here. How much time have you spent studying
scientific philosophy, the history of science, symbolic logic?

>You have been on the outside and the shades are drawn. How can
>you make a judgement in this matter?

This must be an 'insider' joke, right? Again, you are entirely
missing my point. The secret manipulation of information that
you are defending as 'science' is not what science was ever
intended to be and violates many of the principles of science
that scientists often pay lip service to. Of course it goes on.
But to call it science in the real meaning of science is
oxymoronic. That's my entire point.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Weber

From: **Bill Weber** <wweber1.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:13:50 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:27:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Weber

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 09:03:27 -0600
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 09:36:44 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

<snip>

>>My guess is that for the first part of the show, we'll be
>>titled with a few intriguing cases, but by the end of the
>>program, we'll all be reassured that we have nothing to lose
>>sleep over and that orthodox assessments cover all.

>Indeed, Edward R. Murrow, Walter Cronkite, Mike Wallace, and
>Larry King (et sig al) have taken righteous issue with UFOs in
>the past 50 years... well into prime time... and it was if their
>microphones were never on. I'm hoping that it's different this
>time. My feeling is that it will be different this time.

<snip>

Hi Alfred,

I'd like to know where this positive vibe comes from, especially
from someone wedged firmly within the reality based community.

With the volumes written over the past 2 years on TV news icons
trading White House access for journalistic integrity and
objective fact (Bob Woodward?), it doesn't seem very hopeful -
and this no matter how positively Jennings is described by at
least one of the principals.

Maybe it's your choo-choo train whistle. I bought one for my
daughter a few years ago. Maybe it'll elevate my mood if I can
dig it out of the toy box in time for the second, and dreary
half of the show - well, that and a fifth of Bushmill's.

Best,

Bill

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:30:55 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>Source: ABC News

><http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=468496>

Aloha All,

I've been following discussion here about this forthcoming 2 hour ABC special about the UFO phenomenon. I'd like to offer my take on it which represents my own exopolitical approach to this phenomenon rather than the more traditional nuts and bolts approach of UFO researchers.

I notice from the list of interviewees and cases that this show will repeat the same old formula of classic case sightings and veteran UFO researchers discussing why we should consider 'lights in the sky' as a serious phenomenon, and why their nuts and bolts approach is legitimate research.

It seems that the producers of the Peter Jennings show have been persuaded by veteran UFO researchers and 'others' that he needs to stick to the same old formula of focusing on 'lights in the sky' and having the same old pro and con debates, rather than looking at Disclosure Project witnesses and others who have direct EBE experiences.

It's as though the emergence of whistleblowers/contactees disclosing their role in suppressing UFO secrets, and actually witnessing extraterrestrial biological entities (EBEs) and/or their ships hasn't happened.

Now at this point I can imagine many UFO researchers raising their hands in protest and complaining that many of these whistleblowers/contactees are at best not credible or at worst frauds who will damage serious UFO research. It's even contended that many of these questionable 'witnesses' are being encouraged to step forward so that they create controversy and damage 'genuine UFO research'. Often minor inconsistencies are brought forward to put all the testimony of these whistleblowers/contactees under serious question thereby raising the issue of credibility both of these witnesses and of the researchers who cite them.

I noticed from the UFO UpDates archives that Steven Greer was pilloried for not properly screening his witnesses to the satisfaction of some of the veteran researchers. As the 'new kid' on block Greer was condemned as an egomaniac and 'useful idiot' by veteran UFO researchers for organizing his 2001 Press Conference and having his witnesses testify to their incredible stories. Witnesses such as Clifford Stone, Carol Rosin, etc., were criticized in terms of their credibility and knowledge.

Now I have commented in some past posts about different methodologies in approaching the interview of witnesses/contactees - see:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2004/dec/m18-012.shtml>

Now it does appear to me that the question of evidentiary standards is vitally important when we approach those witnesses

making extraordinary claims. However, as I've argued before, we need to use social science methods more analogous to investigating human rights abuses or organized crime since this more correctly contextualizes the nature of the problem before us in terms of government interference.

Its only when those who have direct ET related experiences as whistleblowers/contactees are appropriately investigated and understood that we will begin to fully fathom the political implications of the undisclosed extraterrestrial presence and of current exopolitical developments.

For those UFO researchers not prepared to do this, I do believe their main interest is in limiting this entire UFO phenomenon according to biases and professional competencies that are increasingly becoming an anachronism given the material that is emerging.

The general public is moving beyond this myopic focus on 'lights in the sky' and are seriously exploring the testimonies of whistleblowers/contactees revealing 'lies on the ground'.

The latest whistleblower/contactee that offers testimony with serious exopolitical significance is Charles Hall whom I recommend to the list as someone who is both credible and significant- see:

<http://www.exopolitics.org/charles-hall.htm>

I think that the Peter Jennings special may ultimately dissappoint since its main premises are inappropriate to the true challenge in understanding the UFO/exopolitical phenomenon before us.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:44:51 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:35:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 17:07:03 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>Some versions of the ETH, such as _UFO reports are generated by
>fusion power spaceships from Mars_ would be finite and testable
>and fit into scientific naturalism, but unknown beings from
>unknown locations having unknown powers and motivations
>wouldn't. Ufologists should not assume that just because reports
>cannot be explained easily in terms of well known phenomena they
>should be ascribed to ETs or more exotic variants.

You have stated a fundamental principle of the scientific method, Occam's (or Okham's, if you prefer) Razor. Proper development and testing of ETH, as I have strenuously argued in this forum for the last several years to no avail, must begin with the lowest level of ET technology first and eliminate that before resorting to higher or even infinite ("magic-like") levels of technology. Low and high levels of ET technology must not be mixed together in discussions of UFO technology as that is a violation of logic as well as a violation of Occam's Razor. Yet it is done all the time.

Thus whenever a problem arises in some interpretation of some aspect of the UFO problem, someone invokes Clarke's Law to shut down all critical thinking and analysis from that point onward. Arthur C. Clarke's law or dictum being that alien technology would be so advanced it would be "indistinguishable from magic" to us. Similar mutations of this untrue truism declare that aliens would be so "alien" to us that we could not comprehend or communicate in any way with them, therefore no matter how utterly stupid an alleged "alien" action might seem to us we must just discount it as being "too alien for us to understand" and to stop criticizing it.

Also when UFO theoretical discussions get too far along and start seeming to threaten the ETH, then the "empiricist's dodge" is invoked to shut down discussion of theory on the grounds that "it's too early to theorize we must just continue to mindlessly collect empirical UFO data year after year with no rigorous, disciplined thought and analysis as to what it all means, only casual speculation will be allowed and only if it is favorable towards ETH." Also you are not allowed to be pro-UFO and anti-ETH, if you try to assert such a position you will be attacked with virulent ad hominem about how you are an anti-UFO debunker -- no matter how vigorously you defend the factual scientific evidence for an unexplained UFO phenomenon. If you attack the cherished belief in ETH with rational argument of any kind you will be attacked personally.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 21:04:16 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:37:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Shough

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 08:23:07 -0800
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 16:11:09 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>>There seem to be those who already know that UFOs have a
>>special interest in nuclear sites, they don't (personally) need
>>statistical analysis.

><snip>

>Personally, I don't have a dog in this horse race even though
>some of my work may have added to the discussion.

>I'm not convinced that the best statistical analysis would
>support an 'intent' or interest in nuclear facilities or not. I
>would love to see something convincing either way of course.

>Lost in all this, is the possibility that UFOs, whatever they
>may be, are more interested in something near to nuclear
>establishments.

Larry, this possibility is not lost, or if it is lost then it
isn't for want of searching on my part! This is precisely what I
have been saying, as of course you know.

>Greasy spoon restaurants come immediately to mind.

>Can anyone think of a nuclear facility, be it a power plant, a
>weapons storage facility or just about anything of the kind
>(remotely placed missile silos excepted) that does not have a
>greasy spoon restaurant (GSR) a short drive away?

I can't tell whether you're ironically agreeing with me, or
ironically disagreeing with me, or just being ironical with
everybody - or, hey, maybe all three? :-)

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Leather As A Countermeasure? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 16:40:59 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:39:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Leather As A Countermeasure? - White

>From: Mike Menkin <mmenkin.nul>
>Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 16:37:02 +0000
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: Leather As A Countermeasure?

<snip>

>I have an abductee in Toronto who has worn a helmet successfully
>for over a year, and about four more people in Canada with
>thought screen helmets.

I've already responded to Michael privately and passed on his offer to try his product for free to our members. I'll report our members' success or lack of it once I get the reports for any who may have taken advantage of the offer. But since our case is somewhat different than abductions, if we fail to get any benefit that in no way should discourage abductees from trying his helmet.

All I've said in the past is that the high resistivity 3M Velostat material hasn't shown any benefit with shielding devices, including total body surrounding enclosures, that we have made.

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 21:42:26 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:42:31 -0500
Subject: Re: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World - Allan

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 19:28:04 EST
>Subject: Re: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World

>>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 22:40:04 -0800
>>Subject: MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World

>>Source: The Financial Times

>><http://news.ft.com/cms/s/02ee9662-7589-11d9-9608-00000e2511c8.html>

>>02-03-05

>>MoD's Alien Files Are Out Of This World
>>By Cathy Newman and Jean Eaglesham

<snip>

>Europe and Asia know that they could have made billionaires had
>they the information that the U.S. has allowed to be suppressed.

Billionaires? Don't kid yourself.

<snip>

>I suspect any day, any time, a foreign power or collective of
>foreign powers to start hammering the press and the U.S.
>regarding UFOs.

Again, don't kid yourself.

>They know we've got the goods and aren't about to share them and
>now that the tools to uncover these truths are rapidly expanding
>it's just a matter of time before somebody of great courage
>breaks the silence.

>That's when the sparks are gonna really fly because one spilled
>bean leads back to the bag.

Sorry, but.....

Are you saying that because of the recent UK FOIA we are going
to be told the great truth about UFOs?

Are you saying that we here (in Britain/Europe) have the opportunity
to tell the world what the US has known for decades
but has refused to reveal?

If so, I fear you are going to be a bitterly disappointed man,
as will many other Americans.

All that has been revealed so far by the MOD files is a few
sighting reports. These resemble previous reports down the ages.
And, sad to say, that is all that is likely to be released now
or in the future.

Of course you are free to interpret these reports as 'unknowns' if you wish. But, please, do not expect any ETs.

See also, Close Encounters with the Human Imagination, the title of a London Times article on the FOIA releases, in a previous post.

Amazing that some MOD officials actually concede there might be intelligent life elsewhere! Aint that fantastic? In fact, zillions of scientists the world over have been saying this sort of thing, starting from long before UFOs were ever heard of.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:23:15 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:44:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller

>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 17:23:39 -0000
>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Magonia Supplement No. 54 is now published and the html
>edition is available at

><http://magonia.mysite.wanadoo-members.co.uk/ms54.htm>

Hello John,

It's 53 if you follow the URL.

I am intrigued by the way by these words from Gareth J. Medway about the MJ12 papers. They strike me as very profound and insightful and I am overwhelmed by the sound logic applied;

"Christopher Allan concludes that, if we can't prove MJ-12 a hoax, we can certainly ask why, if the events described therein did occur, there is no proof. I agree: if the Roswell story had been genuine, then confirmation would have come to light by now, just as Moore anticipated. It has not done, so claims about it can be dismissed."

A quite brilliant logical dismissal with incredibly sophisticated and original reasoning. He's hit the very point that's eluded all before him. Another Magonia first!!

Stuart Miller

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: We Need A Memorial - Hale

From: Roy Hale <roy.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:30:07 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:46:47 -0500
Subject: Re: We Need A Memorial - Hale

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 12:07:17 EST
>Subject: We Need A Memorial

>We need a memorial acknowledging those who have contributed so
>much to Ufology and have passed on.

>In the past year we've lost so many good people that there
>should at least be a website acknowledging their contributions.

>I don't know if any of you guys with big websites have one so if
>there is it would be nice to point to it.

>This way, history will know of the unsung.

Hi Greg,

Here are a few links to memorials to passed ufologists.

<http://www.fsr.org.uk/GCreighton.htm>

<http://www.fsr.org.uk/GBirdsall.htm>

Why not also download the UFO tribute song, Future Contact, to Graham Birdsall & Gordon Creighton made by Down To Earth's very own Editor - Roy Hale. It is in MP3 Format at:

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/FutureContact.mp3>

Not sure if there any more links to other ufologists, but these are the Ones I have been directly involved in myself.

Best,

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:08:33 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:50:40 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers ->
>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 13:10:53 -0500
>Subject: UFO UpDate: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

<snip>

>Source: ABC News

><http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=468496>

>02-04-05

>The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

The working title was "UFOs and Life in Universe" or something similar. The new, final title for the program - particularly the "Seeing is Believing" subtitle - may suggest that the show's questions will revolve around the whether the minds of those who have alien contact experiences are perceiving something that exists from without or from within.

I don't know what to expect. I'm experiencing the same excitement/nervousness that I felt before the election, and we know how that turned out.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Still Searching For Clinton's UFO Quote In Belfast!

From: **Giuliano 'Jimmy' Marinkovic** <giuliano.marinkovic.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 00:38:15 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 07:56:16 -0500
Subject: Still Searching For Clinton's UFO Quote In Belfast!

Dear Colleagues,

About a year ago EBK and Grant Cameron were kind enough to find for me the first part of the audio recording from Bill Clinton's UFO quote in Belfast, back in November 30, 1995.

On that occasion Clinton stated;

"I got a letter from 13-year-old Ryan from Belfast. Now, Ryan, if you're out in the crowd tonight, here's the answer to your question. No, as far as I know, an alien spacecraft did not crash in Roswell, New Mexico, in 1947. And, Ryan, if the United States Air Force did recover alien bodies, they didn't tell me about it, either, and I want to know."

In audio I have the first part where Clinton says;

"No, as far as I know, an alien spacecraft did not crash in Roswell, New Mexico, in 1947."

But I still don't have the rest of the recording.

I have even check the Clinton's official web library and I have contacted them. They have the speech in question archived, and I was able to find it. I have contacted them trying to find a recording but they don't have the recording in question and don't know who might have it.

If anyone has any suggestion or knows how could I locate the audio or video recording of that speech, please let me know.

Best regards.

Giuliano Marinkovic
Host of the radio program 'UFO_NAUTICA'
Radio Student
Zagreb
Croatia

<http://www.uforadio.cjb.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Hayakawa Recants?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 09:32:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 09:32:23 -0500
Subject: Hayakawa Recants?

Hayakawa 'Recants'?

There's a curious tone to the following - a non-subscriber post.

ebk

From: Norio Hayakawa <Groom51S4.nul>
To: ufoupdates.nul
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:33:47 EST
Subject: Area 51 Was Never A Secret Base

The construction of this sprawling aerospace complex in Nevada, erroneously known as "Area 51", began in the month of May of 1955.

Since about 16 years ago "Area 51" has become associated ridiculously (wittingly, unwittingly, or "conveniently") with false rumors of "alien technology" or "global" conspiracies.

I, Norio Hayakawa, of the Civilian Intelligence Network:

<http://www.hometown.aol.com/groom51s4/index.html>

was at one time a proponent of such conspiracy theories, but several years ago I totally abandoned such conspiratorial views regarding this base. Furthermore I am no longer associated with any conspiracy theories, period.

Today I am an ardent supporter of the importance and necessity of this vital base for our national defense. I have come to the realization that this base, officially named "an operating base near Groom Lake" is here to stay, no matter what. It is a real aerospace complex which had never really been a top secret base, to begin with. (See the bottom excellent article by aerospace historian, Peter Merlin)

It only became a "secret" base to those who were taken in by paranoia mongers and through misinformation, resulting from false rumors which began in the late 80s and persisted throughout the mid 90s.

Area 51 today is a vibrant aerospace R & D conglomerate test base, employing anywhere from 1800 to 2400 defense contractor employees, working in shifts on diversified projects. Some of the contractors include Raytheon, Lockheed, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, TRW, E. G. & G and General Atomics,

One of the best recent color satellite photos of the base was taken on Thursday, July 24, 2003:

Color Satellite Photo of Area 51 taken on July 24, 2003

<http://www.lasvegasnow.com/area51/Area51-072503-LG.jpg>

Perhaps what I consider to be the best history of Area 51 was recently compiled by Peter Merlin, an aerospace historian who resides near Edwards Air Force Base in California:

Area 51 Was Never A Secret, Classified Base

http://www.dreamlandresort.com/pete/no_secret.html

By the way I would like to announce that in May of 2005, there will be several celebrations marking the 50th anniversary of this important base. Needless to say, the "official" celebrations, closed to the public, will most likely be held at the base itself, including the Base Headquarters (or, officially, Building #269, according to the the Security Manual of the base entitled DET 3 SP), the Administration Building (Bldg. #265), the Dining Hall (Bldg. #267) and at Building #170) which contains a large officers' lounge known as "Sam's Place", the gymnasium and the swimming pool.

However, there will be other "private" celebrations at diverse aerospace facilities both in Nevada and in Southern California, including the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards Air Force Base, whose Detachment 3 operations are allegedly tied in with the Nevada base.

Aside from these private gatherings, there will be several "public" festivities marking the Golden Anniversary of Area 51. On Saturday, May 28, the largest of these gatherings will be held adjacent to the eastern boundary of the base alongside Groom Lake Rd. and will be headed by Joerg Arnu, webmaster of Area 51 - Dreamland Resort

<http://www.dreamlandresort.com>

the world's largest online source of information on Area 51.

Several hundred supporters and "aficionados" of Area 51, including military aviation enthusiasts, are expected to celebrate outside the eastern boundary of the base with a camp-out, barbecue and live music entertainment along with various speakers.

According to Arnu, May 28 was selected because it coincides with the Memorial Day weekend and thus it would be easier for the public to make it to the celebrations.

The news media is expected to cover the event and the Bureau of Land Management is also expected to participate by helping with the coordination of parking and other logistics needed to make the event a success.

For more info, go to:

The 50th Anniversary celebration of Area 51 on May 28, 2005 - public invited!

<http://www.dreamlandresort.com/campout.html>

Norio Hayakawa

Area 51 News Updates

<http://www.hometown.aol.com/area51watch/index.html>

The Civilian Intelligence Network

P.O. Box 861051

Los Angeles,

CA 90086-1051

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

PRG/X-Conference 2005 Press Release 01-09-05

From: **Steven Bassett** <ParadigmRG.nul>
Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 23:45:37 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:26:23 -0500
Subject: PRG/X-Conference 2005 Press Release 01-09-05

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

X-Conference 2005 Press Release - February 3, 2005

Washington, DC - ABC News has announced it will air on Thursday, February 24 at 9 pm EST a two hour documentary titled: Peter Jennings Reporting UFOs: Seeing is Believing is the product of 150 interviews by PJ Productions and Springs Media. Quoting from the ABC News website, "Each year there are thousands of reports of unidentified flying objects, but the U.S. government doesn't investigate any of them. This special program will seriously examine the unexplained phenomena around the world that so many people believe is proof of the existence of UFOs." Several X-Conference speakers from 2004 and 2005 will appear in this documentary. With the retirement and pending retirement of Tom Brokaw and Dan Rather respectively, Peter Jennings is arguably the most respected and powerful news anchor in the world. Paradigm Research Group and other organizations have invested more time over the past nine years in raising the awareness of ABC News to the issues attending extraterrestrial-related phenomena than all the other networks combined. Is this a breakthrough in the truth process - tune in and find out. See: <http://abcnews.go.com/Primetime/story?id=468496&page=1>

The X-Conference is a unique event which focuses on the political, governmental and social aspects relating to extraterrestrial-related phenomena. It is produced by PRG as part of the ongoing activist movement seeking to end the truth embargo. Approximately 28 lecturers and panelists will present. New for this year:

Walter H. Andrus, Jr. - At the Saturday evening banquet, Walter H. Andrus, Jr. will receive the PRG Hall of Fame Award. This is the only PRG Award being announced in advance out of courtesy to the many MUFON members who may wish to make plans to join him in April at the X-Conference.

After 57 years of dedicated interest in extraterrestrial-related phenomena, Walt Andrus is a legend. As with so many others, that interest was precipitated in August 15, 1948, when he and his wife and son had a daylight sighting of four objects flying in formation over downtown Phoenix, Arizona (49 years later lights in formation would once again be seen over Phoenix, Arizona). The rest is history. He went on to be a founding member of the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON) in 1969 and the International Director of the MUFON from 1970 to July 16, 2000 when he was succeeded by John F. Schuessler. He also served on the staff of Skylook, as Editor in Chief of the MUFON UFO Journal and Editor or Co-editor of the annual MUFON International UFO Symposium Proceedings. MUFON became the largest and best known organization in the world addressing the science of extraterrestrial-related phenomena and took up the mantle of NICAP as it was slowly dissembled by intelligence agency plants during the 1970's. MUFON International Director John F. Schuessler will join Walt in giving a presentation on 30 years of engagement.

Pilots Panel

One of the most trusted segments of our society are the civilian pilots who transport millions of Americans safely every year and the military pilots who defend the country. In the early years they reported many sightings, and such reports were eventually suppressed and discouraged. Some pilots began researching the issues, many have learned much over the years and all have risked some personal discomfort by seeking the truth of these matters. After civilian and military pilots we re strongly discouraged from publicly reporting unusual sightings, thousands of pilot reports were collected over many years by researchers. This database now forms the core of the work of the National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena (NARCAP) and is one of the most important evidence compilations for the ETH in the world. Stephen Bassett will moderate a panel of six senior pilots who have engaged the most important issue of our time.

This panel will include: Cmdr. Graham Bethune, Navy pilot; Robert Brown, senior cooperate pilot; David Coote, airline captain; Don Daniels, airline captain; Robert Durant, airline captain; and Jim Courant, airline captain.

Returning from last year:

Cheryll Jones - This former CNN News anchor will again co-host the X-Conference along with Stephen Bassett. She is a polished professional journalist with extensive experience covering a broad range of national and international issues. Her accomplished TV broadcasting career includes extensive experience on both sides of the camera. Starting as a weather reporter, Cheryll quic kly extended her skills and credentials to include talk show host / producer / field reporter / writer and network news anchor. She is uniquely distinguished as the only TV broadcaster to be both a news anchor and degreed meteorologist at the network level. Her career has taken her from her hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee to major markets including Miami, Atlanta, New York, Denver, Kansas City and West Palm Beach. Through Cheryll's prime time broadcasts on CNN and The Weather Channel, her face and voice became familiar to viewers in millions of homes around the world. Cheryll's numerous professional awards include being named "Woman of the Year" by Women in Communications and "Distinguished Alumnus of the Year" by Metropolitan State College in Denver, Colorado.

Stanton T. Friedman (PRG 2004 Hall of Fame inductee), may well be the most recognized researcher in the field of extraterrestrial-related phenomena in the world. He has been making the case for the ETH for over three decades. And he makes it very well. His work intersects many of the core themes of exopolitics. Stanton Friedman spent two years at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey before switching to the University of Chicago in 1953. He received BS and MS degrees in Physics from UC in 1955 and 1956, where Carl Sagan was a classmate. He worked for fourteen years as a nuclear physicist for such companies as General Electric, General Motors, Westinghouse, TRW, Aerojet General Nucleonics, and McDonnell Douglas on such advanced, highly classified, eventually canceled projects as nuclear aircraft, fission and fusion rockets, and nuclear power plants for space.

Since 1967 he has lectured on the topic Flying Saucers ARE Real at more than 600 colleges and over 100 professional groups in fifty s tates, nine Canadian provinces, most of Europe, Brazil, Australia, Korea, Mexico, Turkey, Argentina, and Israel. He has published more than 70 papers on extraterrestrial-related phenomena besides his dozens of conventional articles and appeared on hundreds of radio and TV shows. These include the TNT Larry King UFO Special on Oct.1, 1994; Nightline; Sally Jessie Raphael; Unsolved Mysteries; Entertainment Tonight; Leeza; Sightings; Canada AM; Coast to Coast AM with Art Bell and many more. Stan is the original ci vilian investigator of the Roswell incident, who co-authored Crash at Corona and instigated the Unsolved Mysteries Roswell program. He was heavily involved in both the 1979 documentary UFOs are Real and the 1993 & 1996 videos Flying Saucers Are Real. His new interactive CD ROM, UFOs: The Real Story, was published in 1996. TOP SECRET/MAJIC (Marlowe and Co., NY, 1996), his explosive book about the Majestic 12 group established in 1947 by President Truman to deal with c rashed saucers, includes classified documents never before published. It is already in its 6th printing.

Other speakers already announced include: Stephen Bassett, Paul Davids, Richard Dolan, Ann Druffel, John Greenewald, Jr., Dr. Lynne Kitei, MD, Charles James Hall, Michael S. Heiser, PhD, Bruce Maccabee, PhD, Jaime Maussan, Michael Salla, PhD, Richard Sauder, PhD, David Sereda and Alfred L. Webre, JD.

Full speaker information is posted in the Speaker section at:
www.x-conference.com.

Contact:
Stephen Bassett
202-215-8344

Paradigm Research Group
E-mail: ParadigmRG.nul
URL: www.paradigmclock.com
Cell: 202-215-8344
4938 Hampden Lane, #161
Bethesda, MD 20814

2nd Annual Exopolitics Expo - The X-Conference
Hilton Washington DC North/Gaithersburg
www.x-conference.com
Tapes/DVDs available at: www.lostartsmedia.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Ufology Needs A Ribbon

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 02:12:53 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:27:34 -0500
Subject: Ufology Needs A Ribbon

Say, I was just thinking.

Every other cause celebre has a ribbon to bring attention to it.

There are blue, red, green, and of course yellow ribbons.

Ufology needs a ribbon to commemorate those people who have suffered through this for half a century.

From abductees, whistle blowers, witnesses, researchers, news people, police, believers who have all had to go through the hassles, threats, deaths, ridicule.

How about Silver Ribbons?

I pick that color because so many UFOs have been said to be silver in color and to bring notice to that old saying,

"Every cloud has a silver lining."

Meaning all the junk we've had to go through and still go through there's going to be a bright side to it all.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy!

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:31:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:31:08 -0500
Subject: New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy!

Source: Phenomena Magazine - UK

<http://tinyurl.com/5cj9x>

02-07-05

New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy!
Major new UFO book just published
Project Beta, UFOs and official disinformation

Dateline: Monday,

By: Nick Redfern
By: Phenomena US Editor-in-Chief

Greg Bishop, the editor of the magazine The Excluded Middle, radio host, author and lecturer has just provided the field of UFO research with what is without doubt (in my opinion, at least) one of its finest and most important, published contributions.

Published by Paraview-Pocket Books of New York, the subject matter of Project Beta is an unusual and bizarre one. And I have no hesitation in saying that were it not for the fact that the story is meticulously detailed, referenced and researched by Greg, the reader might be forgiven for thinking that they had stumbled upon the ufological equivalent of a high-tech, X-Files-meets-The Manchurian Candidate (the original, not the horrible re-make)-meets Robert Ludlum-style thriller.

However, Project Beta tells a very real story - and one that is as disturbing and mind-blowing as it is informative.

Seasoned UFO researchers will be aware of certain aspects of this story already as it has been "in the air" so-to-speak for years, but Greg finally nails the case to the wall in detailed fashion and for all to see under one cover.

In essence, the truth-is-stranger-than-fiction book relates the fascinating and compelling story of New Mexico-based physicist Paul Bennewitz, who - after stumbling upon Air Force and National Security Agency secrets at Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, that he believes are connected to the activities of sinister extraterrestrials forces flying around in their UFOs - is literally bombarded (both physically and electronically) with a mass of disinformation, faked stories and outright lies, all carefully provided to him by US Intelligence, with the express intent of diverting him from his research and leading him down the rocky path towards mental and psychological collapse.

While I would urge both anyone and everyone with an interest in UFOs to read Greg's book, it is very unlikely to please some readers - and particularly the I-want-to-believe crowd that foam at the mouth whenever the words "underground alien base," "Roswell," and "alien abductions" surface.

As Greg carefully and skillfully demonstrates, many of the sacred cornerstones upon which much of today's ufological lore are constructed, had their origins not in far-off corners of the galaxy, but in the fertile and imaginative minds of US military intelligence and the behind-the-scenes spook-brigade.

The UFO truth that has captivated so many for so long might not be "out there" after all - in fact, it may all be one big con behind which a veritable plethora of classified, military projects have been carefully hidden.

If there is any justice in the world for the now-deceased and tortured Bennewitz, Project Beta will lead to the opening of floodgates of cosmic proportions that lead to intense questions being asked at a higher, official level about the Bennewitz affair.

Hopefully, those employed within the world of officialdom who manipulated the man to the point of nervous collapse will be made to answer for their actions - and hopefully the lack of mercy shown to Bennewitz will be reflected upon them, in spades.

Project Beta by Greg Bishop is published by Paraview-Pocket Books, New York, and is available from Amazon, Barnes & Noble and all good book-selling outlets.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Renaissance Art & Culture Lacks Link To ETs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:44:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:44:51 -0500
Subject: Renaissance Art & Culture Lacks Link To ETs

Source: The Triangle - A Student Newspaper at
Drexel University Philadelphia

<http://tinyurl.com/6nfbm>

02-04-05

Renaissance Art, Culture Lacks Link To Extraterrestials
By Aaron Sakulich

Beauty is, or so I'm told, more often than not in the eye of the beholder. That's usually a pretty good policy, in my opinion. When people try to claim, however, that they behold not beauty, but rather UFOs in art from the Renaissance and middle ages, I have to draw the line. Last week I spoke about how there is nothing in ancient art that depicts ancient aliens speaking to our ancestors; I'd like to make the same argument here despite the fact that 'aliens' in ancient art and those in art of the renaissance are wildly different.

In ancient art it's mostly reoccurring shapes, such as spirals, and strange looking people, such as the Aborigine 'Brothers of the Lightning' that UFO enthusiasts peg as representing alien influence over human affairs. In Renaissance art, there's a lot of crazy-ass things depicted in paintings. They're harder to explain and, at first glance, appear to show UFOs. I hate to make things simplistic, but my answer to those who have asked what I think about this weird art is that it's all in the eye of the beholder, and I sure as hell don't behold any spaceships.

I can recall the first time I heard the theory that space aliens appeared in renaissance art: someone showed me a picture of the Virgin Mary with a "UFO" in the background. I can distinctly recall looking at it and thinking that it was no UFO, but rather that the Virgin Mary was wearing a beret that looked like a slice of brown baloney. Proof that aliens were visiting Italy in the 1700s? I feel I can make a stronger argument that medieval Italians had some wierd headgear. Sadly, I've never been able to find that painting again.

Obviously, I'm not going to base my entire argument on the fact that these crazy things in artwork don't look like UFOs to me. One other painting I have been able to find is called the Glorification of the Eucharist, painted by Bonaventura Salimbeni in 1600. At first glance it appears to be god and Jesus sitting on thrones, each with a hand on the 'antenna' of a device that looks a lot like Sputnik. It's round, black, and has two long poles sticking out of the top of it.

When I first saw this painting, I was stumped. I had no idea how such a perfect drawing of Sputnik existed in the 1600s. But something seemed a bit odd to me: the two figures have their hands positioned on the 'antenna' not as if they are grasping it, but as if they're holding a pencil. I looked up a clearer, better version of the painting, and was immediately relieved. They're not holding onto a satellite; they're holding onto giant pencils with which they're drawing on the world. On the internet

the orb appears grainy and black, making it look as though the pencils and the earth are connected into a huge satellite-like shape. In better images, it's clear that the orb is the earth and the 'antennae' are pencils are styluses. It's also helpful to recall that during the middle ages Jesus and god were sometimes considered the "divine engineers," the architects who created the universe. This was during the age of building the great cathedrals of Europe; any historian would easily be able to identify this painting as non-UFO related.

And that's the first argument that I have to bolster my contention that there is no proof of past UFO involvement in renaissance culture: there's a lot of garbage and fraud out on the internet, and many people can get suckered in not necessarily by malicious fakes, but by crummy renditions of good pictures. Combine that with the common UFOlogist flair for exaggeration, and I'm sure that's where many of these claims come from.

One picture that has not been distorted by poor imaging is a 17th century fresco depicting the crucifixion. It hangs above the altar in the Svetitskhoveli Cathedral in Mtskheta, Georgia. On either side of the cross are these things that look like jellyfish, hovering in midair. On the underside of these 'jellyfish,' from where the 'tentacles' hang, are the faces of men. The UFOlogist would have you believe that these are clearly paintings showing spacecraft (the round 'bodies' of the 'jellyfish') with men in them (the faces) blasting off (the 'tentacles' are supposedly the flames of a rocket engine.) On the other hand, some historians and artists that it's the artists' way of showing that religious figures (my guess: god and Moses) were watching the crucifixion from on high, and those aren't the flames of booster rockets but rather the shining glow of their holiness. So once again, I ask of you the same question I ask every week when I write this article: which is more likely? That an artist decided to throw some UFOs he'd seen into a piece of artwork, or that the artist tried to represent the omnipotence of his god in a novel, though not really that bizarre when viewed through the lens of reason and sobriety, manner? You don't need Occam's personal approval to know it's the second one.

There's an ancient Chinese woodcut that shows two men standing in a chariot. You can find it everywhere UFOs are discussed. The reason for this is that the chariot has no wheels and is in the middle of the sky. Therefore, some say, UFOs clearly visited the Mandarin Chinese of ancient times. You know what? When I was ten, I drew a picture of a half-man, half-fire truck. It was the coolest thing ever: all the fire-fighting abilities of a fire engine, all the arms and legs of a person. Does this mean that I actually saw one of the things? Perhaps in my fevered nightmares, but certainly not in reality. So that brings me to point three: in matters of art it's rather naive to take everything at literal face value. A flying chariot certainly doesn't say anything about UFOs, and it doesn't even require a whole lot of imagination. In the same manner 'The Crucifixion' above the altar at Visoki Decani Monastery in Kosovo, Yugoslavia, which shows two men riding in half egg, half arrow shaped things in the sky, is interesting. Interesting in that the artist seems to have taken a pretty good amount of artistic license. People claim it shows two men at the controls of spacecraft, flying heavenwards; to me it looks exactly like a man riding in a weird-shaped carriage, except without wheels or horses. The other guy looks like he's riding on the sun. I'd be much more inclined to believe that the artist saw a comet a few nights before and had decided, as medieval religious peasants usually did, that it had some sort of religious connection.

So there you have it. Obviously, I haven't looked at every single piece of artwork out there. But I've laid a basic framework so that you can look at them more critically:

first, make sure that you're looking at an actual painting. Copies of copies of copies, or paintings scanned onto the Internet, can end up badly disfigured. We've seen that even something as simple as the colors coming out a little darker than they really are can have a huge effect on what is shown. Second, don't take anything you see to be the literal truth. A flying chariot in paint is not the same as a flying saucer in real life. third, ask yourself if the object in question looks like something the artist would have seen: a comet-shaped

carriage is, in all likelihood, a stylized comet and nothing more. Fourth, ask yourself: what is more likely? Is it possible that these artists are copying down images of spaceships that they saw first hand? Sure. Is it likely? Not at all. Is it both possible and highly likely that the artists were just taking a little creative license and using their imagination? Absolutely.

I have yet to see anything that convinces me UFOs or aliens were interacting with medieval painters. Keep these common-sense guidelines in mind and you'll have the same trouble.

Aaron Sakulich is a senior majoring in materials science and engineering.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

Here's Why I Believe In UFOs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:50:44 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:50:44 -0500
Subject: Here's Why I Believe In UFOs

Source: Bolton Evening News - Bolton, Lancashire

<http://tinyurl.com/5obfu>

02-01-05

Here's Why I Believe In UFOs
by Fred Shawcross

Do you believe in UFOs? Have you ever seen one? Do you know someone who has? That might not be the most discussed topic among your family and friends but it certainly beats Celebrity Big Brother and who is doing what to whom in Emmerdale.

Those of us fascinated by, and possibly a little apprehensive about alien visitors, have read and heard details of revelations contained in Britain's X-files, the thousands of classified documents relating to reports of UFOs, recently released under the Freedom of Information laws.

The more "believable sightings" documented in the 1970s - a thinly-veiled reference to those credited to people more likely to be accepted as reliable witnesses - were reported by RAF personnel, British Airways pilots and senior police officers. These were more or less similar in that the objects first hovered, then moved at colossal speeds.

They were mostly saucer-shaped and surrounded by, or displaying, very bright lights. It is also worth mentioning that on one occasion, a sighting by RAF servicemen was supported by reports that unidentified objects had been spotted on defence radar screens.

I'm glad that these sightings of UFOs have been made official because it gives me a chance to go public on an incident which, though it happened more than 30 years ago, still causes the hairs to rise on the back of my neck.

And it is the absolute truth. I was travelling home from Park Hall, Charnock Richard, where I was a member of the resident band. It was my turn to drive, so I was alcohol-free. My two companions had had a few scoops but were by no means "bombed".

It was early morning in mid-summer. The sky was clear and with little else on the road, we were chugging along, talking amicably, when suddenly, out of the corner of my eye, I became aware that there was something above my vehicle, to the right. It was round, very brightly lit and appeared motionless, as if sizing up the car. I didn't need to tell my two friends. They had spotted it and looked as scared as I was.

Being beamed up and transported to the Planet Zog without a tearful goodbye to the wife and kids, or a change of underwear, isn't a particularly enchanting prospect, though it would probably be considered a Godsend by all parties these days. However, I digress. After what seemed an eternity, but could only have been minutes, the UFO zoomed off at an incredible

speed and vanished. We all saw it. The UFO could not have been imagined or an alcohol-fuelled illusion.

Those of us who believe in extra-terrestrials theorise that if men can reach the moon, and put unmanned spacecraft on planets light years from Earth, what reason is there for doubting life forms from other solar systems are dropping in to have a look at us?

They could land in Emmerdale [a British TV Soap locale]. What an interplanetary experience that would be. A close encounter of any kind with the Dingle clan would be enough to abort that mission and bring a premature end to plans for a global take-over.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 7](#)

It's A Close Encounter In The Park

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:55:17 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 16:55:17 -0500
Subject: It's A Close Encounter In The Park

Source: Preston Today - Preston, Lancashire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/4cjcj>

02-04-05

It's A Close Encounter In The Park

A spaceship has landed in Worden Park! But do not panic. Leyland has not being taken over by aliens.

The park is one of the settings in a new sci-fi action film being made by Lancashire film director and stuntman, Mark Strange.

Mark, 30, of Dunkirk Lane, Leyland, is famed for his kung fu roles in Jackie Chan movies and plays a ninja in the latest Batman Film.

The martial arts expert has been working on his own movie, Displaced, for four years.

The expensive project has been running for four years =96 so long that Leyland brickworks, where early scenes were shot, has since shut down.

The film kept stalling as the cast and crew try to find more funding to finish it off.

But finally there is just 12 days worth of filming left before the father-of-one puts his project into post-production. Mark said: "Getting to this stage has been a real community effort with local residents and traders raising sponsorship for the film, and I am very grateful.

"A screenplay like this has never been filmed in Lancashire before and I am really hoping to put the county on the map. It is well known for short films but not sci-fi films. It is an inspirational place.

"But we need more funding to finish off the film. We plan to go to the Cannes Film Festival to promote it in May."

Filmed across the North West, Displaced tells the tale of a humanoid alien that wants to search for secret files compiled by the British Government on captured extra terrestrial aircraft and their pilots.

Stem, played by Mark himself, wants to find out what happened to his father.

Special forces are ordered to use the files as bait to capture other advance aliens for secret experiments but a corrupt leader has his own agenda to sell the files on the black market.

A British soldier then has to destroy the dangerous man and locate the file before it is destroyed.

It features a spaceship landing on Rivington Pike, near Chorley, and taking off from Worden Park in Leyland.

In order to film the scene at Rivington, Mark had to make a miniature figure of the moorland, creating the telegraph pole out of

Other scenes have been filmed in the Dunkirk Hall public house... Mark's local.

[stef.hall](#).nul

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 08:13:34 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 06:53:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program - Lehmborg

>From: Bill Weber <wweber1.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:13:50 -0500
>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 09:03:27 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 09:36:44 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Peter Jennings' UFO Program

><snip>

>>>My guess is that for the first part of the show, we'll be
>>>titled with a few intriguing cases, but by the end of the
>>>program, we'll all be reassured that we have nothing to lose
>>>sleep over and that orthodox assessments cover all.

>>Indeed, Edward R. Murrow, Walter Cronkite, Mike Wallace, and
>>Larry King (et sig al) have taken righteous issue with UFOs in
>>the past 50 years... well into prime time... and it was if their
>>microphones were never on. I'm hoping that it's different this
>>time. My feeling is that it will be different this time.

><snip>

>I'd like to know where this positive vibe comes from, especially
>from someone [Jennings] wedged firmly within the reality based
>community.

<snip>

Why - my optimism comes, largely, as a result of your
involvement, Mr. Weber, among significant others... smart
persons plugged into a communications grid we individuals have
never had before that can end run the 'official' grid to explore
things on our own.

Moreover, we are in a position of increasing strength vis a vis
this new grid/network/web that sees the masses abandoning the
corrupted mainstream to sites/blogs/lists... efforts such as our
own, and we are in a better position to hold the 'mainstream's'
feet to the righteous fire... more quickly burn them down, make
them irrelevant or otherwise hasten their self-inflicted
abandonment. So, thank you. <g>

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Pulitzer Pass-ups & A "Flatwoods Monster" Redux

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 08:16:58 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 06:57:30 -0500
Subject: Pulitzer Pass-ups & A "Flatwoods Monster" Redux

Pulitzer Pass-ups & A "Flatwoods Monster" Redux
by Alfred Lehmborg

[Book Review: The Braxton County Monster: The Cover-Up of the Flatwoods Monster Revealed by author/investigator Frank C. Feschino, Jr. and published by Quarrier Press (Charleston, WV-2004)]

On "Strange Days Indeed" with Errol Bruce-Knapp I heard Stanton Friedman say that Frank Feschino's book on the Flatwoods monster would likely never win a Pulitzer. He's likely right.

Only... you'd be taking Friedman well out of contest if you left it there. Maybe it's not for the reason most immediately thought of -- that reason concerning suspiciously judgmental mainstream assessments that it wasn't good enough. Polished enough. Detailed enough. Cited enough...

...Appropriate enough. Pertinent enough...

...Important enough?

I'm betting that's not Mr. Friedman thinking, either. Verily, he seems to have a key understanding just how important Feschino's book actually is.

Indeed, a close look at Mr. Feschino's book and detailed research begs the question. Is it good enough?

The reader discovers he doesn't have to squint his eyes very much, at all, to begin to wonder if that might indeed be so. That's right. It might be good enough, after all...

What did Mr. Pulitzer extort the intrepid aspirates for his prize to do, anyway, but:

[a] Unflinchingly study the social, political, and moral realities of fellow human beings.

[b] Make accurate records of the expressions regarding the character displayed by these fellow individuals, and...

[c] Report, equally unflinchingly, on the principles of the aggregate world condition as it is, and has been, reflected by the persons employing these principles.

I submit that a case could be made that Mr. Feschino has abundantly addressed each of the preceding points in turn... and in spades. That's right.

...But he'll never win a Pulitzer. He can't. To recognize Frank

Feschino for a Pulitzer is to knock a supporting cornerstone from the edifice of a stagnant, officious, and largely illegitimate "status quo" we all continue to endure. Feschino can't get a Pulitzer, flatly, because the establishment lacks the sack it needs to cut its own throat to give him one.

I won't pretend that this is enough justification for an establishment's reluctance to take its own life. Some throats, very likely, should be cut, I suspect, but I digress.

Be much of that as it may, Frank Feschino took more than 15 years of his life to rationally actualize on one startling set of very unsettling conclusions. These were conclusions sensibly kindled by a chance serendipitous interview he'd made near the start of his remarkable quest, an interview startling ...even during a first investigative wash. After that interview the data would accumulate steeply over the next decade and change what began as a garden variety school project... and turned it into a life's work and consuming occupation.

In this investigative effort he was, again, unflinching in a study of the sociopolitical realities revealed to him. He was made aware of moral and ethical sub-realities that these larger realities further implied. Indeed 'Reality' was revealed, considered, and then assiduously chronicled by him. In the final analysis (and we'd have never heard about it otherwise, good reader), Feschino came, he saw, and he wrote it down.

The data are revealing. Feschino reports them to us in detail. Indeed, we weren't in 'Kansas' any more after 1952... and may not, I submit (remembering a wealth of old history indicating same), have ever been in 'Kansas'.

...We're not in 'Kansas'... now. Get used to it.

That aforementioned tumultuous "interview", an interview with the ranking military person peculiarly involved with the Flatwoods affair (...a hard as nails hero of the second world war...) occurred in a moment of idle interest born of distracted and tentative conjecture on the part of an unassuming Mr. Feschino. Mr. Feschino's initial interest, actually, was with regard to a little film documentary he might put together about the Flatwoods "myth," for school. What it turned into would be a taproot into the most important events of our (or any other) time, or... yes...

...Even more compelling evidence that we are not alone in billions of years of space, time, and surface area... a googleplex of alien surface areas and maybe even a googleplex of aliens to inhabit them! More than the reader can imagine is hidden behind a grain of sand held at arms length, sir or madam. The warm breath of unguessed infinity is only the beginning of the beginning for all of us.

We are not alone, folks. An antithesis is ludicrous. Moreover, all the major propeller heads, a few of the high-domes, and a smattering of leading-edge, vetted, and credentialed intelligentsia think it's ludicrous, too. I digress, again. Sorry.

Something occurred in Braxton County, West Virginia September 12, 1952. The data are beyond convincing. Something occurred as surely as flying saucers came close to landing on the White House lawn in July of the same year... and they did come close to landing on the lawn, reader. Believe that, too.

In the town of Flatwoods, Braxton county West Virginia... on a warm Indian Summer evening and interrupting playing children and relaxing adults at the end of their day... multiple objects interacted with multiple witnesses, people were made ill, and a dog ran home in gibbering fright... then subsequently died. None of the participants were ever the same again.

Justifying a Pulitzer, Mr. Feschino makes a durable record of the expressions of character displayed by dozens of individuals concerned with, and material to, this affair... people both guilty and innocent in the affair... by persons both truth telling and glibly lying regarding the affair... by folks both brave and cowardly, warm and cold, by persons encountered on a foggy 'audit trail' Feschino was compelled to plod... a trail rife with dead ends, detours, and official

double-dealings. It's quite a ride. Mr. Toad has nothing on Mr. Feschino.

Moreover, the satisfied requirements for Mr. Feschino's Pulitzer seem to steadily resolve.

Verily, Mr. Feschino risked bodily harm on numerous occasions during his investigation. This threat would come, ironically, as a result of the very persons from which he'd have to draw his story. Consider.

In fourteen years Mr. Feschino was too often mistaken for the same kind of cheap-shot reporter or faux-journalist investigator who'd glutted the area since that fateful night, axe-grinding skeptibunkers coyly generating the disdain, the derision, and the patent disrespect stalwart Flatwoods witnesses had had to endure for half a century -- an unwarranted contempt and ridicule imposed that innocent people unjustly suffered... punished by their own society for having the temerity to stand up and report the highly strange account they had all had on that bizarre September night. The "Mothman Mechanism" at work again.

I suspect Feschino had his shirt-front grabbed more that a few times by this angry group of betrayed citizenry. He was so threatened on more than one occasion.

Again, with regard to Pulitzer, the questions remain begged. Has not Mr. Feschino reported on the principles of the aggregate world and the condition reflected by them? Has he not spent many years tirelessly trying to ferret out important details that would have gone undiscovered and unreported but for his painstaking research and unflinching perseverance? Has he not validated a couple of generations of innocent persons trying to come to grips with the inexplicable thrust upon them? Has he not vindicated these people to some extent and alleviated some of their suffering as a result of his work? Such a person may have earned more than a mere Pulitzer at the denouement.

Does 'Nobel' have a category that applies?

All things equal? Feschino earns his Pulitzer. He has more sack than many who've aspired to that prize, I suspect. Moreover, I'll bet Mr. Friedman agrees with me. He wins my award, at any rate.

Along those same lines, Mr. Feschino can not be faulted for his brave attempt to fill the societally imposed "information void" (he suffers with the rest of us) by starting at the end of an incredible story rife with suspicious details and curious facts... and then working arduously -- modeling, graphing, and plotting backwards on that stark trail... trying, thoughtfully, to connect these ephemeral dots... flesh out one more 'official' story that won't add up from the 'official' account... This is a key concept, folks.

Indeed, his admitted speculations and clearly identified personal beliefs may actually add up, ironically, to the astonishing conjectures he reports in his book. It just may be, reader, that there was an aerial battle with ET out in the Atlantic that night in 1952. It may be that 8 to 10 American jets were destroyed in that struggle, their crews lost. Perhaps one Lt. Jones and crew, valiantly sacrificing themselves, even rammed one of the UFOs, bravely, with his plane in the one-sided fight we likely provoked...

Given that a postwar American military was aggressively over-touchy and otherwise spring-loaded on the balls of their very twitchy feet... especially after the repeated over-flights of prohibited airspace in Washington D.C. the previous July... it's not that much of a stretch that it would react decisively to multiple UFO's and their blithe transgressions of an imaginary fighting line on the coastal ADIZ (Air Defense Identification Zone) with folding-fin rockets and exploding 50 caliber machine gun fire! Further, Feschino's speculation is not unreasonable given the statement by Benjamin Chidlaw, a four star general commanding the very high profile "Air Defense Command", to wit: that many "planes and crews" had been "lost" trying to "intercept UFOs"... these are his words, it's reported.

Mr. Feschino is not making the story up, at any rate, I'm

confident. Mr. Feschino is trying to make sense of the very real story that is already there. Extant is a sincerity in his book, as a result, that this writer can relate to and find some substance in.

Additionally, I don't believe, especially after having spoken with him for a couple of hours (where I asked some pretty pointed questions), that Mr. Feschino has it in him to write a sociopathic fiction, fobbed off to the credulous as fact, to crab their dollars... then smirk at that reader's "nose-bubble credulity" as he orders up goth hookers and greasy cheeseburgers. No, Feschino's only telling you the credible story he knows, or... he is otherwise hanging some 'substance' on the astonishing facts that he has uncovered.

Moreover, his book publisher, predictably weighing size against profit, winnowed down the manuscript to 350 pages, about a third of its former size. There is more there, more to the story, than you get in the published book, reader... witnesses you don't hear from... unsolicited and credible reports about other involvements, other sightings in the area, and still other startling corroborations of fact and circumstance attendant to the whole astonishing affair! It's breathtaking, actually.

Also, it's all very hard to discount. Increasingly so.

An extraterrestrial being (or artifact of et intelligence) arrived Earth-side in a damaged craft... rightly or wrongly terrorized an entire town of good, sober, and horse-sensed people in September of 1952, and then the government worked furiously, if deceptively, to cover it all up... impugning the honor of the aforementioned citizenry (and ourselves!) in the process... Tragic and needless sadness.

As Feschino wrote to me in the inscription of the review copy he sent:

"The questions and answers I have provided in this book are only the beginning..."

I suspect that quote comes up as a bit of an understatement from Mr. Feschino. But that's my feeling. I'm comfortable going with it. I submit you can too.

Get more info about Mr. Feschino's book at:

<http://www.flatwoodsmonster.com/>

Read on!

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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://www.AliensOnEarth.com)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 09:41:18 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 06:59:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 20:02:18 +0000
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>No answer because it is totally irrelevant to anything under
>discusison here. How much time have you spent studying
>scientific philosophy, the history of science, symbolic logic?

Richard:

For some reason (or unreason) you seem locked into formal logic and scientific philosophy when quantum mechanics and UFOs themselves defy logic, as Bertrand Russell, and even Wittgenstein would agree I think.

You can't apply logic, no matter how hard you keep trying, to the UFO phenomenon, nor to how the government and military have handled the matter.

It's time to move into the 21st Century and leave the 19th Century, when the Civil War took place (your specialty), and join those who want new-think to take place, which might allow for a resolution to the UFO mystery that hasn't happened with the thinking you and others here keep espousing.

(And I'm a fan of yours... regardless of your antiquated thought.)

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 11:45:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 07:05:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 20:02:18 +0000
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 15:11:15 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

><snip>

>>Dick, once again you have made a claim unsupported by any
>>evidence about secret science:

>If you would pay attention to what I say, you wouldn't keep
>going off on the tangent of technology development done in
>secret. I gave you a specific example of what I was talking
>about. Do you care to defend that as legitimate science?

And just what example is that and how do you know what was done
with it? If you are talking about the Socorro stuff.

>>1. Many great scientists have done outstanding science in
>>secrecy.. think Glenn Seaborg, Enrico Fermi, Luis Allvarez as
>>the tip of the iceberg... all were Nobel-ists.

>>2. In the second place, it is clear that it is Air Force Policy
>>_not_ to admit to flying saucer reality.Should they advertise in
>>the papers... "wanted scientific analysis of possible trace
>>effects produced by flying saucers?" We are looking for any
>>scraps of info that might help us understand the technology...
>>call this toll free number....

>This seems a mite sarcastic to me, Stan. I would expect anyone
>interested in doing true science to make thei findings available
>to peers for review, and disseminate the results. The fact that
>military agencies and governments sometimes don't behave
>scientifically is my entire point. They hide information and
>manipulate the truth for private and often dubious reasons. You
>seem unable to grasp the simple, philosophical point I am
>making.

I have no idea why you have these expectations, Dick. There is
nothing in the definitions of science that I can find that says
anything about "true science requires making findings available
to peers for review and dissemination." Available to whom?
Dissemination to whom? Everyone? The general public? The news
media? Scientists in other countries working under security?
People working under security are not working in a vacuum. They
have peers.

Science is defined (Websters):

"Knowledge, especially of facts or principles gained by
systematic study; a particular branch of knowledge esp. one
dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged
and showing the operation of general laws; as the science of

mathematics; systematized knowledge, esp. of the laws and facts of the physical or material world; skill resulting from training.

Scientific method: A research method characterized by the definition of a problem, the gathering of data, and the drafting and empirical testing of the hypotheses."

Nothing here about dissemination and making widely available. How the funding agencies deal with the results is politics not science. I am not defending the occasional over classification of scientific work. Secrecy and Science is not an oxymoron, Dick.

>>3. The woman in question was local and available and talented.
>>The point of her work was to provide rapid information... not to
>>submit a paper for a scientific journal to be sent all about for
>>"Peer review" and eventually to be published or maybe not.
>>Classified research is done to provide information rapidly to
>>help in problem solving... not for publish or perish. For all we
>>know several others may have done small pieces of somewhat
>>related research. The USAF certainly had plenty of very talented
>>people in New Mexico and elsewhere to look at the big picture

>If they did and have kept it secret from the public for 60
>years, is that science? Or is that a serious abuse of what
>science is supposed to be?

Science is the work that was done in the lab and writing it up.

Non-dissemination has nothing to do with whether or not it is science.

Clearly the US government has a policy of not admitting the reality of flying saucers. That is a political decision not a scientific one. It may also be philosophical.....

>>In short then, plenty of real science is done when the results
>>are concealed from the public. There are plenty of scientific
>>peers working in secrecy.

>Our difference appears to be a semantical one over the meaning
>of the word 'science.' Yes, people can find things out in
>secret.

>>Remember, one can't tell one's friends without telling one's
>>enemies. Secrecy is an important way of protecting our security.

>And boy is it ever overdone! To the point of stifling good
>scientific research and causing tremendous duplication of
>effort.

How do you know it is overdone if you haven't had access? How do you know there is tremendous duplication because of security?

>>Is all classified research first rate? Of course not. Is all
>>unclassified research first rate, even if published in a peer
>>reviewed journal? Of course not.

>>I was fortunate in my 14 years of work on classified programs to
>>work with a number of outstanding scientists and engineers. We
>>had access to exotic materials, topnotch instrumentation, advice
>>from very sharp people.

>Yes, and what became of it all? Any worthwhile hardware?

Lots of good reports out there. Nuclear rocket engines were successfully tested. Nuclear power supplies for space systems have been widely used. Considerable useful materials research was done. But here again the use to which the fine scientific work was put is politics, not science.

>>How much time did you work on scientific programs, classified
>>and unclassified, to provide a basis for your conclusions? I
>>asked you this before... no answer then.

>No answer because it is totally irrelevant to anything under
>discussion here. How much time have you spent studying
>scientific philosophy, the history of science, symbolic logic?

It isn't irrelevant if you don't know what classified scientific work has been done and how it compares with unclassified work.

Re philosophy etc, ot nearly as much time as you have Dick. But I spent a lot of time doing science and interacting with many others doing science... not so much talking about it. Also I spent a lot of time looking at classified abstracts to find out what others were doing... even if I didn't always have a need to know for the resultant reports.

>>You have been on the outside and the shades are drawn. How can >>you make a judgement in this matter?

>This must be an 'insider' joke, right? Again, you are entirely >missing my point. The secret manipulation of information that >you are defending as 'science' is not what science was ever >intended to be and violates many of the principles of science >that scientists often pay lip service to. Of course it goes on. >But to call it science in the real meaning of science is >oxymoronic. That's my entire point.

What in the world has secret manipulation - presumably of the results of scientific research - have to do with science?

Of course I don't call this supposed "secret manipulation" science.

The research done by the scientists is the science.

The manipulation, presumably if done at all, done by program directors, government managers, etc, of the final results, is not.

Surely you can see the difference?

It would be nice if you spoke of specific instances rather than taking a broad brush to the scientific work done under security about which you seem to know very little. "Secrecy and science" is not an Oxymoron.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Minot B-52 Case [was: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?]

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:07:41 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 07:11:17 -0500
Subject: Minot B-52 Case [was: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?]

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 18:12:35 -0000
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 11:48:08 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>>According to a more recent inquiry, at
>>Minot AFB, on October 24, 1968, a UFO was seen during 45 minutes
>>over a Minuteman missile site. security alarms were activated.
>>An outdoor silo door was opened, which weighted 20 tons! There
>>are some twenty witnesses on that case, which lasted several
>>hours in all. In such a case, there is no need of a long
>>statistical study to realize that it is of very high
>>significance. There was a "message", there, and I bet that it
>>was understood.

>I'm not familiar with this case. At the risk of tempting you to
>paint me as a debunker of the purest pelicanist persuasion, let
>me ask: Does the List have a collective opinion on the verity of
>this story? Is it properly documented? Is the source known, and
>authoritative? Have those 20 witnesses independently and openly
>verified the claim, or are they at least identified? Are there
>any official records?

Martin, Josh and all,

I am also answering to Josh Goldstein who asked for details.

Firstly, Jan Aldrich has just confirmed the case, being himself
one of the researchers on the case. See his message passed on
February 5 about the ABC UFO Special, which is going to present
it. This is a very serious question, and so, let's quote him
here:

"Tom Tulien and I interviewed the primary witness on the Minot
B-52 case several years ago. His story was fantastic, but later
interviews by Tom Tulien and others showed that crewmen
supported the story and gave their observations from their
positions on the aircraft. (Aside: This case is discussed in
several UFO books, but with the wrong date, and the significance
of the case is not communicated to the reader.)

Radar photographs of the UFO exist and were analyzed by various
official and unofficial sources. The Strategic Air Command
intelligence officer who analyzed the radar photographs kept a
set for himself and was also interviewed by Tom."

"This case is not a USAF "unknown" rather it has a silly
official explanation which amused some of the crewmembers during
their interviews."

Now, maybe you are going to laugh a bit, but the story has been published in French for nearly a year now, in the book of J. J. Velasco, the engineer in charge of UFOs at CNES (National Center of Space Studies). Yes, is still in charge, although SEPRA has been closed, pending a new organisation under study. The book is entitled "OVNIS. L'evidence", and it may be translated in english, later this year, I am told.

There are nearly five pages on Minot, 1968 (pp 162 to 167), based on information presented in the "catalogue of Dominique Weinstein, case No 732". This catalogue is surely based itself on the research of the group "Sign Oral History", in which I think that several persons on this list participate. So, it's already pretty well known information, and I am surprised, Martin, that you don't know about it!

The basic facts are the following, according to Velasco (if there are mistakes, thank you to anyone who will correct them): Date: 24 October 1968 (not 1956, date given in the "Hynek UFO report", and in the Mufon UFO Journal No 282 of October 1991). Minuteman missile base of Minot, ND.

Total duration of observations: 2 hours 15 minutes.

Twenty witnesses, 14 of whom on the ground, and 6 on board a B-52H bomber.

Observation recorded by radar on the ground and radar on board. When the UFO passed near the bomber, radio communications were interrupted.

The object landed at the same moment that alarms of one of the missile silos were activated. Its doors were found opened by the security services.

Inquiries were made by Blue Book officers but, in the BB archives (even in the most complete 16 mm version at Maxwell AFB), there are testimonies of only six witnesses on the ground and one crew member of the B-52, the co-pilot. In 2000 and 2001, the Sign Oral History group recorded on video the testimonies of five crew members, including the pilot. Many elements absent of the archives have thus been brought up to date.

I am not going to translate the four pages of Velasco, but here are a few more details.

At 3am, local time, A B-52 bomber flying at about 39 miles from the base has an unidentified echo on its radar screens, moving at about 3,000 mph. The UFO comes along the plane, accompanies it during 20 miles, and goes. Several pictures of the radar screen are taken. When the UFO is next to the plane, none of the two UHF radios function.

At the same time, at the base, a maintenance technician driving his car signals a bright red-orange object at an altitude of about 1,000 feet, emitting a sound similar to a jet engine. He stops his car, starts it again, and the object seems to be following him.

It then accelerates and comes to a stand at about 6 to 8 miles from there. The witness loses sight of it.

Fourteen other military, technicians, police officers, see a similar object at various locations of the base. They have described a large object (apparent size as large as the Sun), too big for a plane, of red-orange colour. At one time, appears a second, similar object, which joins the first. The radar echo is comparable to the one of a KC-135 refueling plane (see below a different estimation).

The B-52 is directed to the location of the visual observation, at about 10 miles, north-west of the base. The crew confirms the visual observation of a bright light which seems to be hovering just above the ground. When the plane approaches at about two miles, the object is apparently still, above the ground. Seen from the plane, it seems to be surrounded with a light oblong halo on one side, and with an orange stain on the other side. The main body appears like a bright white light.

Observers on the ground have also noted the capacity of the object to change direction and speed-up abruptly.

At 4 h 49 am, the exterior and interior alarms of the missile silo Oscar 7 are triggered, at the control and security service. The site is at about 10 miles to the north of the site. An alert security team is sent to Oscar 7. It first discovers that the chain of the fence has been broken, and then that the horizontal door of the missile silo, of about 20 tons, is wide open. No trace of vehicle on the ground will be found.

When interviewed in 2,000, the pilot Bradford Runyon, instructor-pilot of the B-52, said that, at first, they feared an immediate collision, owing to the great speed of the object, estimated at 3,000 mph. But it slowed down and came to the left of the B-52. It departed at about 10 miles from the base, and seemed to land. The pilot intended to land also, but he was ordered to go back and fly over the UFO, at an altitude of about 2,000 feet. The radar pictures have shown a target five times the size of a KC-135 plane.

It is to note that the Condon report was approved two months later, on January 8, 1969 by the national Academy of Science! By the way, would someone remember at what time the Salt negotiation took place? I think that the Salt 2 Agreement was signed by President Richard Nixon in 1972. I just wonder if there could be some relationship there... One thing we can be sure of, is that such a spectacular and disturbing sighting could not be made public at that time. Now, is it significant that it will be mentioned on a national TV program this month?

Gildas Bourdais

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 08:17:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 07:12:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Rudiak

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 16 Jan 2005 10:51:13 -0800
>>Fwd Date: Mon, 17 Jan 2005 08:53:54 -0500
>>Subject: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>The narrative is taken from FATE magazine for July 1961, and
>>came via Loren Gross.

>>A trio of musicians were northbound on US 395 from Southern
>>California to Reno, NV. One Dick Drake (sounds like a typical
>>stage name of the era) was seated in the middle of the front
>>seat flanked by 2 sidemen. A string bass probably took up the
>>entire back seat, though that is unstated (I used to do that).

>>Anyhow, at 3:50 AM, a few minutes north of Big Pine, CA, putting
>>them a few miles south of Bishop, CA, a huge 'flying saucer',
>>width of a full city block, passed over at around 12,000' feet
>>altitude (judged from Mt. Whitney which is 14,000 ft or so),
>>going generally east or ENE toward the Nevada state line.

<snip>

>>A search for Dick Drake led in circles. He was on his way for a
>>band engagement at a club in Reno. One sideman played accordion,
>>I doubt they made the annals of music history.

>>My question is this: Would FATE magazine have invented a story
>>like this, beginning to end, in 1961? The details are almost
>>too good, precise date, time of day, location, altitude etc. I'm
>>so used to imprecision for those data that I got suspicious,
>>maybe overly so.

>>There is also the possibility that FATE faithfully reproduced a
>>bogus account from 'Dick Drake'.

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>Date: Mon, 17 Jan 2005 14:38:06 -0800
>Fwd Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2005 09:26:16 -0500
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

>For reference, the incident is placed at 0340 hrs (3:40 AM,
>still dark) on US 395 perhaps 10 miles North of Big Pine, CA. on
>the morning of 18 April 1960, when a "BIG SAUCER", emphasis from
>Dick Drake, passed over the car headed generally East.

I've already communicated this to Larry in e-mail. On a trip to
Nevada this past week, I was able to verify from newspaper
microfilm from the two Reno newspapers that the Dick Drake trio
was very real and played Harrah's Club Reno starting April 18.
This part of the story completely checks out.

Overall I reviewed about 10 Nevada newspapers for any UFO
reports from April 18 or the next few days, but there were no
UFO reports of any kind. I did find a SETI-type story on the
search for aliens by radio telescope and a Las Vegas casino ad
featuring an alien saying "Take me to your dealer." That's about
it. Oh yes, one of the Reno movie theaters was named "Majestic."
Coincidence? We think not!

I've begun checking into the other entertainers performing with the Dick Drake trio at Harrah's hoping maybe the Drake bunch told them about the sighting. An internet search confirms at least two of them dead. However, a relative of one of them is interested in digging into it, so with a little luck maybe there will be further to report soon.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:41:42 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:00:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Bourdais

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Monday, February 07, 2005 5:07 PM
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>By the way, would someone remember at what
>time the Salt negotiation took place ? I think that the Salt 2
>Agreement was signed by President Richard Nixon in 1972.

I made a mistake:

Salt 1: negotiation started in 1969-11-7, agreement signed in 1972.

Salt 2: negotiation started in 1975-01-31, agreement signed in 1979.
(Brejnev - Carter).

Gildas Bourdais

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Infrasound UFO Detection

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 12:20:35 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:02:38 -0500
Subject: Infrasound UFO Detection

Maybe its a lame idea, but I came across the following while reviewing a document called "Natural background infrasound and signals from Apollo 14 and aircraft", Posmentier, 1971.

Excerpt:

"On several other occasions, qualitatively similar signals were found to agree with visual observations of aircraft. The continuously varying azimuth, localization, high coherency and high horizontal phase speed of the signal indicate that its source must be rapidly moving, local, point-like and above-ground. We therefore conclude that this signal was generated by an aircraft, ALTHOUGH NONE WAS VISIBLE OR AUDIBLE AT THE TIME AND PLACE OF THE RECORDING." (My dramatically Caps).

"The analysis and interpretation of this signal not only confirms the proper functioning of the instrumentation and the applicability to our data reduction techniques used, but also that the high frequency infrasound may be an effective technique for passive detection and tracking of aircraft, including aircraft not audible to the human ear, and aircraft for which active detection and tracking techniques such as radar are not appropriate."

These excerpts raises some interesting points.

1) Did they record an average everyday aircraft way back in 1971 even though it was invisible? (Apparently a separate set of microphones 30 km away did not detect it.)

I wish they had documented the weather, visibility, etc.

2) Can this be a nice method to track UFOs (instead of or in addition to passive radar)?

We remember how often animals have been affected by UFO presence. An example, in Rutledge's book, pg 166:

"At 11:02, the police dog became alert. His ears stood erect, and the fur ruffled his back. Suddenly, his demeanor changed to one of fear. He ran to Rettig, cowered, then burrowed between the man's legs. Rettig said he had never seen the dog act afraid. Surely, the fear shown by the big German shepherd was not caused by something hiding in the knee-high soybeans, which were below the height of the dog. Instinctively, I looked straight up, and for an instant, I thought that I saw a dark form. A chill went down my back. Although, the entire episode hadn't lasted more than a minute or so, a definite uneasiness pervaded our group.

(Later, my wife) said that when the dog became afraid, she felt as if some invisible object were flying overhead. ... She too thought that she had perceived a dark form overhead. Although our perceptions agreed, as a scientist, I had to discard them. (my comments: I assume because there was no recordable data)

Some have attributed this effect on animals to ultrasound, but could it also be infrasound? Animals are affected during

earthquakes which obviously have large infrasound emissions.

Any one have other cases where infrasound may be implicated?

More report equipment details:

The microphones used were sensitive to 1-16 Hz. (Fehr and Fiske Aerophones employed thermistors to measure the flow in a tube connecting a reference volume to the environment. The outputs control Vidar voltage controlled oscillators and recorded to tape along with a time tag. The microphone were arranged in a star pattern (9 meters between star legs).

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 14:25:01 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:06:39 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>Source: ABC News

>><http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=468496>

>I've been following discussion here about this forthcoming
>2 hour ABC special about the UFO phenomenon. I'd like to offer my
>take on it which represents my own exopolitical approach to this
>phenomenon rather than the more traditional nuts and bolts
>approach of UFO researchers.

>I notice from the list of interviewees and cases that this show
>will repeat the same old formula of classic case sightings and
>veteran UFO researchers discussing why we should consider
>'lights in the sky' as a serious phenomenon, and why their nuts
>and bolts approach is legitimate research.

Michael are you psychic? I know I didn't talk about lights in
the sky (I never do) and I very much doubt if Dick Hall or
Jerome Clark or Michael Swords did. I do think our nuts and
bolts approach is legitimate. Of course that includes large
scale scientific studies, physical trace cases, radar visual
sightings involving multiple witnesses, etc

>It seems that the producers of the Peter Jennings show have been
>persuaded by veteran UFO researchers and 'others' that he needs to
>stick to the same old formula of focusing on 'lights in the sky' and
>having the same old pro and con debates, rather than looking at
>Disclosure Project witnesses and others who have direct EBE
>experiences.

They interviewed 150 people including many witnesses. Do you
have a list or are you intuiting who these witnesses were?

>It's as though the emergence of whistleblowers/contactees
>disclosing their role in suppressing UFO secrets, and actually
>witnessing extraterrestrial biological entities (EBEs) and/or
>their ships hasn't happened.

<snip>

>The latest whistleblower/contactee that offers testimony with
>serious exopolitical significance is Charles Hall whom I
>recommend to the list as someone who is both credible and
>significant- see:

><http://www.exopolitics.org/charles-hall.htm>

I take it you have seen some evidence on which to base
acceptance of the tall whites parading around Hall's part of
Nevada? You have checked his military and college records? I
suppose you want everybody to accept Bob Lazar and Michael Wolf
Kruvant as whistleblowers in the know? They don't check out.

>I think that the Peter Jennings special may ultimately

>dissappoint since its main premises are inappropriate to the
>>true challenge in understanding the UFO/exopolitical phenomenon
>before us.

I read with great disappointment Alfred Webre's Exopolitics book. It is loaded with proclamations without providing any evidence to support them. What newsman will accept those on face value? Why should they?

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 14:52:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:08:40 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

<snip>

>The general public is moving beyond this myopic focus on 'lights
>in the sky' and are seriously exploring the testimonies of
>whistleblowers/contactees revealing 'lies on the ground'.

I sincerely pray you are right! That is definitely 'where the
action is!'

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 14:55:10 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:09:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - White

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:44:51 EST
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>If you attack the cherished belief in ETH with rational argument
>of any kind you will be attacked personally.

Since when is the ETH 'irrational'?

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 14:59:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:10:40 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:08:33 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

<snip>

>I don't know what to expect. I'm experiencing the same
>excitement/nervousness that I felt before the election, and we
>know how that turned out.

Some members of this List have access to some of the Jennings
production company, right?

Would there be any benefit in those Listers asking their
contacts now if the government whistleblowers will be mentioned,
at least?

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Landahl

From: Erik Landahl <landahl1.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 12:43:24 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:14:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Landahl

>From: ufo-updates-bounces.nul
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -
>Date: Monday, February 07, 2005 6:32 AM
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Hayakawa Recants?

>Hayakawa 'Recants'?

>There's a curious tone to the following - a non-subscriber
>post.

>ebk

>-----

>From: Norio Hayakawa <Groom51S4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:33:47 EST
>Subject: Area 51 Was Never A Secret Base

>The construction of this sprawling aerospace complex in Nevada,
>erroneously known as "Area 51", began in the month of May of
>1955.

>Since about 16 years ago "Area 51" has become associated
>ridiculously (wittingly, unwittingly, or "conveniently") with
>>false rumors of "alien technology" or "global" conspiracies.

>I, Norio Hayakawa, of the Civilian Intelligence Network:

><http://www.hometown.aol.com/groom51s4/index.html>

>was at one time a proponent of such conspiracy theories, but
>several years ago I totally abandoned such conspiratorial views
>regarding this base. Furthermore I am no longer associated with
>any conspiracy theories, period.

>Today I am an ardent supporter of the importance and necessity
>of this vital base for our national defense.

<snip>

>Area 51 today is a vibrant aerospace R & D conglomerate test
>base, employing anywhere from 1800 to 2400 defense contractor
>employees, working in shifts on diversified projects. Some of
>the contractors include Raytheon, Lockheed, Boeing, Northrop
>Grumman, TRW, E. G. & G and General Atomics.

<snip>

To me it seems as if:

1. Someone has spoofed Hayakawa's e-mail address and pranked the list or;
2. Hayakawa himself is joking with or taunting the list or;
3. An Area 51 'insider' has supplied 'inside information' that convinced

Hayakawa to the degree that he wants to make a 'definitive' statement.

A very curious tone indeed. Does Glenn Campbell have any insight on this?

- Erik Landahl

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Secrecy News -- 02/07/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 15:45:41 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:16:09 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 02/07/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 14
February 7, 2005

** DOE MAINTAINS INCREASED INTELLIGENCE BUDGET SECRECY
** NEW ARMY CBW CLASSIFICATION GUIDE
** NEW FROM CRS

DOE MAINTAINS INCREASED INTELLIGENCE BUDGET SECRECY

The 9-11 Commission concluded last year that the best way to begin to combat the excessive secrecy that has undermined the performance of U.S. intelligence agencies would be to disclose the annual intelligence budgets of those agencies, as well as their aggregate total (9-11 Commission Final Report, p. 416).

But the Department of Energy, which always used to disclose the budget of its small Office of Intelligence, has chosen to move in the opposite direction.

For the second year in a row, DOE has classified its formerly unclassified budget request for intelligence in budget documents released today.

The last unclassified appropriation for DOE intelligence was in Fiscal Year 2004, when the budget was \$39,823,000, a minuscule amount by U.S. intelligence standards.

Incredibly, although this FY 2004 figure can still be found on the DOE budget web site (included in House Report 108-357), DOE now claims that it too is classified information. The Department has gone so far as to withhold the published figure from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

Previously, for more than a decade, the size of the DOE intelligence budget was unclassified public information. Along with the State Department's Intelligence and Research Bureau, DOE intelligence was one of the few intelligence community components to have an unclassified budget.

"The DOE intelligence budget does not disclose any classified information," advised John G. Keliher, then-Director of the DOE Office of Nonproliferation and National Security, in a June 24, 1994 letter he wrote on the subject.

"National security is neither threatened nor damaged as a result of the unclassified [DOE] intelligence budget released to the public," he wrote.

But that was then. According to one DOE official, the Central Intelligence Agency directed the Department to cease publishing its intelligence budget total. That assertion, not for attribution, could not be independently confirmed.

Several annual DOE intelligence budget requests dating from before the big chill set in may be found here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/doe/budget.html>

"The [DOE] intelligence program provides information and technical analyses on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy related matters to policy makers in the Department and other U.S. government agencies," according to last year's DOE appropriations bill.

NEW ARMY CBW CLASSIFICATION GUIDE

The U.S. Army last week issued revised guidance on the classification of chemical and biological weapons-related research and defense, a field which is unclassified in large part.

See Army Regulation 380-86, "Classification of Former Chemical Warfare, Chemical and Biological Defense, and Nuclear, Biological, Chemical Contamination Survivability Information," 1 February 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/ar380-86.pdf>

Unrelated, but of interest to some, another newly updated Army regulation describes in painstaking detail the proper manner of wearing Army uniforms along with their diverse insignia and accouterments.

See Army Regulation 670-1, "Wear and Appearance of Army Uniforms and Insignia," 3 February 2005 (362 pages, 2.9 MB PDF file):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/ar670-1.pdf>

NEW FROM CRS

Some new reports from our friends at the Congressional Research Service include the following.

"Continuity of Operations (COOP) in the Executive Branch: Issues in the 109th Congress," January 31, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/RL32752.pdf>

"The Middle East Peace Talks," updated February 1, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/IB91137.pdf>

"Tsunamis: Monitoring, Detection, and Early Warning Systems," January 24, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/RL32739.pdf>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to secrecy_news-request.nul with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sgp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 13:12:50 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:18:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Gehrman

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 11:30:36 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>When one's witnessing anecdote is based primarily on
>observation, I would think that an investigation would zero in
>on the eyesight of the person relaying information he or she
>saw. Everything else is peripheral (no pun) to that.

>The devil's, again, in the details.

>(By the way, I'm not an advocate of the balloon hypothesis, but
>rather the experimental craft hypothesis. The balloon thing was
>intertwined into the argument because the NASA information was
>confluent with LEMs, balloons, and other tested flying and
>landing thingies.)

Rich, David, EBK, List,

I haven't been to exactly the spot where Zamora encountered
the craft and the two small individuals but Wendy Connors
pointed it out to me when we were driving to the crash site and
since then I've studied topographic maps and an aerial
photograph of the area. Six Mile Canyon (which I explored
carefully by car and foot) sits behind a small range of
mountains (Chupadera) which are about seven hundred to a
thousand feet in elevation.

As the crow (craft) flies, Six mile canyon is less than six
miles southwest of the sighting area. It would be difficult to
estimate a departing speed using six mile canyon mountain as a
reference point to determine distance and time.

Zamora's stated: "the object seemed to lift up slowly, and to
get small in the distance very fast. It seemed to just clear Box
Canyon or Six Mile Canyon Mt. It disappeared as it went over the
mountain."

Most of this observation was without prescription glasses. The
sun would also be a factor since this was a clear day and Zamora
was looking directly into the setting sun.

My review Zamora's testimony shows that the only thing we know
for sure is that the object and the small beings were not a
figment of his imagination and the object probably looked like
what he described. But there is definitely a question regarding
the speed of departure.

After Zamora lost his glasses, all his observations are
questionable. First he ran 100 feet behind his car and took his
eyes off the object while it lifted off. Then while the object
was in line with his car, he covered his eyes again. As he
watched the craft depart, he was walking back to his car (100

ft) and trying to keep the object in sight, but without glasses. Then he recovered his glasses and put them back on. This all took about 40 seconds, by my reckoning. (I reenacted the scene with my wife using a stop watch). But most importantly, Zamora had to take his eyes off the object while he found, picked up and replaced his gasses(six seconds). When he resumed looking for the craft, as he got in his car to began transmitting, it may have already disappeared over the first rise (about 2500 feet from the car and over 100 feet higher than his vantage point) and dropped down out of his sight. At that point Zamora may have begun viewing some other object in the sky like a bird or another airplane.

If the "Lonnie and the Bean" account is correct, then the trashed outer shell could still be in one of the arroyos between the sighting site and box canyon. There are roads in that region which are totally accessible and mostly secluded where the "bean" could have landed again. This might have given the illusion that the craft had disappeared via 1000 MPH speed.

Other interesting details:

Ray Stanford relates that an Albuquerque resident called a local TV station on that April afternoon, about 5:25 PM and reported an egg shaped object traveling at low altitude and not too fast, to the south (toward Socorro). About twenty minutes later, a family driving north on Hwy 85 spotted an "ellipsoid" craft that was very low to the ground, and as it crossed the highway from the north east, almost hit their car antenna. They saw it land to the west of them. They noticed a police car heading in the direction of the object. There are also two other witnesses who observed the object landing and a cloud of dust, but it's not clear from their testimony whether this was the first landing that Zamora witnessed or the second landing that might have happened if the craft crashed a second time.

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:19:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:23:15 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 17:23:39 -0000
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>I am intrigued by the way by these words from Gareth J. Medway
>about the MJ12 papers. They strike me as very profound and
>insightful and I am overwhelmed by the sound logic applied;

>"Christopher Allan concludes that, if we can't prove MJ-12 a
>hoax, we can certainly ask why, if the events described therein
>did occur, there is no proof. I agree: if the Roswell story had
>been genuine, then confirmation would have come to light by now,
>just as Moore anticipated. It has not done, so claims about it
>can be dismissed."

>A quite brilliant logical dismissal with incredibly
>sophisticated and original reasoning. He's hit the very point
>that's eluded all before him. Another Magonia first!!

I'm glad you appreciate that, because it is a vital point.

Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble, with little contact with the outside world. One of the ways this is manifested is in its inability to understand that some UFO events - if they had in fact happened as described - would have had a major impact on the outside world, and not be confined to the 'paper trail' which many ufologists are so assiduous in tracing.

Roswell, as generally accepted by many ufologists, represents a major turning point in human history: an extraterrestrial civilisation has come into contact with the major political, scientific and industrial power on our planet. The earth's greatest centre of scientific research suddenly found itself in possession of a piece of advanced technology from another planet.

And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard to believe.

I think anyone who really believes that a piece of extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it was an event of negligible historical importance?

If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:56:33 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:21:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Rimmer

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 02:12:53 EST
>Subject: Ufology Needs A Ribbon

>Say, I was just thinking.

>Every other cause celebre has a ribbon to bring attention to it.

>There are blue, red, green, and of course yellow ribbons.

>Ufology needs a ribbon to commemorate those people who have
>suffered through this for half a century.

>>From abductees, whistle blowers, witnesses, researchers, news
>people, police, believers who have all had to go through the
>hassles, threats, deaths, ridicule.

Pretty silly idea. Why does everyone want to express their
imagined victimhood? And OK, I'll accept hassles and ridicule,
threats up to a point, but deaths? C'mon, name names!

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

An Open Letter To ABC News' Nightline Program

From: Larry W. Bryant <overtci.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:02:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:28:22 -0500
Subject: An Open Letter To ABC News' Nightline Program

To: Mr. Tom Bettag, Executive Producer of "Nightline" ABC News
niteline.nul

As most of us in the UFO-research community eagerly await the airing of Peter Jennings's new documentary on the state of public UFO awareness (Feb. 24 at 8:00 p.m. EST), some of us would like to see "Nightline's" cameras zoom in on the "politics of UFOlogy" (as exemplified by our decades-long efforts to seek a full, unequivocal accounting from pertinent government officials as to what they REALLY know (and when they knew it) about UFO reality... and why they've chosen to suppress that knowledge from public view).

We're aware that at least once in the past - several years ago - "Nightline" did air a program devoted to this hot-potato subject, but it failed to dig far enough for that elusive gold at the end of the UFO-coverup rainbow. Now, with Mr. Jennings's attempt to defuse this sociopolitical/cultural taboo, "Nightline" can capitalize on the public edification thus gained - by helping us ferret out and cultivate certain whistleblower-derived data, further insider contacts, deathbed confessions, and "leaked" documentation. You could start the process by querying certain congressional committee chairs about their behind-the-scenes activity on the UFO-coverup issue; you could assign a team of investigative reporters for producing follow-up programs; and you thereby could export the wealth and worth of Jennings's trench work in helping tell this, the greatest story ever never told.

Unfortunately, the field of serious, sustained UFO research - along with the concomitant pursuit of full UFO freedom-of-official-information/accountability - remains replete with missed opportunities. "Nightline" can help close that public-access gap by marshalling its worldwide resources as a force multiplier for UFOtruth. Peter Jennings has placed an ABC-News foot into the UFO inner sanctum's back door; now let us have you folks at "Nightline" boldly barge into the FRONT door!

Meantime, I thank you all at ABC News for affording me this (unmissed) opportunity to urge you to let ALL the UFO evidence speak for itself.

LARRY W. BRYANT
Director,
Washington, D.C. Office
Citizens Against UFO Secrecy
(and author of the 2005 Galde Press, Inc., edition of
"UFO Politics at the White House: Citizens Rally
'round Jimmy Carter's Promise")

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 14:23:06 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:29:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - Hatch

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 21:04:16 -0000
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 08:23:07 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

><snip>

>>>There seem to be those who already know that UFOs have a
>>>special interest in nuclear sites, they don't (personally) need
>>>statistical analysis.

>><snip>

>>Personally, I don't have a dog in this race even though
>>some of my work may have added to the discussion.

>>I'm not convinced that the best statistical analysis would
>>support an 'intent' or interest in nuclear facilities or not. I
>>would love to see something convincing either way of course.

>>Lost in all this, is the possibility that UFOs, whatever they
>>may be, are more interested in something near to nuclear
>>establishments.

>Larry, this possibility is not lost, or if it is lost then it
isn't for want of searching on my part! This is precisely what I
have been saying, as of course you know.

>>Greasy spoon restaurants come to mind.

>>Can anyone think of a nuclear facility, be it a power plant, a
>>weapons storage facility or just about anything of the kind
>>(remotely placed missile silos excepted) that does not have a
>>greasy spoon restaurant (GSR) a short drive away?

>I can't tell whether you're ironically agreeing with me, or
ironically disagreeing with me, or just being ironical with
everybody - or, hey, maybe all three? :-)

>Martin

- -

Hi Martin:

I wasn't agreeing or disagreeing with anything you wrote, just
trying to inject some levity into a long discussion. Maybe my
suggestion was overdone itself. "All three" comes closest.

Best - Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy! -

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 16:58:42 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:34:14 -0500
Subject: Re: New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy! -

>Source: Phenomena Magazine - UK

><http://tinyurl.com/5cj9x>

>02-07-05

>New UFO Book Destined To Create Controversy!
>Major new UFO book just published
>Project Beta, UFOs and official disinformation

>Dateline: Monday,

>By: Nick Redfern
>By: Phenomena US Editor-in-Chief

>Greg Bishop, the editor of the magazine The Excluded Middle,
>radio host, author and lecturer has just provided the field of
>UFO research with what is without doubt (in my opinion, at
>least) one of its finest and most important, published
>contributions.

<snip>

>In essence, the truth-is-stranger-than-fiction book relates the
>fascinating and compelling story of New Mexico-based physicist
>Paul Bennewitz, who - after stumbling upon Air Force and
>National Security Agency secrets at Kirtland Air Force Base, New
>Mexico, that he believes are connected to the activities of
>sinister extraterrestrials forces flying around in their UFOs -
> is literally bombarded (both physically and electronically)
>with a mass of disinformation, faked stories and outright lies,
>all carefully provided to him by US Intelligence, with the
>express intent of diverting him from his research and leading
>him down the rocky path towards mental and psychological
>collapse.

<snip>

Nick was telling our MUFON group just last night (Sunday, Feb. 6th) that at one time an 'agency' had rented a residence across the street from Bennewitz and even though he had fairly good security in his home 'they' would wait until he would go out and then break in to his house. However, instead of ransacking or taking anything they would move his furniture and belongings around slightly, just enough so that he would be aware that someone had been there. This was apparently part of their plan to shake him up.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:05:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:35:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Groff

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 02:12:53 EST
>Subject: Ufology Needs A Ribbon

>Say, I was just thinking.

>Every other cause celebre has a ribbon to bring attention to it.

>There are blue, red, green, and of course yellow ribbons.

>Ufology needs a ribbon to commemorate those people who have
>suffered through this for half a century.

<snip>

>How about Silver Ribbons?

<snip>

Or how about 'gray' for the color of some ET's :-)

or perhaps a combo of both

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 18:39:09 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:37:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Maccabee

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 11:30:36 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>David and James...I 'll ask this, again of Dr. Rudiak...
>>>What was the nature of Zamora's eyesight - David Rudiak's
>>>professional specialty?

>>>He lost his glasses (and sunglasses) at an inoportune time, so
>>>what could he see or not see, accurately?
>>>Has anyone ever checked this? Have they?

>>What's with the badgering tone?

>>The important point is not that Zamora dropped his glasses, but
>>when he dropped them and for how long. What did he report seeing
>>when he had his glasses on and glasses off?

>>Zamora's eyesight with or without his glasses has nothing to do
>>with some of the more important details of the case, such as the
>>complete silence of the craft as it rapidly zipped away or the
>>fact that it was flying against the wind. No conventional
>>propulsion system or balloon can account for such details.

>This is the point of my "badgering tone" - what was the nature
>of Lonnie Zamora's eyesight? Isn't that an important "detail"
>(not minutiae, Dr. Maccabee)?

I am not aware of anyone having checked Zamorra's eyesight,
although it might be possible even at this late date if the
police dept. or his optometrist keeps records going back that
far.

However, David has correctly pointed out that the eyesight
"ability " (acuity) is generally emodied in the "20/20 or 20/40"
requirement that a person be able to see in order to drive and
be a police officer. With prescription glasses if necessary, he
should be able to see (resolve)at 20 ft what the "normal" person
(without optical aides) can see at 20 ft (20/20) or to see at 20
ft what the normal person can see at 40 ft (20/40) (Dave can
correct me if I'm wrong; I'm not an eye specialist)

I think it is correct to say that with 20/20 (with glasses on,
if needed) vision a person could "see" (resolve) an image made
up of dark lines on a light background with an angular spacing
between the lines of about 1 minute of arc (a "two bar" or
"three bar target"). This is 1/60 of a degree and since a degree
is 0.0174 radians, the resolution angle would be about 0.0003
rad.

Radian angle measure is equivalent, at small angles, to the
"size divided by the distance" where size is measured transverse
to the line of sight. Thus a person with 20/20 could see, at 100

distance, the spacing of 0.03 ft or 0.4 inch between dark lines on a light background. 20/40 eyesight would be "half as good" or seeing a spacing of about 1 inches at 100 ft. For 200 ft, double the minimum spacing that can be "seen."

This resolution angle really corresponds to the minimum spacing that can be seen between two dark objects (or painted areas) silhouetted against a considerably brighter background, e.g. black paint on white. To actually resolve an object and see shape can require it be several "resolution angles" in size. Army experiments done many years ago indicate that 2 to 3 resolution elements are enough to see basic shape and if there are 4 or more resolution elements across an object like a tank or an overturned car (or a balloon or an experimental aircraft) it should be identifiable.

Thus if Zamorra's vision were corrected to 20/20 he should have been able to resolve a shape of several inches in size at 100 ft.

Note: Experimental Evidence is imbedded in the sighting!!!!

He said he saw "children" near the "overturned car" when he was at an estimated 800 hundred feet away. A comparison with children suggests he could see well enough to determine the overall shape of objects 1/2 ft or so in size (size of a child's head) at several hundred feet.

This corresponds to an angle of .0006 rad.

Obviously he could have resolved much shapes much smaller than 1/2 ft when he was closest to the object.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Satellite Restrictions

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 03:34:36 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:43:36 -0500
Subject: Satellite Restrictions

This began a few years ago when RADARSAT II was proposed. The original RADARSAT is powerful a remote sensing satellite that can actually compromise some military operations.

NASA used it to map Antarctica and other Earth sensing missions in return for launching it. Trouble is - for the military and intelligence agencies - it's a civilian satellite developed by a company in British Columbia and not subject to the usual restrictions. RADARSAT II is proposed to be much more powerful.

See below:

Don Ledger

Source: Space.Com

http://www.space.com/spaceneews/businessmonday_050207.html

Canadian Bill Would Align Remote Sensing Law With U.S.

By Jason Bates
Space News Staff Writer

WASHINGTON - A bill that would align Canadian remote sensing laws with those of the United States has made its first steps through the Canadian parliament.

The legislation, co-sponsored by four Canadian ministries with purview over imagery satellite interests, is designed to promote the development of the commercial remote sensing industry in Canada but also provide the government the power to curb satellite operations to protect national security, a process referred to in the industry as shutter control.

The bill, C-25: An Act Governing the Operation of Remote Sensing Space Systems, was introduced in the Canadian House of Commons in November and received its first hearing before the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade Feb. 1.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gevaerd

From: A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO <gevaerd.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 08:17:09 -0200
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:46:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gevaerd

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers ->
>Date: Monday, February 07, 2005 12:32 PM
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Hayakawa Recants?

>Hayakawa 'Recants'?

>There's a curious tone to the following - a non-subscriber
>post.

>ebk

>-----

>From: Norio Hayakawa <Groom51s4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:33:47 EST
>Subject: Area 51 Was Never A Secret Base

>The construction of this sprawling aerospace complex in Nevada,
>erroneously known as "Area 51", began in the month of May of
>1955.

>Since about 16 years ago "Area 51" has become associated
>ridiculously (wittingly, unwittingly, or "conveniently") with
>>false rumors of "alien technology" or "global" conspiracies.

>I, Norio Hayakawa, of the Civilian Intelligence Network:

><http://www.hometown.aol.com/groom51s4/index.html>

>was at one time a proponent of such conspiracy theories, but
>several years ago I totally abandoned such conspiratorial views
>regarding this base. Furthermore I am no longer associated with
>any conspiracy theories, period.

<snip>

Amazing... Hayakawa goes against all theories, solid or not,
ever established to explain the secrecy towards Area 51. I
remember listening to one of his lectures, some 10-12 years go,
when he was one of the leading proponents of the theories which
claim that Area 51 is, yes, a UFO-related top secret facility.
What made this man change his mind?

A. J.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 02:20:34 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:47:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News

>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 11:52:33 -0800
>Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 07:41:15 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Prager Won't Discuss Controversial UFO News Story

><snip>

>>Now, Meier has gone beyond flying saucer photography, beyond
>>contacts with sexy space blonds or whatever, and is now
>>predicting the future like a prophet or a swami ..

>>We learn that Meier predicted the US invasion of Iraq, mad cow
>>disease etc. after the fact. Islamic terrorism? That's like
>>predicting the tides.

>If you were to look into it, like I've been doing, you'll find
>that "after the fact" doesn't belong there. That's wishful
>thinking.

>I've remained silent on the Meier case for quite a while, not
>referring to all the supportive evidence for the case, because
>ebk called for silence, a year or two back.

Hello Jim:

If you feel Meier's claims of contact with space alien Semjase
and company, and/or his predictions of the future have some
merit, I suppose we should simply agree to disagree.

It troubles me when I hear that somebody predicted unlikely or
unexpected events, only to learn so after they happened.

EBK was probably wise to call a halt to Meier matters as they
probably weren't getting anywhere, just stirring up needless
rancor.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

UFO Research Software?

From: **Nikolay Subbotin** <paragloss.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 08:51:50 -0500
Subject: UFO Research Software?

Hi!

Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any software for professional UFO research.

In Russia, we're now trying to create special programs. Is it of interestt to you?

I think we can work together on this.

Regards,

Nick Subbotin
Director RUFORS
Russian UFO Research Station

RUFORS
P.O.Box 5172
Perm 614010
Russia

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Large Colour Image Of Area 51

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 09:04:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 09:04:13 -0500
Subject: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

For those of you interested in a large, colour image of
Area 51:

<http://www.lasvegasnow.com/area51/Area51-072503-LG.jpg>

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 04:46:45 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 09:14:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 08:17:33 -0800
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 16 Jan 2005 10:51:13 -0800
>>>Fwd Date: Mon, 17 Jan 2005 08:53:54 -0500
>>>Subject: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>>The narrative is taken from FATE magazine for
>>>July 1961, and came via Loren Gross.

>>>A trio of musicians were northbound on US 395 from Southern
>>>California to Reno, NV. One Dick Drake (sounds like a typical
>>>stage name of the era) was seated in the middle of the front
>>>seat flanked by 2 sidemen.

>>>At 3:50 AM, a few minutes north of Big Pine, CA, putting
>>>them a few miles south of Bishop, CA, a huge 'flying saucer',
>>>width of a city block, passed over at around 12,000' feet
>>>altitude (judged from Mt. Whitney which is 14,000 ft or so),
>>>going generally east or ENE toward the Nevada state line.

<snip>

>>>My question is: Would FATE magazine have invented a story
>>>like this, beginning to end, in 1961? The details are almost
>>>too good, precise date, time, location, altitude etc. I'm
>>>so used to imprecision for those data that I got suspicious,
>>>maybe overly so.

>>For reference, the incident is placed at 0340 hrs (3:40 AM,
>>still dark) on US 395 perhaps 10 miles North of Big Pine, CA. on
>>the morning of 18 April 1960, when a "BIG SAUCER", emphasis from
>>Dick Drake, passed over the car headed generally East.

>I've already communicated this to Larry in e-mail. On a trip to
>Nevada this past week, I was able to verify from newspaper
>microfilm from the two Reno newspapers that the Dick Drake trio
>was very real and played Harrah's Club Reno starting April 18.
>This part of the story completely checks out.

>Overall I reviewed about 10 Nevada newspapers for any UFO
>reports from April 18 or the next few days, but there were no
>UFO reports of any kind. I did find a SETI-type story on the
>search for aliens by radio telescope and a Las Vegas casino ad
>featuring an alien saying "Take me to your dealer." That's about
>it. Oh yes, one of the Reno movie theaters was named "Majestic."
>Coincidence? We think not!

>I've begun checking into the other entertainers performing with
>the Dick Drake trio at Harrah's hoping maybe the Drake bunch
>told them about the sighting. An internet search confirms at
>least two of them dead. However, a relative of one of them is
>interested in digging into it, so with a little luck maybe
>there will be further to report soon.

I have to say this is one fine piece of legwork by Dave Rudiak.

There was a Dick Drake Trio, they did play in Reno (accordion and all!) and now we know which club (Harrah's which has since eaten up two city blocks).

My initial suspicions were groundless. If we get real lucky, maybe someone who knew Drake or one of the sidemen will be found; somebody who might confirm hearing them talk about their experience on US Highway 395.

Best wishes

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 07:12:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 09:15:52 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 14:52:15 -0500
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
>>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

><snip>
>>>The general public is moving beyond this myopic focus on 'lights
>>>in the sky' and are seriously exploring the testimonies of
>>whistleblowers/contactees revealing 'lies on the ground'.

>I sincerely pray you are right! That is definitely 'where the
>action is!'

Halleluiah, yea and verily, and can I hear an 'amen', good
sister! <g>

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Myers

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 05:52:18 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 09:17:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Myers

>From: Erik Landahl <landahl1.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 12:43:24 -0800
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Landahl

>>From: ufoupdates.nul
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -
>>Date: Monday, February 07, 2005 6:32 AM
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Hayakawa Recants?

<snip>

Norio sent me an e-mail a week ago that was posted to my site:

<http://www.ufowatchdog.com/norio.html>

Everyone is surprised...

Regards,

Royce J. Myers III
UFOWATCHDOG.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Brazilian Physician Compelled To Lie About UFOs

From: **A.J. Gevaerd** <ufo.freedom.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:29:26
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:28:37 -0500
Subject: Brazilian Physician Compelled To Lie About UFOs

Brazilian UFO Magazine reports:

Physician Compelled By Brazilian Air Force To Lie About UFOs

Wellaide Cecim, a physician working during the 70s in a health care unit in Village of Colares, Para, Brazil, admits she was forced by military to lie about how serious the "suck-suck phenomena" was.

Article by Carlos Mendes.

Translated by Paulo Santos, from the Brazilian UFO Magazine team.

Distributed by the Brazilian UFO Magazine: www.ufo.com.br

See more info at:

www.ufo.com.br/materiaespecial/brazilianairforce.htm

Introduction

"I've been compelled by Brazilian Air Force to convince the locals that the lights attacking them were mass hallucinations and that what they saw has never happened". Who says this, after reading the material published yesterday by newspaper O Liberal about the "suck-suck" phenomena, a weird episode that terrified many communities at Colares, Vigia, Santo Antonio do Taua, Mosqueiro e Ba=EDa do Sol in the end of 1977 and beginning of 1978, is Wellaide Cecim Carvalho. She was the responsible for a health care unit at Colares at that time. She treated about 80 victims of the mysterious lights. "I was the first one to make contact with the victims of the suck-suck phenomena. In spite of my 22 years old at that time and being completely skeptic, I started to notice changes the medicine failed to explain. The burns on the victims' skin were almost always on the neck and the breast, with two small and parallel holes, as if it was a little bite, but it wasn't".

Doctor on public health and psychiatry, Wellaide Cecim says that after 60 days of daily records, more than 120 cases, she started to report these cases to their superiors. But she wasn't prepared to their reaction: She has been forbidden to admit something strange was happening. "But, being faithful to what I see, not to what I hear, I kept on speaking. Even under the risk of being fired". Follows the interview she gave to Carlos Mendes, a journalist from O Liberal, published by the Brazilian UFO Magazine and added to its campaign UFOs Freedom of Information Now, which is described at:

www.ufo.com.br/secretcy.php

Interview

Question =97 The authorities didn't see the phenomena, but even seeing they wouldn't believe...

Wellaide =97 They didn't even pay me a visit. I had to discover the victims lost erythrocytes all by myself. I've always tried

to do my best in my job, since that time. I noticed the victims had lost blood because of the research I made to find out why these people had giddiness, sluggishness and could hardly walk. I sent several reports to the health secretary.

Question =97 And who was the health secretary?

Wellaide =97 Doctor Manoel Ayres. My immediate superior was doctor Luiz Flavio Figueiredo. He forbade me to talk, make suggestions or even agree to the locals. But, you don't need medical knowledge to know. Necrosis occurs only 96 hours after a burn. The victims burns had necrosis immediately, just five minutes after the attack.

Question =97 What's the explanation to this?

Wellaide =97 That's when it all begins: they (the flying objects pilots) couldn't be Russians because, it doesn't matter their technology at that time, and nobody could make burns in that way.

Question =97 As a psychiatrist, do you believe these people could be victims of a mass hysteria?

Wellaide =97 This is what the Air Force always asked me to say. It did not happen any kind of mass hysteria or visual hallucinations. The psychiatry proves it didn't happen. It may happen mystic collective problems when people commit mass suicide. But nobody can have the same delirium, the same visual, sonic and synesthetic hallucination at the same time and in different places.

Question =97 Who asked the Air Force to investigate the case?

Wellaide =97 Once nobody helped, much the opposite, they told me to shut up, the Colares mayor at that time, Mr. Alfredo Ribeiro Bastos, called the Brazilian Air Force. And came, from Parana, the president of the Ufology society of that state, the philosopher, ufologist and biomedical Daniel Rebisso Giese. We wrote the first book on this subject: "Vampires and extraterrestrials in Amazonia". The priest of Colares and also a doctor, Alfredo de la O, already dead, also called for help.

Question =97 And what hurt you most?

Wellaide =97 It was the fact that, in my 22 years old, responsible for a health care unit, I had a lot of people in front of me needing research to find out why they were immobilized. Why they couldn't walk or talk. And when I looked at the hemogram to compare the last records, I've learnt they had very low rates of erythrocytes and hemoglobin. The fact is, no object can bring out skin necrosis after a burn so fast. A third factor is the alopecia, the fall of hair from the skin, in a way it will never grow again. The victims have never had hair on the skin burnt again.

Question =97 And when did the Air Force appeared?

Wellaide =97 90 days after our requests. When Colares was empty and scared, they came. Because of the dictatorship we were under, they used to call me every day to ask me to speak to the people, to try to convince them they were having mass hallucination, but I always refused.

Question =97 Under all this pressure from the military, what did you do?

Wellaide =97 I refused to do this. I always told them I wouldn't obey. I disagree to them when they say I was afraid of being considered a fool. I really don't mind. I gave interviews to several TVs from Brazil, EUA and Europe, even under the risk of being fired. Besides being a skeptic, I'm totally sure of what I saw. I don't know what it is, but I know its real.

Question =97 Did you, as did the captain Uyrange Hollanda, the investigation commander, see beings from space?

Wellaide =97 Yes I did. It was 5 pm in the afternoon at Colares. There was a ship at 50 meters of altitude, above the city's main street. Inside of this ship there was a being, 1.20 or 1.30 meter high. This happened when I was driving to help a child

with broken clavicle, I was going to immobilize her. They were flying so low that I was completely unable to react. I could see the UFOs bright metal and it wasn't a dish-like object, but much more like a cone or a cylinder. Its course was elliptical. 5 o'clock in the afternoon your eyes can't play tricks on you. You may have visions, hallucinate, but, like me, many others would have to.

Question =97 Did someone died after being sucked by the lights?

Wellaide =97 Two persons I took to the hospital in the capital, Bel=E9m, had died. I took them in my car. And when they gave me the death certificate, I could read "unknown reason". The victims had the burns, the tinny holes, the examination. I mean, it's very easy to hide things in this country.

Some amazing cases

The Operation Saucer collected reports from the people who saw the lights. Fishermen, rural workers, simple and ordinary people hit by the lights were interviewed by the Brazilian Air Force's personnel between November of 1977 and the beginning of 1978. What they told is written in a report called Operation Saucer. The Air Force's document signed by the captain Uyrange Hollanda and obtained by the newspaper O Liberal. Over 230 pages of the Operation Saucer main report were fully scanned and are published at the website of the Brazilian UFO Magazine. They can be downloaded freely at:

www.ufo.com.br/documentop.php

More documents about the Brazilian Air Force secret procedures of UFO research can also be downloaded freely at:

www.ufo.com.br/docPrincipal2.php

Both courtesy of the Brazilian UFO Magazine.

Case 1 =97 Adelaide Pereira da Silva, 37 years old, illiterate. Place: Colares, October 16th 1977, 21:00 hours. She noticed a reddish light lighting her room and all the interior of the house. All the doors and windows were closed, then she opened a window to see a bright object with a bluish light moving slightly above the trees (about 30 meters). She felt a strong pain in the eyes and her body became numb. She carried these symptoms for several days.

Case 2 =97 Maria Celeste Pereira da Silva, 20 years old, educated. Her UFOs sighting happened on October 18th 1977 at 22:00 hours. In the same moment her mother, Adelaide, noticed a strange light coming inside her house, she felt a great pain all over her body, as if she were being heavily compressed. Also a numb feeling started to rise through her body coming from the feet and a strong heat appeared, spreading from the right shoulder until the head. She thinks She have been hit on the right side of the body by a beam of reddish light.

Case 3 =97 Maria Francisca Furtado, 30 years old, primary school education only. She told what happened in the night of October 18th of 1977, about 21:30. She lives close to a village called Vila Nova do Ubintuba. As the attacks were becoming more common, she and her husband used to come every night to Mr. Miguel Arc=E2ngelo Soares house in order to sleep together to several families. On that day, she was hit by the light beam and got half-paralyzed. She felt a kind of electric shock. First, her feet became hot and a shiver took over her body, from the feet until the head. She felt the right part of the body became numb and this sensation endured for one hour. Then came the headache and fever. Se did not go outdoors, so she couldn't see the 'ship'. Men and Women had the same symptoms after seeing the object.

Case 4 =97 A farmer called Abel Soares Trindade, 28 years old, was inside his house hearing to the radio when something happened. It was about half past nine in the night of September 14th 1977 when he noticed a bluish light coming from the roof. He got half-paralyzed and had a feeling as if his head was growing bigger. He struggled to cry for help for he could hardly speak. For several days after the attack he had headache and hoarseness. His wife, America Silva Soares, 23 years old, had the same symptoms.

Case 5 =97 Another report came from Raimundo Nonato Barbosa, 48 years old. He told when he was coming back home through the woods, as he passed by a friend's house, he suddenly felt as if he lost his strength. The shoes he was carrying on his hand fell to the ground. He picked them up and kept walking. The shoes fell to the ground again. When he lowered to pick them up again he could see a bright object, with a round shape like a sea-ray, just above his shoulder. It had about 1.50 meters and moved at very low altitude, about five or ten meters over the ground. The object was emitting a light beam, as a flash lamp, very strong and bluish colored, towards him. Very scared, Raimundo gathered his strengths and run to his friend's house, crying for help.

In the middle of his way, looking back, he noticed the object rose to the sky, between the trees, leaving bright and multicolored sparks behind. He complained of shivering, headache and numbness on the region of the body hit by the light beam. It wasn't noticed the symptoms of burning. He showed how the object was drawing on the ground. He represented the bright sparks using three vertical lines with about 20 degrees between themselves. He drew small circles connected to these lines and told they were lights in several colors. He couldn't repeat the draw on paper.

Case 6 =97 Five fishermen told to the military they could see two beings inside the ship. An encounter of the first kind with five fisherman of Colares and a ship with extraterrestrial beings inside would have taken place on October 12th, 1977, at 23:30. In the report the farmer called Manoel Esp=EDrito Santo, 20 years old, primary school education, told to the military what happened, during the Operation Saucer. He told he was in front of his house with his friends, Julio, Paulo, Deca and Carlito, when he noticed a yellow light moving in the rising-sunset direction. It slowed down, almost stopping by them, about 20 meters away. Manoel said he could see the light had two 'pilots'. They seemed to be human. The 'man' was at the left side and the 'woman' at the right side.

Both were wearing something similar to glasses on their eyes and had communication equipment. The man on the left rose his 'glasses', as if staring to them, and at this very moment the other pilot, using a lateral pipe, sent a red light beam to them. The moment he was hit by the light Manoel felt a strong shock, as if it was an electric shock. The sensation started on the feet and rose to his head. Then he got his legs and arms paralyzed and almost lost his consciousness. The ship went away slowly, speeding up. Manoel could move again, but felt numbness for several minutes. From far away, the ship looked like a star red-yellow colored. It changed its color from bright yellow to red and, when it was closer, he could see a bluish light on the frontal upper part. It was cylinder-shaped, like a barrel, and had a frontal smaller pipe, reddish colored, and a thinner one on its side, 45 degrees apart, where the bluish light was coming from. It had about 1.20 to 1.40 meters, seemed transparent on the bluish part and had a division between the pilots.

To Be Continued...

See more at www.ufo.com.br/materiaespecial/brazilianairforce.htm

Support The Brazilian Ufo Community Campaign:

UFOs =96 Freedom Of Information Now

Brazilian UFO Magazine

www.ufo.com.br

A. J. Gevaerd, editor of the Brazilian UFO Magazine, can be contacted at:

gevaerd.nul

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 14:32:44 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:29:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 11:45:15 -0400
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 20:02:18 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 15:11:15 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>Dick, once again you have made a claim unsupported by any
>>>evidence about secret science:

>>If you would pay attention to what I say, you wouldn't keep
>>going off on the tangent of technology development done in
>>secret. I gave you a specific example of what I was talking
>>about. Do you care to defend that as legitimate science?

>And just what example is that and how do you know what was done
>with it? If you are talking about the Socorro stuff.

<snip>

>Stan Friedman

Stan,

I give up trying to communicate with you. This is going nowhere,
so I decline to participate any longer. You are playing word
games, not thinking, reasoning, and communicating rationally.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 09:49:14 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:31:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Maccabee

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 09:41:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 20:02:18 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>No answer because it is totally irrelevant to anything under
>>discusison here. How much time have you spent studying
>>scientific philosophy, the history of science, symbolic logic?

>Richard:

>For some reason (or unreason) you seem locked into formal logic
>and scientific philosophy when quantum mechanics and UFOs
>themselves defy logic, as Bertrand Russell, and even
>Wittgenstein would agree I think.

>You can't apply logic, no matter how hard you keep trying, to
>the UFO phenomenon, nor to how the government and military have
>handled the matter.

Whoa, there. This statement is too broad. Logic as part of the
scientific process of investigation of any particular sighting
must be used in order to determine whether or not it can be
reasonably (there's that term... reason) explained as a known
phenomenon.

As to the logic of government activities... there is some logic
based on certain assumptions, such as, if you really have
something that could affect national defense you don't your
enemies to know about it. Therefore you withold info or - uh, oh,
here comes that nasty phrase - "cover up"

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Hamilton

From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 07:00:06 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:35:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Hamilton

>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 05:52:18 -0800
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

<snip>

>Norio sent me an e-mail a week ago that was posted to my site:

><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/norio.html>

>Everyone is surprised...

This is no surprise to me having known Norio over the years.

He was once a strong supporter of the ETH based on Bob Lazar's story.

He was once interested in Reptilian aliens.

Then he got religion.

A friend of mine was invited to dinner at Norio's house some years ago to answer questions posed by Norio's new minister. The minister must have convinced Norio that aliens were all demons and should be shunned.

After that Norio was showing me logos on advertised name brand products that he said were symbols of satanism.

In Norio's world, there are now no ETs, but there do live demons.

With this in mind, he had once decided that Area 51 was home of demonic projects and that he and Anthony Hilder were missioned to bring this to the attention of the world and thus he and Anthony formed "marches" on Area 51.

Now, he changes once again and it looks like his influence comes from PNAC and the neocon agenda (just my guess).

Several have tried to argue the UFO evidence with Norio but to no avail. You cannot argue evidence against a deep emotional belief.

- Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 07:26:28 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:37:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2005 16:23:54 +0000
>Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:58:40 -0500
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 14:33:07 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>The rest of my post was about the nonconventional aspects of
>>the Socorro craft, such as it's shape, VTOL capability, and a
>>silent propulsion system capable of accelerating the craft to
>>supersonic speed in a matter of seconds. If we had such an
>>advanced experimental craft 40 years ago, we would have a fleet
>>of them now and jet aircraft would be obsolete. The absence of
>>such aircraft now speaks very eloquently about who made the
>>Socorro craft. It wasn't us.

>David,I agree with your arguments here, including that flying
>pigsmake as much sense as any of the balloon hypotheses, but
>wheredid you get supersonic flight from? I never heard that
>claimedfor the Socorro UFO.

Dick and List,

From Ray Stanford's book, Zamora thought the total time from
blastoff to fadeout in the distance was about 10 seconds.
Stanford doubled that to 20 seconds, which he thought more
reasonable. Zamora's fadeout distance was estimated at 6 miles
(near Six-Mile Canyon SW of Socorro). 6 miles in 20 seconds is
18 miles a minute or 1080 mph average speed.

However, Zamora estimated that it took the craft about 6 seconds
to lift off. For simplicity, assume that it took the remaining
14 seconds to travel six miles and it accelerated smoothly
during this interval.

Distance = $1/2 * \text{acceleration} * \text{time}^2$ or $\text{accel.} = 2 * \text{dist} / \text{t}^2$.
This works out to $\text{accel.} = 0.061 \text{ mi/s}^2 = \sim 100 \text{ m/s}^2$.
That's about 10 G of acceleration. Final velocity would be
 $v(\text{final}) = a * t = \sim 3100 \text{ mph}$.

Even if one assumes that the time intervals were further
underestimated by another factor of 2 and the fade-out distance
overestimated by a factor of 2, cutting the final speed by a
factor of 4, this would still be in the neighborhood of roughly
770 mph maximum speed, i.e., still supersonic.

The speeds are probably even higher than this if one does
calculations closer to Zamora's description of events.
According to Zamora, the craft didn't begin its rapid
acceleration phase until it was about 1 mile away. Therefore
the craft would have been traveling much faster during the
second phase than the more simplistic model above would suggest.

Suppose, e.g., it took 8 seconds to go the first mile at a
slower acceleration, and then only 6 seconds to go the last 5
miles to fadeout at a much higher acceleration. Under these

assumptions, the acceleration in the second phase could have been over 30 G's and the final speed around 4200 mph.

One could again play it very conservative in this more complex model, again cutting the final speed by a factor of 4 by halving the distances and doubling the time intervals. The final speed would still be over 1000 mph.

Thus even with large margins of error depending on one's assumptions, the craft seemed capable of supersonic flight. Yet it was completely silent, according to Zamora, after it lifted off the first 20 feet. I don't know of any conventional propulsion system that can do that.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 09:32:59 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:38:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Groff

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 12:20:35 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Infrasound UFO Detection

>Maybe its a lame idea, but I came across the following while
>reviewing a document called "Natural background infrasound and
>signals from Apollo 14 and aircraft", Posmentier, 1971.

>Excerpt:

>"On several other occasions, qualitively similar signals were
>found to agree with visual observations of aircraft. The
>continuously varying azimuth, localization, high coherency and
>high horizontal phase speed of the signal indicate that its
>source must be rapidly moving, local, point-like and above-
>ground. We therefore conclude that this signal was generated by
>an aircraft, ALTHOUGH NONE WAS VISIBLE OR AUDIBLE AT THE TIME
>AND PLACE OF THE RECORDING." (My dramatically Caps).

>"The analysis and interpretation of this signal not only
>confirms the proper functioning of the instrumentation and the
>applicability to our data reduction techniques used, but also
>that the high frequency infrasound may be an effective technique
>for passive detection and tracking of aircraft, including
>aircraft not audible to the human ear, and aircraft for which
>active detection and tracking techniques such as radar are not
>appropriate."

James,

Your dramatic caps are quite appropriate.

Seems to me the major drawback of this method would be the
variation in the speed of sound itself. It could probably detect
an object but a moderately fast moving object might be long gone
by the time the signal was received.

Variations in air pressure and temperature would also effect the
accuracy of the reading.

A signal through air at 40deg F would travel at about 748 mi/hr or
1096 ft/s. An object at 10000 ft. wouldn't register for 9
seconds. This would give a lot of craft time to move on or
change headings.

At 0 deg F sound travels through air at 1052 ft/s.
At 100 deg F it's 1163 ft/s.

So this is a variation of 8.5 to 9.5 seconds for an object at
only 10,000 ft. It's 3 1/2 times that for an object at
35,000 ft., and this is plenty of time to disappear. Amplitude
and frequency can determine how far a sound signal can travel
through a given medium but it will have no effect on the
velocity.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 5:38:25 -1000
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:40:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Goldstein

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:07:41 +0100
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 18:12:35 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 11:48:08 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

><snip>

>>>According to a more recent inquiry, at
>>>Minot AFB, on October 24, 1968, a UFO was seen during 45 minutes
>>>over a Minuteman missile site. security alarms were activated.
>>>An outdoor silo door was opened, which weighted 20 tons! There
>>>are some twenty witnesses on that case, which lasted several
>>>hours in all. In such a case, there is no need of a long
>>>statistical study to realize that it is of very high
>>>significance. There was a "message", there, and I bet that it
>>>was understood.

>>I'm not familiar with this case. At the risk of tempting you to
>>paint me as a debunker of the purest pelicanist persuasion, let
>>me ask: Does the List have a collective opinion on the verity of
>>this story? Is it properly documented? Is the source known, and
>>authoritative? Have those 20 witnesses independently and openly
>>verified the claim, or are they at least identified? Are there
>>any official records?

>Martin, Josh and all,

>I am also answering to Josh Goldstein who asked for details.
>Gildas Bourdais

<snip>

Hello Gildas,

Thank you for the information. I suppose that back in 1991 I
read about the skeleton of the case with a wrong date and I had
forgotten about it. This sounds like a more amazing case than
the other two USAF missile base episodes. I look forward to
seeing this case on TV.

Josh Goldstein

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 09:47:48 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:41:13 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Groff

>From: Nikolay Subbotin <paragloss.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
>Subject: UFO Research Software?

>Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any
>software for professional UFO research.

>In Russia, we're now trying to create special programs. Is it
>of interestt to you?

>I think we can work together on this.

This is something I'm interested in myself in conjunction with
my UFO Tools website.

<http://www.terrygroff.com/ufotools>

I have written a javascript program that estimates the size of
an object based on it's relative size compared to the Moon.

<http://terrygroff.com/ufotools/size/index.html>

I also have one based on the Ballester-Guasp Report evaluation
method.

http://terrygroff.com/ufotools/eval/eval_calc.html

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 10:39:29 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:43:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs? - King

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:07:41 +0100
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 18:12:35 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2005 11:48:08 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

><snip>

>By the way, would someone remember at what time the Salt
>negotiation took place? I think that the Salt 2 Agreement was
>signed by President Richard Nixon in 1972. I just wonder if
>there could be some relationship there... One thing we can be
>sure of, is that such a spectacular and disturbing sighting
>could not be made public at that time. Now, is it significant
>that it will be mentioned on a national TV program
>this month?

Hi Gildas,

SALT I was signed by Nixon in 1972. SALT II was signed in 1979,
by Jimmy Carter. While it was never actually in force, the
tenets were generally adhered to by the US and the Soviets.

Reagan was not a SALT fan, and began the START talks with
Gorbachev in the early 80s.

Just remembering...

Best,

Kyle

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Steven G. Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:40:58 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:45:36 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 14:25:01 -0400
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
>>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

<snip>

>>The latest whistleblower/contactee that offers testimony with
>>serious exopolitical significance is Charles Hall whom I
>>recommend to the List as someone who is both credible and
>>significant- see:

>><http://www.exopolitics.org/charles-hall.htm>

>I take it you have seen some evidence on which to base
>acceptance of the tall whites parading around Hall's part of
>Nevada? You have checked his military and college records? I
>suppose you want everybody to accept Bob Lazar and Michael Wolf
>Kruvant as whistleblowers in the know? They don't check out.

>>I think that the Peter Jennings special may ultimately
>>dissappoint since its main premises are inappropriate to the
>>>true challenge in understanding the UFO/exopolitical phenomenon
>>before us.

>I read with great disappointment Alfred Webre's Exopolitics
>book. It is loaded with proclamations without providing any
>evidence to support them. What newsman will accept those on face
>value? Why should they?

Gentlemen, Gentlemen, sheathe thy swords.....

Four points:

- 1) I seriously doubt anyone convinced PJ Productions of anything. This was the documentary company owned by a network anchor. They did 150 interviews, compiled the footage and did with it whatever they wanted. No one in the ET research community could have steered this production.
- 2) It is also true that one way the issue has been contained was the imposition (and acceptance) of a Sisyphean requirement that the same points be proved over and over again. Further, each new media entrant felt it had to begin at the beginning. This is an outgrowth of the ghettoization of the issue by the institutions of authority and it is maddening.
- 3) And most importantly, both the nuts and bolts investigations and the advanced exopolitical extrapolations are needed. It isn't one or the other. It is time to take what the researchers have learned and begin to speculate on the political and social considerations, to attempt to fill in the missing pieces and test assumptions, and to advance the level of the discussion to

realms which would be perfectly fine in any other "accepted,"
"mainstream" area of interest.

4) When the full truth is finally known, some of the witnesses
thought to be phony will prove to have been valid, and some of
the witnesses thought to be valid will prove to have been phony.
Even after all the work and all the research we are still
operating within a constructed labyrinthine hall of mirrors.

But we do the best we can.

Steve 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 12:50:14 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:47:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Ledger

>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 05:52:18 -0800
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

>>From: Erik Landahl <landahl1.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 12:43:24 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Landahl

>>>From: ufoupdates.nul
>>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -
>>>Date: Monday, February 07, 2005 6:32 AM
>>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Hayakawa Recants?

><snip>

>Norio sent me an e-mail a week ago that was posted to my site:
><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/norio.html>
>Everyone is surprised...

Let me get this right. Norio finally comes to his senses re Area 51 not being a haven for UFOs or alien craft being reverse engineered, and now that he has, the rest of the phenomenon is whacky and we are the ufologists because of his former unsubstantiated beliefs.

Now he has gone the other way and is a fervent supporter of this base's "good works".

Either way, Norio has a thing for Area 51.

I'd beg to differ however about this base [or at least its riason d'etre] not being "secret" at least until the Soviets outed it through satellite photography.

The constant expansion of its perimeter over the years to keep prying eyes at bay certainly makes the operations at "Area 51" secret.

It's the developmental ground for much of the United States' aerial weapon's development.

What's the big deal - it was and is a no brainer.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:00:33 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:49:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - King

>From: A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO <gevaerd.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 08:17:09 -0200
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers ->
>>Date: Monday, February 07, 2005 12:32 PM
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Hayakawa Recants?

>>Hayakawa 'Recants'?

<snip>

>Amazing... Hayakawa goes against all theories, solid or not,
>ever established to explain the secrecy towards Area 51. I
>remember listening to one of his lectures, some 10-12 years go,
>when he was one of the leading proponents of the theories which
>claim that Area 51 is, yes, a UFO-related top secret facility.
>What made this man change his mind?

Hi A.J.,

Perhaps he had his furniture surreptitiously rearranged too many times. <g>

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Boone

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 12:08:47 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:51:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Boone

>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 05:52:18 -0800
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

<snip>

>Norio sent me an e-mail a week ago that was posted to my site:

><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/norio.html>

>Everyone is surprised...

It's always been a pleasure to communicate with Norio.

He's always been a stand up kind of guy with a great sense of humor.

We fans of his will miss him so I hope he doesn't regret his years of hanging around the UFO arena.

At least he's a big enough of a man to say that maybe he made an error or that he did make an error. How many can say they would own up like he's done?

What's funny to me is how at first, many years ago he was one of a few telling the world of the secret Area 51 base. No one believed him.

Now, everybody and their third cousin believes Area 51 to be a secret base and now Norio doesn't?

Another flipped script.

With any luck, as soon as Norio appears on Coast to Coast to tell the world about his latest conclusion, a fleet of alien spaceships will blanket the entire Groom Lake region.

Just jokin'.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 12:13:19 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 16:51:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Boone

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:05:31 -0600
>Subject: Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 02:12:53 EST
>>Subject: Ufology Needs A Ribbon

>>Say, I was just thinking.

>>Every other cause celebre has a ribbon to bring attention to it.

>>There are blue, red, green, and of course yellow ribbons.

>>Ufology needs a ribbon to commemorate those people who have
>>suffered through this for half a century.

><snip>

>>How about Silver Ribbons?

><snip>

>Or how about 'gray' for the color of some ET's :-)

>or perhaps a combo of both

Well, the 'gray' is used to highlight senior citizen causes.

We've just about run out of primary and secondary colors.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 8](#)

Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 17:01:00 -0500
Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
02.08.05

Source: Terra.cl
Date: 02.08.05

<http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

[Click 'Ir A Galeria' below thumbnail]

At Iquique
Incredible UFO Photo In Northern Chile

This extraordinary chance photo was taken in the northern part of our country and shows the transit of an unidentified flying object (TERRA.cl)

IQUIQUE, February 8, 2005.- On Friday, February 4, Carlos Bruna, an official with the Controllorship of the Republic in the city of Iquique, visited the Tres Islas Beach, some 10 minutes away from this northern city, to take a break. Since he had acquired a digital camera in recent days, he began taking photos of the mountains and their contrast with the blue sky.

To his surprise, upon loading the photos into his computer, he saw that one of the images showed a lens-shaped object, expelling some sort of white energy, was flying high above one of the mountains.

The AION CHILE organization received the images of the strange object from Carlos Bruna. They are still under analysis.

"The fact is that when they informed me of the case, I only expected to see the alleged evidence. I thought it could correspond to one of many explained phenomena. But I think the photo shows some interesting details," observes Rodrigo Fuenzalida, AION's director.

"When I received the material, I found that the mountains were too well outlined, and the colors had a curious clarity. However, upon listening to Carlos, the percipient, I found his account to be an honest one. I think the photo is genuine. Now the challenge consists in determining the origin of the stimulus captured by the camera's eye," he remarked.

According to AION's representative in Chile's 1st Region, Mario Pizarro, the UFO image is genuine and studies conducted on site suggest that the object had a diameter of between 3 and 4 meters.

Translation (c) 2005, Scott Corrales Institute of Hispanic Ufology
Special thanks to Guillermo Gimenez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 13:18:44 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 06:44:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 04:46:45 -0800
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 08:17:33 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

<snip>

>>I've begun checking into the other entertainers performing
>>with the Dick Drake trio at Harrah's hoping maybe the Drake
>>bunch told them about the sighting. An internet search confirms
>>at least two of them dead. However, a relative of one of them is
>>interested in digging into it, so with a little luck maybe there
>>will be further to report soon.

>I have to say this is one fine piece of legwork by Dave Rudiak.
>There _was_ a Dick Drake Trio, they did play in Reno (accordion
>and all!) and now we know which club (Harrah's which has since
>eaten up two city blocks).

>My initial suspicions were groundless. If we get _real_ lucky,
>maybe someone who knew Drake or one of the sidemen will be
>found; somebody who might confirm hearing them talk about their
>experience on US Highway 395.

Dave,

You could try contacting the American Federation of Musicians
[Union] in NY.

<http://www.afm.org/public/home/index.php#>

They should have them listed or a history of them.

However a search in these two locals [below] of the AF of M
might be more productive. If any of these musicians are still in
the business, they will show up here. Check past presidents of
the local or the treasurer.

Even after 40 odd years Drake might still be playing though more
likely he's moved on to another line of work.

The Las Vegas Local 369 of the AF of M is:

<http://www.afm.org/369/>

The Reno Local 368 for the AF of M is:

<http://www.afm.org/368/>

Best,

Don Ledger

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

How UFOs Relate To The New World Order

From: William Bolt <ab5sy.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 09:19:26 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 06:51:26 -0500
Subject: How UFOs Relate To The New World Order

Source: savethemales.ca

05-02-05

How UFOs Relate To The New World Order

By Henry Makow

Like most people my opinion of flying saucers and aliens was programed by the mass media.

I thought they were possible but highly unlikely and speculative.

Now I know better, thanks to Dr. Stephen Greer's book "Disclosure: Military and Government Witnesses Reveal the Greatest Secrets in Modern History." (2001) His web site is www.disclosureproject.org

Stephen Greer is a country doctor from North Carolina who has a wife, four children, a dog and a faith in American values. Since 1992, he has collected video and written testimony from some 400 retired members of the U.S. military, intelligence and aeronautics industry including Presidential advisors, generals, pilots and two astronauts many of whom had Top- Secret clearance.

The gist of this overwhelming evidence is that every year we have thousands of visits from UFO's, which are tracked on radar at speeds ranging from 5000 to 20,000 mph. There are also thousands of signals reaching the earth from outer space.

Over the last 60 years many UFO's have crashed or have been shot down by missiles or laser beams. The US has recovered these spaceships and replicated some of the technology. It has recovered aliens both dead and alive.

The revelations contained in "Disclosure" have profound implications for the fate of humanity. They reveal that the laws of physics as we know them are obsolete. Space is not empty but an energy field that can provide an infinite supply of free energy and propulsion.

Thanks to extraterrestrial contact, the technology already exists to release humanity from its dependence on its dwindling reserves of polluting fossil fuels, which is the cause of war.

I am not asking you to believe this right away. People think they must either accept or reject a new idea. There is a third alternative: reserve judgment.

Keep in mind that your attitudes to UFO's were shaped by "experts" like Dr. Carl Sagan, who was on the CIA payroll. The CIA employs a small army of people to mislead you.

I urge you to get Dr. Greer's 570-page book. It may be one of the most important you ever read.

Nick Cook, the Aviation Editor of Jane's Defense Weekly, also confirms these conclusions in a book "The Hunt for Zero Point." He traces the development and suppression of zero gravity technologies over the last 80 years.

COVER-UP

Witnesses describe a massive and coordinated cover-up. People who have had UFO contact are ridiculed and warned that their career will end if they speak. Their lives and their family's lives are threatened. Many people have "disappeared."

A network of military and intelligence agencies along with major defense contractors is responsible for the cover-up. Generally speaking, they are not accountable to the President and Congress. Dr. Greer has met with many Senators who frankly admit they are "not in the loop."

The purpose of this cover-up is both economic and political. At the end of the Nineteenth Century, London-based bankers established their power and wealth on the basis of large international cartels. In the US, they used their control of the railroad to favor their agent J.D. Rockefeller with low rates enabling him to eliminate competition.

The same principle applied to the coal and steel cartels. Later they expanded to defense, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and media. They run the US from London through their American partners.

As my readers know, the goal of these bankers and their allies is to formalize a thinly veiled totalitarian world government. The presence of extraterrestrials and new technology is interfering with this plan. The bankers have trillions of dollars invested in old technology. They will release the new technology only if and when it suits them. In the meantime, they use it to keep us enslaved, and to ward off more advanced civilizations.

COORDINATION

How do they coordinate a cover-up that extends to so many countries? I don't know the answer to this but there is a disturbing possibility that national differences may be more apparent than real. Through Communism they took control of Russia and China. After World War Two, they took over Japan and continental Europe.

Witnesses describe secret meetings dedicated to the subject of extraterrestrials that involved an international cast. The New World Order has been here a long time. They are unveiling it gradually.

In the US alone, the cover-up must extend to hundreds of government agencies, military units, research labs and corporations. How is that coordinated?

Again, I do not know, but if I had to guess, I'd venture it is controlled by Freemasonry through their network, which I understand is well represented in these areas.

Dr. Greer quotes Senator Daniel Inouye: "There exists a shadowy Government with its own Air Force, its own navy, it's own fundraising mechanism, and the ability to pursue its own ideas of the national interest, free from all checks and balances, and free from the law itself."

Indeed the emerging picture is that the London bankers use this occult secret network to control the planet. This Satanic "religion" is indeed the secret guiding principle behind our ideas of "progress" and what is "modern."

PRISON PLANET

Many civilizations in the universe may be thousands of years in advance of ours. Increasingly they appear to view banker-controlled mankind as a potential menace, with reason. Strange as this may sound, the focus of UFO attention has been the bankers' nuclear installations. They appear to be actively resisting the US plan to put weapons in space.

Space-based weaponry is presented to the public as a deterrent

against "rogue nations" like North Korea. In fact, it seems to have a dual purpose that has nothing to do with this. It is designed to prevent "alien influences" from liberating us from our mental, spiritual and economic bondage, at the same time as controlling us physically.

Apparently this scenario has been in place at least since the 1970's. According to the testimony of Dr. Carol Rossin, which is on line, Werner Von Braun warned her about it in 1974. He said the aim was "to control the Earth from space and space itself."

Dying from cancer, Von Braun enlisted Rossin, a fellow executive at Fairchild Industries, to help educate the public and decision-makers. He regarded space-based weapons as "dumb, dangerous, destabilizing, too costly, unnecessary and unworkable."

Significantly he outlined the five-step "scare tactics" used to justify them. First the public has been made to fear the Communists; then "terrorists"; then "rogue nations"; then "asteroids" and finally "extraterrestrials."

"Remember Carol, the last card is the alien card. We are going to have to build space-based weapons against aliens and all of it is a lie," he told her.

The program is slowly unfolding as Von Braun predicted. We are at the rogue nation, terrorist stage.

A 2002 report concludes: "The continued development of these space systems seriously undermines the claim that the U.S. missile defence project is purely defensive in nature. Instead, the dual use capability of both the SBL and kinetic kill vehicles makes them inherently threatening to the space assets and national security of other countries. ... The possibility of sparking an arms race in space, with seriously detrimental effects on global commerce, communications and security, should not be underestimated."

CONCLUSION

The "dual use capability" of US space weapons might also be designed to deter advanced civilizations that pose a threat to the Masonic banker's monopoly of power and wealth, and their satanic New World Order agenda.

Yes, it would be better if a large flying saucer landed on the field during half time at the Superbowl and ETs emerged. But Dr. Stephen Greer's book is credible. Don't dismiss it without reading it first.

Far fetched as it sounds, at the rate we're going, extraterrestrials could represent degenerate mankind's best hope. Who knows what form Divine intervention can take? If we won't represent God, maybe a more advanced civilization will.

Henry Makow, Ph.D. is the inventor of the board game Scruples and author of A Long Way To Go For A Date. His articles on feminism and the New World Order are archived at his web site. Henry is a regular columnist for Ether Zone.

Henry Makow can be reached at: Henry.nul

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:27:14 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 06:53:02 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - King

>From: Nikolay Subbotin <paragloss.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
>Subject: UFO Research Software?

>Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any
>software for professional UFO research.

>In Russia, we're now trying to create special programs. Is it
>of interestt to you?

>I think we can work together on this.

Hi Nikolay,

What would the software you are working on actually do?

I have thought for some time that a "killer app" for UFO research would be to leverage the internet for what it is best able to do...link far-flung data with ease.

Imagine a subscription website, where the work of Sparks, Aldrich, etc., were linked to appropriate audio files in Wendy Connors project, and the Brian Vike, Peter Davenport style sites were cross-linked by similar traits, locales, or event details.

The internet was created for exactly this purpose...to reduce duplicated effort by providing "living" documents. When new data is added, the links remain up to date, since the data is managed by individuals far and wide.

A good example of this is the Wikipedia. Perhaps not the best model, but it's a good example of how the internet can be leveraged to provide good data in a single place, even while the actual data resides in many places, updated and categorized regularly.

Another example is the "Maestro" software provided by JPL for managing the rover images returned from Mars. The program itself is really just a graphical front-end for a database...allowing the user to access specific data from a growing database of images, without having to remember an unwieldy file name, etc.

The database is the real product. Maestro is just a "viewer" for the database...a query engine.

The only requirement would be an agreed-upon framework for listing event details...a nomenclature as it were for UFO data gathering. Once the parties involved most directly in warehousing current and past events agreed on a set of descriptive criteria, all the databases could be merged from a distance, using the simple little hyperlink.

Even without such a framework, the wikipedia idea could be used as a central link warehouse for current work in the field. Just like "real" scientists. And I mean links to data on a case by case basis, rather than a list of links to disparate databases. Without conformity of database design, it would be much more

cumbersome and more like a Google search, which we can already accomplish.

I suggested a subscription model because an open project of this sort would likely attract many from beyond the fringe. Plus, those who do the work of producing the content would see some compensation for their toil. Many news services provide constantly updated information for a monthly fee.

Alfred Lehmborg mentioned the internet as a growing source of news for many people, as an obvious reaction to the politically-canted and dubiously authoritative "mainstream media".

The internet was invented to allow collaboration without proximity. What better bailiwick for serious UFO study and research?

I think this would qualify as an example of the "software" Nikolay refers to.

So Nikolay, what software are you Russians working on?

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 07:52:57 -1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 06:55:32 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 14:25:01 -0400
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
>>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>>Source: ABC News

>>><http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=468496>

>>I've been following discussion here about this forthcoming
>>2 hour ABC special about the UFO phenomenon. I'd like to offer my
>>take on it which represents my own exopolitical approach to this
>>phenomenon rather than the more traditional nuts and bolts
>>approach of UFO researchers.

>>I notice from the list of interviewees and cases that this show
>>will repeat the same old formula of classic case sightings and
>>veteran UFO researchers discussing why we should consider
>>'lights in the sky' as a serious phenomenon, and why their nuts
>>and bolts approach is legitimate research.

>Michael are you psychic? I know I didn't talk about lights in
>the sky (I never do) and I very much doubt if Dick Hall or
>Jerome Clark or Michael Swords did. I do think our nuts and
>bolts approach is legitimate. Of course that includes large
>scale scientific studies, physical trace cases, radar visual
>sightings involving multiple witnesses, etc

Aloha Stan,

I know you don't have control over the ABC's editorial decisions
but it's clear that they chose to focus on the sightings
phenomenon in their selection of what to air which is clear in
their promotional blurb, e.g.:

"For decades there have been sightings of UFOs by millions and
millions of people. It is a mystery that only science can solve,
and yet the phenomenon remains largely unexamined. Most of the
reporting on this subject by the mainstream media holds those
who claim to have seen UFOs up to ridicule."

The blurb also mentions it will look at "strange stories of
abduction" indicating a casual look at this phenomenon rather
than a thorough analysis. I agree that the nuts and bolts
approach is legitimate and needs to be included, but so too are the
multiple 'whistleblower' reports about EBEs, crash retrievals,
reverse engineering, etc., which appear to be absent in the
forthcoming show if the blurb correctly outlines the content.
You may have mentioned some of these things in your own
interview but it looks like they didn't make it past the final
cut.

>>It seems that the producers of the Peter Jennings show have been
>>persuaded by veteran UFO researchers and 'others' that he needs to

>>stick to the same old formula of focusing on 'lights in the sky' and
>>having the same old pro and con debates, rather than looking at
>>Disclosure Project witnesses and others who have direct EBE
>>experiences.

>They interviewed 150 people including many witnesses. Do you
>have a list or are you intuiting who these witnesses were?

I'm sure that it will be a very interesting set of interviews but if they are all going to focus on the sightings phenomenon and a few 'strange abduction' stories, then it demonstrates the show will be very unbalanced given the available testimonies of disclosure witnesses. This is really disappointing given many of these witnesses put their credibility on the line in coming forward but this continues to escape mainstream media attention. For some these are tall stories that can't be verified. Yet they do indicate non-disclosure policy by various agencies and collectively these testimonies are impressive evidence. That's what I and others found to be so compelling about Greer's 2001 Press Conference and the Disclosure Project book.

>>It's as though the emergence of whistleblowers/contactees
>>disclosing their role in suppressing UFO secrets, and actually
>>witnessing extraterrestrial biological entities (EBEs) and/or
>>their ships hasn't happened.

><snip>

>>The latest whistleblower/contactee that offers testimony with
>>serious exopolitical significance is Charles Hall whom I
>>recommend to the list as someone who is both credible and
>>significant- see:

>><http://www.exopolitics.org/charles-hall.htm>

>I take it you have seen some evidence on which to base
>acceptance of the tall whites parading around Hall's part of
>Nevada? You have checked his military and college records? I
>suppose you want everybody to accept Bob Lazar and Michael Wolf
>Kruvant as whistleblowers in the know? They don't check out.

Hall's testimony, his sincerity, coherence and consistency are all factors in determining whether he is credible. Documents in terms of degrees, employment are available to be checked out and he has made some of these available on his website. Paola Harris has done much of the background checking and preliminary investigations on Charles Hall and found that he checks out. I think she has good intuition about credible witnesses and she has an impressive track record in interviewing witnesses and thus has the background to make a decent call about a witness's testimony.

As for Bob Lazar and Michael Wolf (deceased), I think our approaches differ. I know that you view their inability to provide documents substantiating their employment and degrees as indicating a lack of credibility, thereby making their claims too dodgy to seriously consider. In contrast I view such removal/alteration of documents as very likely a sign of government interference. So would the responsible government agencies alter and/or remove documents/records of (potential) whistleblowers? You seem to think such an idea is ridiculous based on your past critique of Lazar (I don't know if this is still your view), whereas I would argue that this is a standard policy by various agencies. I know many would agree with me on that one since there's a pattern here which repeats itself in the cases of many whistleblowers and some of these have commented on this government policy.

If document tampering/removal is standard policy by government agencies in dealing with potential whistleblowers, then we need to put more emphasis on factors such as sincerity, coherence, consistency, etc., when assessing whistleblower testimonies. If the end result is inconclusive (which is the intention of government agencies), this doesn't preclude citing their testimonies in building a larger picture or pattern in what is going on. Consistencies in whistleblower testimonies is something that also helps in dealing with the credibility issue. For example, Roger Dean's testimony about NATO's 1964 Assessment is similar to what Lazar claims to have read at S4. Since Lazar wouldn't have known about Dean, this helps build up Lazar's credibility.

>>I think that the Peter Jennings special may ultimately
>>dissappoint since its main premises are inappropriate to the
>>>true challenge in understanding the UFO/exopolitical phenomenon
>>before us.

>I read with great disappointment Alfred Webre's Exopolitics
>book. It is loaded with proclamations without providing any
>evidence to support them. What newsman will accept those on face
>value? Why should they?

I can't comment on Alfred's forthcoming book but I do agree that
it's vitally important to provide references substantiating
one's arguments and claims. I think we might disagree over the
plausibility of the sources we respectively cite but as long as
there's consistency and sufficient argumentation to support
one's approach, then we can have a productive dialogue. I know I
have an uphill struggle in substantiating many of the
whistleblower/contactee testimonies I use in my exopolitics
analyses, but that's to be expected given the distorting factors
that exist in this field of research which deliberately skews
debates and investigations in ways that suit undisclosed
national security agendas.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 18:07:24 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 06:57:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>to believe.

You may find it hard to believe, but I'm afraid I don't. I know there's a popular view that extraordinary events must always have extraordinary consequences, but actual human behavior often turns out to be much at variance with what one might expect.

For example, if I were to ask people on this List how they think they might react if they were in a building which caught fire, I'm sure many people would say "I'd run like mad for the fire exit". But when the psychologist David Canter examined how people had behaved during a real life event - the King's Cross Underground fire - he discovered that many people were extremely reluctant to abandon their normal routine behavior, even when at one point smoke was clearly visible inside the station. It seems from this and from other examples that human beings can be very resistant to accepting that the proper order of things is being violated, and often very slow to react when it is.

There is also evidence from lab studies that people can often readily be induced to believe self-evidently false propositions by means of peer conformity pressure. Exactly what this indicates about behavior outside the lab is arguable (as always) but this does suggest that there are potentially powerful forces acting on human behavior which could inhibit the flow of information about anomalous events.

>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell
>hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>was an event of negligible historical importance?

I can't say I really believe the story (the endless talk about balloons has lost me completely I'm afraid) but I have no difficulty with the idea that Roswell might have been of negligible historical importance.

In order to have an effect on history, something has to be capable of impacting on our culture. But a crashed spaceship (let's assume for the sake of argument that it would have been a spaceship) would be simply an inert object unless scientific analysis were capable of unlocking its secrets.

I know we tend to think of alien spaceships as artifacts a few hundred years in advance of our current civilization, but statistically it's actually extremely unlikely that our first

encounter with an alien civilization would be with one so close to our own in terms of technological development.

The gap is far more likely to be millions of years, if not tens of millions or hundreds of millions, rather than just a few hundred. Given such a technological gap I can well imagine that scientific analysis of such an artifact might yield little more than confusion and bafflement (rather like trying to solve an impossible crossword clue :-))

In such a circumstance I can imagine that initial excitement might give way to frustration and even anger, whereupon attempts might even be made to destroy the offending artifact (I'm not sure but I believe there are examples in the primatological literature of exactly this sort of behavior), or failing that, to hide it away and forget about it. In that case those individuals who had been associated with the debacle might well be disinclined to remark on the fact.

Or perhaps you don't believe human beings are capable of this sort of behavior?

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 18:22:56 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 06:58:48 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>Source: ABC News

>><http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=468496>

>Aloha All,

>I've been following discussion here about this forthcoming
>2 hour ABC special about the UFO phenomenon. I'd like to offer my
>take on it which represents my own exopolitical approach to this
>phenomenon rather than the more traditional nuts and bolts
>approach of UFO researchers.

>I notice from the list of interviewees and cases that this show
>will repeat the same old formula of classic case sightings and
>veteran UFO researchers discussing why we should consider
>'lights in the sky' as a serious phenomenon, and why their nuts
>and bolts approach is legitimate research.

>It seems that the producers of the Peter Jennings show have been
>persuaded by veteran UFO researchers and 'others' that he needs to
>stick to the same old formula of focusing on 'lights in the sky' and
>having the same old pro and con debates, rather than looking at
>Disclosure Project witnesses and others who have direct EBE
>experiences.

>It's as though the emergence of whistleblowers/contactees
>disclosing their role in suppressing UFO secrets, and actually
>witnessing extraterrestrial biological entities (EBEs) and/or
>their ships hasn't happened.

Oh it has happened all right, starting with George Adamski in
1952.

>Its only when those who have direct ET related experiences as
>whistleblowers/contactees are appropriately investigated and
>understood that we will begin to fully fathom the political
>implications of the undisclosed extraterrestrial presence and of
>current exopolitical developments.

What are these "current exopolitical developments"?

>For those UFO researchers not prepared to do this, I do believe
>their main interest is in limiting this entire UFO phenomenon
>according to biases and professional competencies that are
>increasingly becoming an anachronism given the material that is
>emerging.

>The general public is moving beyond this myopic focus on 'lights
>in the sky' and are seriously exploring the testimonies of
>whistleblowers/contactees revealing 'lies on the ground'.

The public moved well beyond 'lights in the sky' five decades
ago. Remember Scully and crashes in the desert? Also Roswell

and Rendlesham have had plenty of, maybe too much, attention in the last 20+ years.

>The latest whistleblower/contactee that offers testimony with
>serious exopolitical significance is Charles Hall whom I
>recommend to the list as someone who is both credible and
>significant.

In which case he will at some point testify before Congress?

>I think that the Peter Jennings special may ultimately
>disappoint since its main premises are inappropriate to the
>>true challenge in understanding the UFO/exopolitical phenomenon
>before us.

You are right, the program is likely to disappoint. Most sighting reports, especially night lights, are dull & boring. But if contactees, abductees or whistle-blowers like Charles Hall are present, it is still likely to disappoint.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Youngsters Outstripped At Some Visual Tasks

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 18:26:21 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 07:04:58 -0500
Subject: Youngsters Outstripped At Some Visual Tasks

So, does this mean that older people are more likely to notice an UFO?

Joe

Source: [News.nul](#):

<http://tinyurl.com/57fbf>

02-02-05

Motion Perception Improves With Age

Roxanne Khamsi

Older observers outstrip youngsters at some visual tasks

As people grow older, their vision can actually get better in some ways, according to a Canadian study. The findings suggest that neurological changes could help the elderly to spot small motions in otherwise uniform scenes.

Part of visual processing in the human brain involves cells that suppress each other's activity. This allows the mind to focus on a scene's important features while ignoring trivial regions. But as people age, these inhibitory interactions seem to weaken.

To explore the effects of this change, researchers tested people between 18 and 31 years old, and others aged 60 and above. Subjects viewed a computer screen showing moving, vertical black-and-white stripes. They then had to decide in which direction the bands were travelling.

Prompt perspective

Previous studies have shown that, as the number of stripes in view increases, young people become much worse at identifying their movement. Scientists think that the stripes' large, stark borders activate the brains inhibitory mechanisms. The mind starts disregarding these monotonous forms.

Vision expert Patrick Bennett of McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario and his colleagues wanted to know if older people showed the same drop in performance. To the researchers' surprise, they did not.

With a large part of the screen filled with the high-contrast stripes, younger people required 100 milliseconds to work out the direction of movement, and took twice as long for a small patch. But the performance of older people stayed constant at around 70 milliseconds.

"That's a very odd result because in many, many tasks you find that older people require more time. It's an exception to the rule," says Bennett. Reduced brain inhibition might make older

observers more sensitive to visual input that is normally suppressed, he says. The team reports its results in *Neuron*.

It is the high contrast between black and white stripes that produces this effect, and not the expanding area on the screen showing the stripes. Both young and older people are faster at identifying the movement of low-contrast grey stripes when they can see more of them.

The big picture

So might this be an advantage in the real world? Bennett speculates that older people might find it easier to follow action in sweeping scenes, such as a sporting event. "If you're watching a football match, you look at the flow of the players up and down the field. That part might be easier for older people."

At the moment, however, he and his fellow researchers simply aim to pinpoint where the related inhibitory pathways act in the brain.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Fort Wayne Media Watch [was: Socorro & Balloons]

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 10:32:03 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 07:15:29 -0500
Subject: Fort Wayne Media Watch [was: Socorro & Balloons]

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 11:30:36 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 08:48:36 -0500
>>>Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2005 07:34:04 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

><snip>

>>>David and James...I 'll ask this, again of Dr. Rudiak...
>>>What was the nature of Zamora's eyesight - David Rudiak's
>>>professional specialty?

>>>He lost his glasses (and sunglasses) at an inopertune time, so
>>>what could he see or not see, accurately?
>>>Has anyone ever checked this? Have they?

>>What's with the badgering tone?

>>The important point is not that Zamora dropped his glasses, but
>>when he dropped them and for how long. What did he report seeing
>>when he had his glasses on and glasses off?

>>Zamora's eyesight with or without his glasses has nothing to do
>>with some of the more important details of the case, such as the
>>complete silence of the craft as it rapidly zipped away or the
>>fact that it was flying against the wind. No conventional
>>propulsion system or balloon can account for such details.

>David,

>This is the point of my "badgering tone" - what was the nature
>of Lonnie Zamora's eyesight? Isn't that an important "detail"
>(not minutiae, Dr. Maccabee)?

This post was written in frustration and anger at Rich Reynold's
and his disingenuous bunch of cohorts at "Fort Wayne Media
Watch," who have been attacking many here on UFO Updates the
last month or so. Maybe I'll regret writing this later on, but
right now I feel there are certain things that should be said
about this group of malcontents.

First, allow me to expand on my "badgering tone" comment. I had
been away for four days visiting a sick relative. I got back and
saw Reynolds post with his usual insistence that his questions
be answered yesterday, as if people didn't have their own lives
and were at his personal beck and call. Maybe Reynold's should
first learn that responding to his numerous queries is not an
obligation but a courtesy extended him by the responder.

But what really got my blood up occurred right after I wrote my

"badgering tone" post, I went to Reynolds blog site to see his and his fellow Fort Wayne Media Watch's latest rants on the "inner circle" of UFO elitist. These "whine columns" are what Reynolds and his cohorts call the new Ufology, as opposed to the old Ufology dominated by aging "elitists" like Dick Hall, Don Ledger, Bruce Maccabee, Jerry Clark, Larry Hatch, and many others. Many of these aging "elitists" are fond of outmoded things like good evidence logical thinking, and subjecting theories to scientific analysis when possible.

Before these computer geeks started attacking the UFO UpDates crowd, they were typing out worthless blogs about the deficiencies of the Fort Wayne media: the newscasts were all bad, the newscasters were worse, the weather people terrible, etc. (So what else is new?) Apparently even they found themselves boring and decided they needed a new gig. Hey, why not attack Ufology?

The old Ufology and Ufologists have failed, they write. Further they claim old Ufologists are suppressing the younger Ufologists and their ideas, which they claim will ultimately solve the UFO mystery. Since they never seem to research or know anything on their own, seem to have no scientific backgrounds, and seem incapable of logically analyzing information provided them by the old Ufologists, it's difficult to understand how this new whiz-bang Ufology is supposed to solve anything.

The new Ufology seems to consist of nothing more than entertaining the latest screwball theory of the week and then writing character assassination pieces against anybody who points out that it is crazy. This leads to charges that anybody who doesn't seriously consider their latest nutso theory is unimaginative, narrow-minded, and rigid in their thinking. We are accused of not considering all the possible angles, no matter how preposterous.

But I digress. Back to the latest blogs at Reynolds site:

<http://rrrgroup.blogspot.com/>

with titles like "My God, it's incestuous...", "Where is the cogent UFO web-site?", "The Insular UFO Crowd." Then there was one directed specifically at me, titled simply "David Rudiak" by Fort Wayne blecher Christopher Jay, of whom I know nothing. His essay on me opens charmingly as follows:

"David Rudiak is considered a charlatan by some in the UFO Community and by many in media; this from his creative interpretation of the Ramey memo seen in the famous Roswell photograph..."

(Well no doubt "some" in the UFO Community consider me a "charlatan," but who are these "many in the media?" This is certainly news to me that I have any media following whatsoever. "The many in the media" is probably none other than the Fort Wayne Media Watch group themselves.)

Then Jay goes on to write the following: "I find David Rudiak, whose specialties are Optometry and Physics, to be an interesting and thorough (not necessarily correct) exponenter of things arcane when it comes to UFOs.

"For instance, I posed a query asking what kind of eyesight deficiency did Socorro witness Lonnie Zamora have =96 which is right up Dr. Rudiak's alley. (Zamora lost his glasses at a key moment during his UFO episode, and I'm wondering what corrective lenses he was using and how the loss of his glasses might have affected his observation.)

"David Rudiak hasn't addressed that issue, focusing instead on the balloon hypothesis that has been discarded by me, and others, in favor of an experimental craft, or even a contraption cited at this web-site."

Well there it is again, the demand for information and an insinuation that I was avoiding the question. First of all, I had never received a query from Christopher Jay, whom I don't know. Second, even if I had received it, I had no way to respond to it, since I was away.

The only reason I was still "focusing on the balloon hypothesis"

was because other people wouldn't let it go. I was still going over all those angles I was accused of not considering.

It is also wonderful that Jay and others (meaning fellow bloggers like Reynolds) have the freedom to discard the balloon hypothesis whenever they like and move on to other things (their latest nutso theory of the week). That freedom they wouldn't grant to the old Ufologists. No, we had to go over and over again why the balloon hypothesis made no sense, didn't fit the facts of the case, in fact was physically impossible, and then guys like Reynolds would come back and accuse us of narrow-mindedness, still not looking at all the angles, etc., etc.

What we have here from Rich Reynolds and the Fort Wayne bunch is typical self-centered adolescent behavior. They act like teenagers in rebellion. Everything has to be done on their terms or else you become the subject of their attacks. Though they claim their priority is solving the UFO question with fresh thinking, what they really appear to be after is personal attention and more grist for their worthless blogs.

The extent of their UFO 'research' seems to be doing two-minute Google searches to find another nut-ball theory or worthless link to waste everybody's time on. After Reynolds couldn't get any traction recycling a hot-air balloon theory, he moved on to a NASA Web link of balloon research. This supposedly contained "new angles" which we had failed to consider. What was it exactly we had failed to consider? Reynolds couldn't say. Of course there was nothing new there to consider. They were just different balloons.

Reynolds simply ignored all the arguments that had been made why a balloon of any kind couldn't work, such as balloons are light, whereas the Socorro craft was heavy, balloons can't fly at high speed, don't fly against the wind, and had to be very big whereas the Socorro craft was small.

As if that wasn't enough, Reynolds then claimed it was our obligation, not his, to dig through hundreds of old NASA technical papers. We were supposed to do his own research for him, wasting our time chasing after his own fantasy "new angles."

When he couldn't get anywhere with that "new Ufology" ploy, he and the Fort Wayne gang moved on to "Lonnie and the bean." You see, one website had this story that some old biker had told someone a story in a bar that he and his biker buddies had built the Socorro craft, which was powered by some miraculous new-fangled reciprocating engine. Anybody with any brains familiar with the Socorro case could see from the gitgo that the story was complete idiocy on a number of grounds, but we were all supposed to take it seriously lest we again be accused of narrow-mindedness and not willing to look at all the angles.

>When one's witnessing anecdote is based primarily on
>observation, I would think that an investigation would zero in
>on the eyesight of the person relaying information he or she
>saw. Everything else is peripheral (no pun) to that.

>The devil's, again, in the details.

No, in this case the devil's in the those who ignore the details. After laying out why Zamora's temporary loss of his glasses has no real effect on the important details of the case which point to the Socorro craft being highly unconventional in nature, Reynold's typically has no comment. It's off to new and better things.

>(By the way, I'm not an advocate of the balloon hypothesis,

By the way, this is typical Reynold's disingenuousness. He was initially very much an advocate of the balloon hypothesis. He demanded we look at every conceivable aspect of it, no matter how absurd. He milked it to death. I suspect he and his gang only moved on to other things because even they realized they would be branded as fools if they lingered on it any longer.

>but rather the experimental craft hypothesis.

Now the "new Ufologists" have moved on to Socorro being an "experimental craft," their newest flavor of the month. Do they

present anything called `_evidence_` to support this theory before again wasting people's time on it? How about an actual document of a real experimental craft that matched the described unconventional characteristics of the Socorro craft, such as vertical takeoff and landing, completely silent propulsion when aloft, oval shape and wingless operation, and capable of high acceleration and supersonic speed. At the very least, how about even one witness who worked on such a project? Is that asking for too much?

Oh, I forget. Real evidence is an "old Ufology" thingie. Instead we all must seriously consider their (not so) new proposal, sans any evidence, lest we again be accused of narrow-mindedness, elitism, and suppressing the new generation of "Ufologists."

>The balloon thing was
>intertwined into the argument because the NASA information was
>confluent with LEMS, balloons, and other tested flying and
>landing thingies.)

"The balloon thing" began as Reynolds trying to resurrect Larry Robinson's hot air balloon theory. When that deflated, he moved on to the "NASA information," insisting we consider hybrid hot air balloons, not that that changed anything. Then there was "Lonnie and the bean." Now its LEMS and "other flying and landing thingies."

Now here's a simple question for Rich Reynolds and the other clueless time-wasters at Fort Wayne Media Watch. What NASA "LEM" or "other flying and landing thingies" had a silent propulsion system as described by Lonnie Zamora? Wasn't that the whole point of introducing balloons to begin with?

No doubt rather than taking a moment to think about this, Reynolds or somebody else at FWMW will write a blog demanding to know whether Zamora's hearing was tested.

I suggest we just ignore this group of adolescents. Let them invent the "new Ufology" on their own without the help of the fossilized old Ufologists, whose knowledge they ignore anyway while heaping abuse upon them. With no one to act as a foil, they will have nothing more to blog about. My bet is that the "new Ufology" will die in a month or two as the adolescents quickly grow bored with themselves and seek yet another blogging gig.

David ("blog on") 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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:42:56 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 07:24:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

The version of the B-52 Minot issue by J. J. Velasco and quoted by Gildas Bourdais is flawed and incorrect.

Many hearsay items have not been confirmed and are stated, by Velasco, as fact, completely crippling the impact of the case.

The number of errors in this account renders it almost useless!

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947
<http://www.project1947.com/>
P. O. Box 391
Canterbury, CT 06331
(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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii

From: **Ralph Howard** <rhjr.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 14:04:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 09:09:54 -0500
Subject: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii

A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii (NASA NSL Project)

Take a look at this:

<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap050208.html>

Note: You may have to go to:

<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/>

and hit "refresh" to get animation

"UFO" is not listed as a possible candidate to explain the recorded observation.

Ralph O. Howard
MUFON of GA

A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii
Credit: Night Sky Live Collaboration

[sky photograph]

Explanation: What in heavens-above was that? Not everything seen on the night sky is understood. The Night Sky Live (NSL) project keeps its global array of continuously updating web cameras (CONCAMs) always watching the night sky. On the night of 2004 December 17, the fisheye CONCAM perched on top of an active volcano in Haleakala, Hawaii, saw something moving across the night sky that remains mysterious. The NSL team might have disregarded the above streak as unconfirmed, but the Mauna Kea CONCAM on the next Hawaiian island recorded the same thing. The NSL team might then have disregarded the streak as a satellite, but no record of it was found in the heavens-above.com site that usually documents bright satellite events. If you think you have a reasonable explanation for the streak, please contribute to the on-line discussion. Current candidates include a known satellite that was somehow missed by heavens-above, a recently launched rocket, and a passing space rock. Volunteers are solicited by the NSL project to help monitor the operability of each NSL CONCAM, including looking for interesting anomalies such as this.

Disclosure: Robert Nemiroff collaborates on both the NSL and APOD projects.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <alienview.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:44:00 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 09:15:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmberg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:23:15 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 17:23:39 -0000
>>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>I am intrigued by the way by these words from Gareth J. Medway
>>about the MJ12 papers. They strike me as very profound and
>>insightful and I am overwhelmed by the sound logic applied;

>>"Christopher Allan concludes that, if we can't prove MJ-12 a
>>hoax, we can certainly ask why, if the events described therein
>>did occur, there is no proof. I agree: if the Roswell story had
>>been genuine, then confirmation would have come to light by now,
>>just as Moore anticipated. It has not done, so claims about it
>>can be dismissed."

>>A quite brilliant logical dismissal with incredibly
>>sophisticated and original reasoning. He's hit the very point
>>that's eluded all before him. Another Magonia first!!

>I'm glad you appreciate that, because it is a vital point.

Right... I would have hoped that Mr. Miller appreciated that
'vital point' altogether differently than you presuppose for him
here, but it's not required. The value of 'Evidence', while not
salt/sugar proof, is certainly going to be in the eye of the
beholder, and in your case the beholder peers from the center of
a self-contrived, canted, and irrational hubris.

>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>with little contact with the outside world.

Stark irony there when the truth seems to be that the air
inside that little bubble seems to be of 'psychosocial'
manufacture, too much nitrogen and not enough O2. In other
words, you're hallucinating the high ground, Mr. Rimmer.

And there is no 'mainstream ufology', Sir, there are just some
more willing to hang out over the edge than others, and, going
"too far"... we'll, then they are largely treated the way
you treat the lesser fringy. The trouble with ufologists
generally, and what constitutes the threat to your 2D worldview,
seems to be their irritating proclivity to think outside your
churlish little bubble, you know, out where the Nitrogen, O2
ratio is a little more conducive to progressive thinking and
lesser self-delusion.

>One of the ways this
>is manifested is in its inability to understand that some UFO

>events - if they had in fact happened as described - would have
>had a major impact on the outside world, and not be confined to
>the 'paper trail' which many ufologists are so assiduous in
>tracing.

Amazing! Your argument is that if 'UFO events' (how dismissively quaint) occurred, the facts of that occurrence would be transmitted to the interested rank and file as a matter of standard operating procedure... by the agencies, institutions, and governments investigating them (and most impacted by them), and, then, in the same oblivious breath, dismisses six levels of quality evidence providing for a thoroughly ignored but valid impetus to study UFOs in the first place. What stupefying gall, Mr. Rimmer. What lofty assumptiveness! What incredible arrogance! I almost have to bow at your incredible audacity.

>Roswell, as generally accepted by many ufologists, represents a
>major turning point in human history: an extraterrestrial
>civilisation has come into contact with the major political,
>scientific and industrial power on our planet. The earth's
>greatest centre of scientific research suddenly found itself in
>possession of a piece of advanced technology from another
>planet.

Truly, you have sucked that up, entirely, out of a psycho-socialist thumb. At best you've conveniently cheery-picked the most objectionable reporting on a Roswell affair... Besides, you've been all over this before and the more credible Roswell researchers (we'll exclude yourself and the lovely 'triple 'K'...') are very clear that something decidedly 'untoward' occurred there in the forties... other things would occur in the 50's and so on... it's your lot living in pink cotton candy, Sir.

>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>to believe.

Just how unreasonable is all that exactly, Mr. Rimmer? Your use of a pop culture reference does not belie the fact that secrets are kept, likely ensconced into wooden crates at the centers of vast storage facilities like that scene in the Indiana Jones movie you allude to, and in a sense understood by ALL who saw it as an archetype... and secrets revealed, as they often are, are dealt with by a mechanism of ridicule, derision, and sleeve laughing... you know... your department, Sir.

>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell
>hadn't happened.

Well, not in-line with anything 'Corsonian'... but maybe you haven't been keeping up on current events... or maybe you have and just keep the sweat forming on your top lip well blotted... be that as it may, the world is a completely different place since 1947... but you're not going to see any of that from the center of your cloistered little bubble, are you, Sir.

>Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>was an event of negligible historical importance?

You won't be changing anything you don't officially admit to, Mr. Rimmer.

>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

You won't have any information without an official admission, either, Sir. No answers to questions not already asked and answered by the very persons I would criticize, and you should be.

[alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.net](http://www.AlienView.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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: An Open Letter To ABC News' Nightline Program

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 16:49:50 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 09:19:42 -0500
Subject: Re: An Open Letter To ABC News' Nightline Program

>From: Larry W. Bryant <overtci.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:02:46 -0500
>Subject: An Open Letter To ABC News' Nightline Program

>To: Mr. Tom Bettag, Executive Producer of "Nightline" ABC News
>niteline.nul

>As most of us in the UFO-research community eagerly await the
>airing of Peter Jennings's new documentary on the state of
>public UFO awareness (Feb. 24 at 8:00 p.m. EST), some of us
>would like to see "Nightline's" cameras zoom in on the "politics
>of UFOlogy" (as exemplified by our decades-long efforts to seek
>a full, unequivocal accounting from pertinent government
>officials as to what they REALLY know (and when they knew it)
>about UFO reality... and why they've chosen to suppress that
>knowledge from public view).

>We're aware that at least once in the past - several years ago -
>"Nightline" did air a program devoted to this hot-potato
>subject, but it failed to dig far enough for that elusive gold
>at the end of the UFO-coverup rainbow.

<snip>

Phil Klass and I were on Nightline on June 24, 1987, doing
battle about the government coverup. The rules were strange.
They wouldn't allow me to bring in the blacked out NSA or CIA
UFO documents - though I argued strongly. We were not supposed to
look at each other though sitting 2 feet apart, but each was to
look only at his camera.

Furthermore we never saw Ted Koppel, not even on a monitor, and
only heard him through a crumby earplug... thus being denied all
the non-verbal signals that one is accustomed to using.

Not great TV, though, in later looking at the tape, I thought it
went well. Strange way to seek truth.

Our part was shortened a bit because of a tribute Nightline did
to Jackie Gleason who died earlier that day.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 6

From: John Hayes <John.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 21:12:23 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 09:55:54 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 6

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan.nul>

=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 10, Number 6
February 9, 2005
Editor: Joseph Trainor

E-mail: Masinaigan.nul
Website: <http://www.ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

RUSSIAN JET ANSWERS
UFO ALERT ON BORDER

"Combat aircraft of Russia's Baltic Sea fleet were rushed to the border with Lithuania on Wednesday," January 22, 2005, "to repel a possible violation by what turned out to be an unnaturally thick and fast-moving cloud, the RIA-Novosti News Agency reported, citing the Baltic Fleet's press service."

"The press release said a Sukhoi Su-27 was vectored into the area near Russia's Baltic Sea enclave of Kaliningrad," located about 400 kilometers (250 miles) north of Warsaw, Poland after radar spotted a large object entering Russian airspace from Lithuania. However, the (Russian) plane found nothing after reaching the border area."

"The Baltic Fleet's Air Defense Command contacted military officials in Lithuania and Poland later, revealing that the intruder was actually a thick cloud that was being driven by a strong wind."

"Our fighter approached the trespasser to make it land or else leave Russian airspace," the press release said, 'A closer examination showed that it was a cloud instead of a light plane, and it was coming from the territory of Lithuania,' the Baltic Fleet spokesman said."

"Lithuanian military spokesman Ricardas Uzelka said Wednesday that Lithuanian authorities had no knowledge of any incident on the border."

"No Russian planes entered Lithuanian territory, nor did any Lithuanian plane enter Kaliningrad airspace," Uzelka said. (See Moscow News for January 27, 2005, "Russian combat jet signalled to repel trespasser cloud." Many thanks to Robert Fischer for this newspaper article.)

TOURISTS SAY A UFO WENT
DOWN IN THE HIMALAYAS

"In the Dharbanga district of" India's Bihar state, "which borders Nepal, tourists returning from Nepal are talking about a possible UFO crash in Nepal."

"The rumour is also rampant in Kathmandu, the capital of Nepal, and in other Nepali cities" such as Lalitpur, Bhaktapur and Nawakot.

"According to the rumours, the (UFO) crash site may

be close to Mount Everest and is totally inaccessible from either side. The rumour world is also speculating that the Chinese military is actively working to reach the crash site."

"It is also rumoured that the extraterrestrials are not allowing anyone to go near the site."

"Unusual activities and strange tremors were felt all over the Himalayan region last week from the India/Nepal (south) side. The number of UFO activities has gone up very heavily in recent days in this area" near Mount Everest. "And no one really knows what is happening."

"It's possible that the crash was nothing but a Chinese spacecraft. China has a number of secret military projects in this area."

"According to UFO scientists, it's possible that the underground UFO bases were damaged by the earth tremor last week and some slight aftershocks or the big earthquake in Sumatra, Indonesia" on December 26, 2004 and which measured 9.0 on the Richter scale, causing catastrophic tsunamis all around the Indian Ocean. (See India Daily for January 31, 2005, "Rumour of a UFO crash on Nepal/China border." Many thanks to Krishnari Bai Dharapurnanda for this newspaper article.)

LUMINOUS UFOs SEEN NEAR SCARBOROUGH, UK

"A series of moving bright lights was spotted in the sky off Scarborough," North Yorkshire, "cementing claims that the (UK's) East Coast is the UFO capital of Europe."

"Pat Glenwright of Grange Avenue saw the lights dart around the sky at 4:40 p.m. yesterday (Monday, January 31, 2005)."

"She said, 'There were about 14, so it definitely wasn't an aeroplane. They were flying in a group, and it looked from here they were the size of light bulbs.'"

"A friend added, 'They were bright and very high up. It was very noticeable.'"

"They were moving from right to left and looked as though they were heading (north) towards Whitby.'"

"In December (2004), Chris Parr of the British UFO Hunters Group said the coastal area between Filey and Scarborough was the hotspot for British UFO incidents."

"Filey UFO researcher Russ Kellett said there were more recorded sightings of UFOs in Filey and along the East Coast than anywhere in the country." (See the British newspaper Scarborough Today for February 1, 2005, "Bright lights spotted in sky." Many thanks to Robert Fischer for this newspaper article.)

AMBER UFO SIGHTED OVER SANTA ROSA, ARGENTINA

On Thursday, February 3, 2005, at 9:45 p.m., eyewitnesses in Santa Rosa, the capital of Argentina's La Pampa province, "saw a UFO crossing the skies of the pampas (prairie in the USA--J.T.). The UFO was yellowish-brass in color and moved from southeast to northeast some 30 degrees over the horizon."

"The object was recorded during part of its transit by CIUFOS La Pampa," a local UFO research group.

"Subsequently, another object was detected some 35 degrees over the horizon toward the west, following a north-south trajectory. After moving along at a constant luminosity, the object unexpectedly increased its size for 30 seconds, as in the earlier case, before vanishing completely."

Santa Rosa is located 400 kilometers (250 miles) west-southwest of Buenos Aires, the capital of Argentina. (Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales y Raul Oscar Chavez del grupo Planeta UFO para estas noticias.)

FLASHING RED-AND-WHITE UFO HOVERS OVER OTTAWA

On Sunday, January 30, 2005, at 5:30 p.m., eyewitness J.E. reported, "As I was preparing supper, I noticed a bright, red-and-white flashing light in the sky outside my

kitchen window. I called my husband to come and see. So we went outside, and my neighbour was walking by. I called her over and asked her to look at it. She was like, 'Oh, my God! What is that!?'"

"My husband kept saying it was an airplane, but airplanes don't sit in one spot like that."

"It was very bright, white-and-red flashing lights," she added, "It sat in one spot over Ottawa (Canada's capital--J.T.) for three minutes. It was as high as an airplane but every silent. The evening was dark, and the skies were clear that night."

The UFO "was a hundred times brighter than any star. Then, as we watched, it started moving toward the northwest slowly, then it was gone. It was nowhere in sight, just the stars."

"We started stating again it was a helicopter or an airplane, since we live close to the (MacDonald-Cartier International) airport, and incoming/outgoing air traffic flies right over our house. It was very unfamiliar and nothing like what would be coming from the Ottawa airport."

"It was bright red and white, the shape looking to be oval, as well. The lights kept going very fast around it. The red was brighter than the white and sparkled in the clear sky. The speed as I watched it was about 30 kilometers per hour (18 miles per hour), and then it was gone." (Email Form Report)

AMBER UFO SIGHTED IN HILLSBOROUGH, N.J.

On Wednesday, February 2, 2005, at 10:58 p.m., Stu P. was outdoors at his home in Hillsborough, New Jersey when he noticed something strange in the sky, approaching from the northeast.

"It was a small moving amber light which I saw from the highest point of my view, southwest across the sky, for about four seconds, hovered for about one-tenth of a second, and then changed direction about 30 to 45 degrees to the south."

"Amber color, shape too far away to be easy to see. It just looked like a dot. The only thing that could go that fast and then stop to change direction could be falling space junk that would burn up at first, and then change shape, this would change the air-flow over the object, making it change direction. But I'm pretty sure it was a UFO. I was looking up at the sky at a 45-degree angle, and it went through my whole view of the sky (about half the sky--S.P.) in about two seconds." (Email Form Report)

FAMILY SPOTS A UFO OVER KELSEYVILLE, CALIFORNIA

On Tuesday, February 1, 2005, at 8:30 p.m., Leslie Roberts reported, "My husband was out on our deck, smoking a cigarette" in Kelseyville, California (population 2,928) "He was facing Mount Konocti, which we were at the eastern side of. He noticed a very bright light hovering over the south side of the mountain. He yelled for me to come see. I, who do not believe in UFOs, did not want to go out there to see what I figured was a plane or a satellite. He was excited and insisted that I come. So I went outside to see what it was."

"At first I thought it had to be a very bright star, but, as I stood there, it began to rise in altitude. I was amazed to say the least. By this instant, our 17-year-old daughter, her boyfriend and our 12-year-old son also came watching too."

"I noticed that it was moving, which frightened my 12-year-old. He ran, tripping on the entrance to our house. We stood and watched as the light changed from a bright white to flashing blue and red lights and turned towards us, coming right over our house. It was so close that we could make out the shape of the vehicle."

"It was sort of shaped like a diamond at the front but also long and cylindrical. It made absolutely no noise. It passed over our heads and headed in an eastern direction. We watched as it went farther away, and then

it just disappeared."

"My son...was so frightened. I had to assure him that they were not coming back to hurt him." The UFO was "about 500 feet (150 meters) above us. Cannot estimate speed but can say it moved slowly enough for us to see it clearly. When it headed away, though, at some point it all at once moved so fast it just disappeared. I reported it to the police department."

Kelseyville, Cal. is just south of Clear Lake on Highway 175, located about 70 miles (112 kilometers) north of San Francisco. (Email Form Report)

UFOLOGIST KENNY YOUNG
DEAD IN OHIO

Kenny Young, 38, producer/director of the Cincinnati, Ohio cable TV show UFO Updates Live and a long-time contributor to UFO Roundup, died on Monday, January 31, 2005 following a long illness.

"Kenneth Harold Young, a graphics designer and producer for the Telecommunications Board of North Kentucky died Monday of complications of leukemia at Mercy Anderson Hospital. He was 38."

"'Scarcely a person could watch TV without seeing some of Kenny's graphics work,' said John Stephenson of Fort Mitchell, Ky., former superintendent of public instruction for northern Kentucky and former director of the Telecommunications Board Community Program Center."

"Born in Cincinnati (Ohio) on December 28, 1966, Mr. Young graduated in 1984 from Howard High School, where he was active with the video center. He worked for the Community Program Center, which produces religion, public-access and government programs for Kenton, Campbell, Boone, Grant, Gallatin, Owen and Pendleton counties."

"He had a passion for UFOs and produced several programs recreating sightings. He also played the piano at nursing homes. And he loved his dog, Boo. 'Everywhere he went, he took that dog with him,' Stephenson said."

Kenny is survived by "his mother, Carol Waller Young Boettger, of Anderson; a brother, Gary McCarty, of Laurel, Miss., and a sister, Cindy Porter, of Florence, Ky."

The funeral was held Thursday, February 3, 2005 at 2 p.m. at the Charles and Grubbs Funeral Home in Florence, Ky. Interment was in Walker Cemetery."

Kenny's colleagues in the field of ufology reminisced about his outstanding career.

"During 21 years of his sterling commitment to ufology, Kenny was always as good as they get," radio host Jeff Rense said, "His reports were rock-solid and outstanding in their collection of data, he jumped to no conclusions, and he always conducted himself with absolute integrity--and a special kindness--which everyone could do well to emulate."

"I met Kenny back in 1994, after I got back into research after a two-year sabbatical," Roy Schaeffer said, "I didn't even have to introduce myself to him. He knew who I was and offered me a warm welcome back into the field at the local cable-access show out of Cincinnati. A small group of us who were affiliated with the show worked with another Ohio group. It was headed by the late Pat Packard and called Advocates for Scientific Knowledge. After Pat's untimely death, we changed the name to Tri-States Advocates for Scientific Knowledge (T.A.S.K.) Kenny was named our public relations director. One of the most celebrated cases of T.A.S.K. was the 1996-1997 UFO flap in southern Ohio."

Southern Ohio section director of MUFON, Donnie Blessing, remarked, "Back in 1999, when I first contacted Kenny, I had no idea what an impact the group was going to have on my life. I had Kenny's Website and contacted him. My thoughts were then that he would not give me a minute of his time. Instead, he told me he could use some help with his research. I happily accepted and, for the next five years, I was taken on the journey of my life. We used to kid each other when we had a hot UFO case by saying, 'Keep your seat belt on, we are in for a ride.'"

One of Kenny's most famous cases "was the Screaming Woman case of Morehead, Kentucky in November of 2003," Blessing added, "He never ceased to amaze me how he could take the raw footage we had taped and turn it into a high-

quality video production. The world has lost a true hero in the UFO field, and I shall never forget the fun and hard work we had to help make him that hero."

(Editor's Note: For more on the Morehead case, see UFO Roundup, volume 8, number 47 for December 10, 2003, "Kentucky UFO sighting may have included an abduction," page 1.)

"Kenny first began contributing reports to us back in 1996, the glory days of T.A.S.K.," UFO Roundup editor Joseph Trainor recalled, "For nearly ten years, Kenny was a mainstay of the newsletter. I relied on him for coverage of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana and southern Illinois, and he never disappointed. He always turned in good, crisp, readable, detailed copy on the many UFO sightings in his area. Not only has ufology lost one of its best investigators, but I think American journalism has lost one of its great unrecognized reporters. Kenny will be sorely missed by all of us here at the Roundup." (See the Cincinnati Enquirer for February 3, 2005, "Kenneth Young, 38, TV graphics designer." Many thanks to Jim Danvers for this newspaper article.)

SHIRLEY FICKETT, MAINE'S
"FIRST LADY OF UFOLOGY"
DEAD AT AGE 82

"Shirley Cardin Fickett, 82, a local artist, passed away on Wednesday, February 2, 2005, after a long illness."

"She attended Portland (Maine) schools and married the late Richard E. Fickett. They resided in the North Deering area of Portland."

"She and her husband owned and operated the Driftwood Art Gallery and Gift Shop before retiring with her husband to Ellsworth, Maine. The Gallery was a place where local artists, both young and old, were welcome to display their work and receive positive and enthusiastic support from Shirley."

"Shirley was also very active in psychic phenomena and UFO research. She liked to have gatherings at the Art Gallery, where topics of the unexplained would be heard and discussed. People were drawn to her knowledge of this unusual subject matter. She was a freelance writer and had many articles published in magazines and newspapers."

"She is survived by four children: Sharon Cleaves of Windham, Richard Flickett of Windham, Randall Flickett of Auburn and Leanne Brainerd of Cumberland, nine grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Also surviving are two sisters, Pat Dunbar of Sullivan and Donna Jean Diphilippo of Windham, and two brothers, Courtney Campbell of Ellsworth and Mike Harris of Richmond."

Fortean investigator Loren Coleman said, "Shirley was the Dean of Ufology in the Pine Tree State, Maine's answer to Betty Hill. Mrs. Fickett wrote a widely-shared document, 'The Maine UFO Encounter: Investigating Under Hypnosis,' about an expert physician/hypnotist who explores the lost-time experience after a UFO's beam of light hits his car. The Dr. Herbert Hopkins/David Stephens case included Men in Black (MIB) and lost-time, and it became the case most people associated with (Shirley) Fickett's name. Fickett investigated others of the state's UFO encounters as an associate of the International UFO Bureau." (See the Portland, Me. Press-Herald for February 3, 2005, "Shirley Cardin Fickett, 82." Many thanks to Loren Coleman for this newspaper article.)

BLACK HELICOPTERS SEEN
IN SOUTHEASTERN MASS.

On Saturday, February 5, 2005, at 9:10 p.m., the male eyewitness was putting out overnight feed for the animals on his farm in Rehoboth, Massachusetts when he heard "the noise of a whole squadron of helicopters."

Going out in the farmyard, he saw "a formation of black military-style helicopters heading southeast toward Mount Hope Bay. There were six or seven of them. They looked like (UH-60) Blackhawks. One of them came from Providence (Rhode Island, i.e. the southwest--J.T.) and

flew right over the farmhouse. Real low. Very low and very loud. This helicopter joined the others, and they flew over Bad Luck Pond on their way to the bay."

The black helicopters "were still circling at the southern horizon at 9:45 p.m. They were right over Somerset. They looked like they were on patrol or maneuvers or something. They were still circling at ten o'clock. This is the first time we've seen the black helicopters here in a while. Something must be up. When the FBI was looking for terrorists in Boston" four weeks ago, "there were jets flying over all evening."

Earlier that afternoon, a North Seekonk woman saw "two black helicopters flying very low over Beckwith School and the Palmer River area just north of Route 118. They were military...(UH-60) Blackhawks, I think, and they were flying side by side towards Attleboro. This was late afternoon, about 4 p.m. A half hour later, I saw a single black helicopter flying a bit higher. It was heading northeast but not on a normal flight path. I think maybe it was heading for Devens."

(Editor's Note: Located in Ayer, Mass., Fort Devens was closed in 1992, but has since become a regional facility for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). A "federal reserve prison," sometimes called "Camp Hillary," is located on the grounds of the former military post.)

On Sunday, February 6, 2005, at 7:10 a.m., the same male Rehoboth witness was outside, feeding the farm animals, when he again "heard a tremendous noise. It sounded like dozens of helicopters just over the (western) horizon. I listened to this for ten minutes or so. Then I went to fetch my 12 X 50 millimeter binoculars and got up in the hayloft. I looked west towards Providence, R.I. and I saw two of them. Definitely military, black as the ace of spades. They looked like they were flying up to Worcester (Massachusetts)."

UFO Roundup correspondent Mary Lou Jones-Drown reported, "People who have seen these helicopters think they may be protecting the electrical generating plant at Brayton's Point in Fall River, Mass. This is an important link in the country's power grid. Another possibility is the big (oil) tank farms on the Narragansett Bay shore in Riverside (a section of East Providence, R.I.--J.T.)." (Many thanks to Mary Lou Jones-Drown for these reports.) (Editor's Note: Rehoboth was the site of numerous black helicopter overflights during the summer months of 2003 and 2004.)

From the UFO Files...

1946: NAZIS IN SPACE

On an evening in late November 1924, a knock sounded on the door of a cramped apartment in Munich. Graduate student Rudolf Hess went to answer it. As he opened the door, he saw a couple standing there--a white-haired elderly lady and a man in a dark trenchcoat, scarf and slouch hat. The man lifted his head slightly, letting the hallway lamp spill beneath the hatbrim and illuminate his features.

Hess let out a gasp of astonishment. "Grandmaster!"

The stranger smiled. Yes, it was the Grandmaster himself--Baron Rudolf von Sebottendorff (birth name: Adam Rudolf Glauer--J.T.), the founder of the mystical Thule Gesellschaft (Thule Society), back in Germany for the first time in five years. He had been forced to flee to Switzerland in February 1919 after one of his acquaintances, Count Anton von Arco-Valley, assassinated the governor of Bavaria. (For more on Anton, see UFO Roundup, volume 9, number 5 for February 4, 2004, "1919: Dance of the Assassin," page 12.)

The self-styled Baron von Sebottendorff was Germany's foremost mystic. Born in 1875, the son of a railroad engineer from Hoyerswerda, Sebottendorff was an enthusiastic disciple of Madame Blavatsky (birth name: Elena Petrovna von Hahn). For many years he had traveled in the Middle East, studying Sufi wisdom with the Bektashi dervishes and joining the Masonic Order of Constantine. Returning to Germany in 1912, he had helped found the mystic Germanen Orden and, a few years later, his own group, the Thule Gesellschaft.

"It's good to see you again, Rudolf," the baron said, ushering his companion into the dimly-lit apartment. "I don't believe you know Madame Orsic."

"Only by reputation," Hess replied, barely able to contain his excitement. Maria Orsic was the most famous medium in the Balkans. Surely tonight's magickal working would be one to remember.

One year earlier, Dietrich Eckart (1868-1923) had died. Eckart, the brilliant but erratic author who had translated Ibsen's plays into German and had published the magazine *Auf gut Deutsch* (Translated: In Good German), had served as Thule's "minister of information." It was Eckart who had introduced Sebottendorff to the Austrian orator who was rapidly becoming the rising star of the volkisch movement--Adolf Hitler.

On his deathbed, Eckart had told a small circle of Thule disciples, "Hitler will dance, but it is I who plays the tune. Do not mourn for me, for I will have influenced history more than any other German."

Tonight Sebottendorff wanted to make contact with his deceased friend. To accomplish this, he had returned to Munich under a fake passport and with Maria Ostric in tow. In no time at all, Sebottendorff, Hess, Dr. Ernst Schulte-Strathaus and the other Thulists were joining hands around the black-draped table, while Maria summoned her envoys from "the spirit world."

Hess found it a bit unnerving to watch Maria Ostric's eyeballs roll back, showing only whites, and to see her slumping backward in her chair, mouth agape. But Sebottendorff had seen spookier shit than this during his sojourn in the Middle East, and he smiled in satisfaction as the familiar baritone voice of Dietrich Eckart emerged from the medium's open mouth.

Midway through the reading, "Eckart" announced that he was obliged to give way to "someone with an important message." Then a weird melodious voice came through, identifying itself as "the Sumi, dwellers of a distant world, which orbits the star Aldebaran in the constellation you call Taurus the Bull."

Hess and Dr. Schulte-Strathaus blinked at each other. Aliens from space!?

"The Sumi" explained that they were a humanoid race who had briefly colonized Earth 500 million years ago. The ruins of ancient Larsa, Shurruk and Nippur in Iraq had been built by them. Sumi surviving "the great flood of Ut-napishtim" (the Deluge of Noah's Ark--J.T.) had become the ancestors of "the Aryan race."

Sebottendorff was skeptical. He asked for proof. Still in a trance, Maria scribbled several lines of queer-looking marks. "These proved to be written in Sumerian, the language of the founders of the oldest Babylonian culture."

Flash forward to February 1945.

Hess, once deputy Fuehrer of Adolf Hitler's Third Reich, is now Churchill's prisoner in UK. Baron Sebottendorff, now 70 and supposedly "retired," is back at his old haunts in Istanbul. What's left of the Thule Gesellschaft now works for a new "Lord of Atlantis," the SS-Reichsfuehrer Heinrich Himmler.

At an SS base near Prague (now capital of the Czech Republic--J.T.), a strange-looking rocket rises on five pillars of flame from its concrete launch pad. If the Battle of the Bulge was Hitler's last throw of the dice, then the launch of the Ostara was Himmler's.

The Ostara (named for the ancient German goddess of the dawn--J.T.) was the brainchild of Himmler's most trusted aide, SS-Brigadefuehrer Hans Kammler, the Schriever-Miethe rocket design team from Peenemunde, the Thule Gesellschaft and the equally-mystical Vrill Society. This Haunebu-3 saucer "had a diameter of 71 meters and could reach a speed of 40,000 kilometers per hour (25,000 miles per hour) with a range of eight weeks and carried a crew of nine men."

Hurling this big vehicle into space was no small feat. To do it, Kammler had his SS Department E-4 cobble together a Rube Goldberg-style vehicle. Propelling the saucer were two bolted-together A-9 rockets, with five A-10 boosters behind them. Indeed, the entire contraption never would've gotten off the ground at all, if not for a revolutionary device invented in the 1920s.

This was the Schumann Levitator. "A leading member of the Vrill (Society), Dr. W.O. Schumann pioneered the development of electromagnetic fields through rotating discs, and a prototype was constructed near Munich in 1922. Over the following decade, this research and development led to an entire range of German flying saucers based on the principle of anti-gravitational levitation."

During World War II, "the Schumann group produced two smaller saucers, the Vrill-1 and 2, as fighters" while Gruppe Kammmler, or SS E-4, worked on its Haunebu Flugeschiebe (Translated: Flying Disc) project.

By the beginning of 1945, though the Third Reich was crumbling, SS E-4 saw that "seven craft of the Haunebu-2 type, one each of the other Haunebu types and 17 Vrill-1 craft. In late 1944, the SS E-4 also designed the Andromeda vessel," a cylindrical spacecraft "139 meters (458 feet) in length and 30 meters (100 feet) high. Powered by four 'Thule-Tachyonators' and four 'Schumann Levitators,' this long-distance spaceship could transport a Haunebu-2 and two Vrill-1 saucers in its internal hangars. This huge cigar-shaped mother ship and its accompanying saucers were supposed to be responsible for George Adamski's famous sighting in California in (November) 1952."

Operating at low power, the Schumann Levitator "cut the throw-weight" of the Ostara, allowing the A/9-A/10 array to hurl the saucer into Earth orbit at an altitude of 500 kilometers (300 miles). Once in orbit, the Ostara's crew dropped the twin A-9s and used their Schumann device, powered by small nuclear batteries, to push the saucer away from Earth.

While the Ostara had her shakedown cruise in space, back on Earth, Field Marshal Bernard Law Montgomery launched Operation Varsity, the crossing of the Rhine, while Marshal Zhukov's Soviet (Russian) armies overran East Prussia. With the Reich's lifespan reduced to weeks, if not days, why had Himmler taken such an insane gamble?

Although never a member of Thule or Vrill, Himmler was a devoted occultist who, in 1923, joined Dr. Willibald Hentschell's Artamen. This group "expressed an attitude which saw cities as sinks of decadence and the land as the real strength of a people."

In the Artamen, Himmler was exposed for the first time to the scriptures of ancient India. He read the Vedas and the Mahabharata and was particularly fond of the Bhagavad Gita. During the drive to Auschwitz in July 1942, Himmler amused himself by reading a German translation of the Gita, which he usually kept in his desk at the office.

In his 1940 book, The Flight of Hanuman to Lanka, Indian author C.N. Mehta discusses the vimanas, the UFOs of ancient India. Mention of them is sprinkled throughout the Vedas. "In his essay on the Rig-Veda, Professor H.L. Hariyappa of Mysore University writes that in a distant epoch 'gods came to the earth sometimes, and that it was the privilege of some men to visit the immortals in heaven.'"

"Another book from India--the Samaraganana Sutradhara--contains a fantastic paragraph about the distant past when men traveled in the air in skyships and heavenly beings came down from the sky." Himmler was fascinated with these tales of rishis (Hindu wizards--J.T.) visiting Chandra (Earth's moon), Karktikeya (Mars) and the small worlds circling Brahaspati (Jupiter) and Sani (Saturn).

From SS aides who had been members of Thule, Himmler had heard about the purported "alien contact" in 1924. So the Ostara's mission seems clear enough--find these aliens and persuade them to help the Reich against its enemies.

When a flyby of the moon turned up no trace of any aliens, the Ostara continued on into space. According to German author Norbert Juergen-Ratthofer, "after an eight-and-a-half month voyage, the Haunebu III lands on Mars in January 1946, only to find the deserted pyramid city and 'Face' (Cydonia--J.T.), signs of a bygone higher civilization. 'What disappointment must these men have felt, when they realized that all was in vain.'"

Returning to Earth in October 1946, the nine-man crew of the Ostara found a world transformed. Germany was divided and occupied. Reichsmarschall Hermann Goering and

other Nazi leaders were on trial in Nuremberg. Himmler was dead--a suicide. He had been captured by British troops on May 23, 1945 and had swallowed a capsule of potassium chloride before he could be interrogated. He had made certain that the deepest secrets of the SS died with him.

The Ostara landed at Station 211 in Antarctica, in a region of the Hoffman-Muhlig Mountains. The area was called Neuschwabenland (German for New Swabia--J.T.), and all during the war Himmler had been sending U-boats full of German and Ukrainian settlers there.

But now the Nazi sanctuary was in danger. On December 30, 1946, a U.S. Navy Martin Mariner seaplane crashed in Antarctica. This tipped off the "Antarctic Reich" to the threat of Operation High Jump, an Allied task force commanded by Admiral Richard E. Byrd of the U.S. Navy.

So the SS refugees undertook their last gamble. They decided the launch the Andromeda, the large cylindrical spacecraft built by Gruppe Kammler and Thule. According to Juergen-Ratthofer, aboard the spaceship was an untested device that would put the ship into a "trans-dimensional canal," enabling it to achieve interstellar flight.

(Editor's Note: Kammler himself was last seen in Oberammergau, Germany on April 6, 1945. It is not known for certain if he died during the last days of the war in Europe or if he somehow got to Antarctica.)

Thirty-two volunteers, all veterans of Himmler's Waffen-SS, were selected for the flight. There was no guarantee that the "Magnetapparat" star-drive would even work. The Andromeda could easily get 5,000 kilometers (3,000 miles) away from Earth. But what would happen when they threw the switch? The cylindrical ship might instantly explode, creating a momentary bright flash visible from Earth's night side.

Even worse, it was strictly a one-way trip. The Nazis were going to point the Andromeda at the star Aldebaran, hit the switch and hope for the best. Even if they made it across 68 light-years of space, there was no way they'd be able to return. They'd never be able to find Earth's sun among the myriads of stars.

What happened next is a mystery.

Three years later, a cylindrical UFO similar to the Andromeda began to be seen. Ufologist Harold T. Wilkins, in his book *Flying Saucers Uncensored*, wrote, "There is a vast spindle-shaped or cigar-shaped, cylindrical space ship of unknown origin, which was photographed over a blast furnace in Hamilton, Ohio in 1950. It was also 'snapped' by a young woman taking pictures of ordinary terrestrial objects at Hawthorne, California when it was seen in the act of releasing satellite discs. It was seen over Denham, in England, and, twelve hours later over Sweden, in 1949, again releasing discs, which, at high speed, flew off in opposite directions."

According to Henry Stevens, author of *Hitler's Flying Saucers*, a U.S. Air Force fighter jet captured "gun-camera film footage from Victorville, California taken on February 2, 1953. It apparently shows a cylindrical 'Mothership' in flight."

Also in the early 1950s, "a classic cigar-shaped UFO" was seen and photographed by Joe Ferriere in Woonsocket, Rhode Island.

(Editor's Note: At the time of the Ferriere sighting, your editor was a two-year-old living in Taunton, Massachusetts, 14 miles (20 kilometers) southeast of Woonsocket, R.I.)

Had the Andromeda returned to Earth? Or were alien vessels disguising themselves as the Nazi ship while they scouted out our planet?

In 1967, a German psychic again heard from the mysterious Sumi. They assured the attendees at the seance that the Andromeda had indeed made it to Aldebaran. The crewmen were well-treated while "the Aldebaran regime then dispatched an enormous interstellar armada consisting of 280 battle cruisers of various classes ranging from 1.5 to 6 kilometers (1 to 4 miles) in length and capable of carrying between four and 810 flying saucers apiece. Depending on its speed after emerging from the 'trans-dimensional canal' (hyperspace) in the asteroid belt, this armada is to arrive on Earth sometime between 1992 and 2005 to resume the Second World War."

Off-and-on channelled contacts with the Sumi has provided us with a rough idea of how an Aldebarani star fleet is organized--similar to a U.S. Navy task force. The table below gives the alien ship classes and their USN equivalents:

ALDEBARANI	EQUIVALENT
Nupqukyuk	Carrier
Qaspiluk	Heavy Cruiser
Akuqnuk	Light Cruiser
Nakyu	Destroyer

We have only the Sumi's word for it that the Andromeda's crewmen were treated as guests upon their arrival in the Aldebaran system. For all we know, the ship was destroyed by vigilant Sumi spacecraft two minutes after it emerged from hyperspace. Or the Earth ship might have been boarded and its crew captured.

If that's the case, what might have happened to Hans Kammler if he'd been on board? Kammler, the architect who began his SS career designing the Nazi camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau in southern Poland. Did he congratulate himself on a successful escape from Earth, only to wind up an exhibit in some alien zoo, crouched in a corner of the cage--cold, naked, always hungry--gaped at by terrible three-lobed eyes?

As bad as it sounds, it's still a kinder fate than any deportee from Drancy or Westerbork met at that camp he designed.

Are the Sumi really coming to Earth? And what happens when they get here? Most days I just don't want to think about it. (See the books Hitler's Flying Saucers by Henry Stevens, Adventures Unlimited Press, Kempton, Illinois, 2003, pages 86, 87, 88, 99, 100, 101, 161 and 225; Das Vrill Projekt by Norbert Juergen-Ratthofer, Dr. Michael Daemboeck Verlag, Ardagger, Austria, 1993; Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism and the Politics of Identity by Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, New York University Press, New York, N.Y., 2002, pages 167 to 170; Himmeler by Peter Padfield, MJF Books, New York, N.Y., 1990, pages 37, 68, 85 and 90; Unholy Alliance by Peter Levenda, Continuum International Publishing Group, New York, N.Y., 2003, pages 92 to 95; Flying Saucers Uncensored by Harold T. Wilkins, The Citadel Press, New York, N.Y., 1955, page 17; The Flight of Hanuman to Lanka by C.N. Mehta, Narayan Niketan, Mumbai, India, 1940; and On the Shores of Endless Worlds by Andrew Tomas, Bantam Books, New York, N.Y., 1976, pages 53, 68 and 124.)

Well, that's it for this week. Join us in seven days for more UFO, Fortean and paranormal news from around the planet Earth, brought to you by "the paper that goes home--UFO Roundup." See you next time.

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2005 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their Web sites or in news groups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan.nul> or use the Sighting Report Form at:

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/submit/sightings.shtml>

 Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster.nul>

UFOINFO: <http://www.ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives for UFO Roundup, AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI Magazine plus archives of Humanoid Sighting Reports (Albert Rosales), Filer's Files, Oz Files, UFO News 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 16:47:31 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 09:58:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Boone

>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 07:00:06 -0800
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

<snip>

Last I had a chance to chat with Norio one on one was 4 years ago here in Hollywood. We were having dinner at a Thai restaurant and suddenly he leaned back in his chair, had a strange look in his eyes and said to me,

"Greg, I'm very worried about Coop."

I said, "Coop?"

"Bill Cooper", he responded. "We should go visit him", he continued.

"He lives in Arizona, we can make it there."

I said "sure...", as I'd always wanted to interview Bill and I told Norio I would have to get my gear together and would meet up with him to go.

I kid you not. The very next night as I was getting ready to call Norio to say I'd go with him to see Cooper, Cooper was gunned down.

You guys know the rest of that story.

Norio was always, always a favorite in the legendary Grassy Knoll chat room on AOL for the Parascopes Magazine. People would cheer and send him well wishes whenever he popped in to share some new tidbit with us.

I respect and admire him no matter what his viewpoints may have become. He's a-okay with me.

As for the religious viewpoint on UFOs, I can say that if all of us in the UFOlogy arena were to up and say that UFOs are a trick of Satanic origin, it would be splashed over every newspaper and tv station on Earth.

Why? Because it's more an acceptable answer than the ETH.

People in general aren't science oriented. They don't get it. They fight science because they think science will invalidate their religious beliefs. Yet they'll grab the latest scientific gizmo to kill each other with in a NY minute.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 16:47:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:01:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Reynolds

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 09:49:14 -0500
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 09:41:18 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>You can't apply logic, no matter how hard you keep trying, to
>>the UFO phenomenon, nor to how the government and military have
>>handled the matter.

>Whoa, there. This statement is too broad. Logic as part of the
>scientific process of investigation of any particular sighting
>must be used in order to determine whether or not it can be
>reasonably (there's that term.... reason) explained as a known
>phenomenon.

>As to the logic of government activities... there is some logic
>based on certain assumptions, such as, if you really have
>something that could affect national defense you don't your
>enemies to know about it. Therefore you withhold info or - uh, oh,
>here comes that nasty phrase - "cover up"

Dr. Bruce...

As you know, in comedy, the "rule" is "If you accept the
premise, you'll accept the bit."

The same is true in logic. If one accepts the premise, then they
can apply logic to the rest. But if the premise is crazy? Well.
that's a whole other story.....

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:18:07 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:03:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 14:55:10 -0500
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:44:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>>If you attack the cherished belief in ETH with rational argument
>>of any kind you will be attacked personally.

>Since when is the ETH 'irrational'?

I didn't say that at all. Arguing against something using
rational argument doesn't mean that it has to be something
"irrational." It can be just plain factually erroneous. Or it
can unsubstantiated or unfounded, and rational argument points
that out.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 22:23:28 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:05:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Hall

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 5:38:25 -1000
>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:07:41 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>Thank you for the information. I suppose that back in 1991 I
>read about the skeleton of the case with a wrong date and I had
>forgotten about it. This sounds like a more amazing case than
>the other two USAF missile base episodes. I look forward to
>seeing this case on TV.

>Josh Goldstein

Josh and Gildas,

I know as a matter of fact based on personal knowledge that the Peter Jennings/Springs Media people were given full details, names, leads, etc., for many, many of the cream-of-the-crop cases such as this B-52 case which Jan had advised us about. It all depends on how much prominence they give to these cases as opposed to the sociological baggage of the UFO field, and general 'noise' as opposed to documented facts.

To Michael Salla these are 'lights in the sky' cases and worth nothing in comparison to Greerite wild speculations and extreme political posturing.

To Rich Reynolds we are engaging in outmoded 'logic' (huh?) for which he substitutes wild imagination and provocation.

I'll stick with facts, logic, reason, science, and the best documented cases indicative of an extraordinary phenomenon, thank you.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 16:35:07 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:07:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
>Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>INEXPLICATA
>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
>02.08.05

>Source: Terra.cl
>Date: 02.08.05

><http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

<snip>

Hi Scott,

It's a cool photo. But I have a few observations.

First, the object is not clearly in focus. It shows no apparent lateral smearing as if in motion.

The remainder of the image is in rather startlingly clear focus.

If the analysis provided was an accurate retelling, the object is very unlikely to be 3-4 meters in size. If it were, the object would have to be rather close to the camera, and would have been quite noticeable to the photographer prior to his loading the images to his computer. He was shooting photos of the scenery, after all. One rarely just aims the camera in a random spot and shoots under these conditions. The image is very clear, indicating that the camera was on a tripod or was very still, as the darkness would preclude a motion-stopping flash, and the depth of field indicates a "small-aperture" exposure. If so, the camera would have been on a tripod to resolve such crisp detail while exposing for a sufficient time to reproduce not just light, but color, as in the tower warning lights above the mountain ridge. This would also explain the "blobby" nature of the streetlights on the far shore.

The pertinent question in my view is the conditions under which the photograph was taken. Was he in a vehicle? In a building? Was the photo taken through a window?

My impression on seeing the image is that of a reflection of something behind the photographer, reflecting in a window in front of him. The shape of the object correlates with a circular light fixture, like you might find in a hotel room, or office area.

This would explain the blurry aspect, and would also explain how the photographer failed to see the object while shooting the photograph. Since the reflection was out of his focus, and not the object of his attention, it would have been easy to ignore it. If it were out in front of him, it would have been odd not to notice a 3-4 meter object hanging in the sky in the dead center of the camera viewfinder.

I would really love to hear how the AION arrived at the size estimate.

I'd also like to see a raw version of the image, since it appears to me to be cropped from a larger original image. I say this because since the object is in the very center of the image, it strains credibility to accept that he didn't notice it until he was downloading the images. My guess is that the original image includes more area, and perhaps even a clue as to the reflected object in the image.

These are just my impressions. I could be wrong.

Respectfully,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 22:41:11 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:09:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 17:07:03 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 16:25:28 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 17:50:05 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>Cathy, Martin

>Very quickly. Personal agency is linked to humans and other
>animals with complex nervous systems, that would include ET
>quasi animals. In the future it might just include super
>computers (and of course my own nice and much treasured
>computer!) We don't expect to see it in such things as rocks
>and clouds.

Hi Peter

I don't think anyone has claimed intelligent motivation for rocks
and clouds, have they?

>Some versions of the ETH, such as ufo reports are generated by
>fusion power spaceships from Mars_ would be finite and testable
>and fit into scientific naturalism, but unknown beings from
>unknown locations having unknown powers and motivations
>wouldn't.

Your objection to some variants of ETH appears now to be that
they would not be testable, whereas your fusion-powered Martians
supposedly are testable. Yet your original objection was not
about testability; it was an assertion that explanations
invoking "trans human intelligences" had no legitimate place in
modern scientific naturalism. Now you propose that animistic
theories proposing "occult personal agencies, arbitrary wills
[or] boggarts" are valid after all, if they are testable - i.e.,
if they involve Martians.

But exactly what is it that, from the point of view of
epistemological principle, makes your Martian-fusion theory
testable, whereas someone else's Zeta Reticuli space-ark theory
isn't? Or, if I am not drawing a valid distinction here, at
precisely what point on the spectrum of imaginable cosmic
intelligences is a proper distinction to be drawn?

If I understand the implication of your remark, it is that
intelligences capable of manipulating the nuclear 'strong' force
would be a valid hypothesis, whilst those capable of
manipulating, say, the quark-gluon colour force or perhaps the
gravitational force, would not be. I think this is a rather
esoteric sort of distinction that could only be defended on some
very esoteric theoretical grounds of your own, and I don't see

any connection to "testability".

You said (rightly) that the successful advance of scientific naturalism was achieved by the steady replacement of animistic causal models with mechanistic ones. But this has nothing directly to do with testability, everything to do with broadening scientific imagination. And your acceptance in principle of Martian non-human mental agency has nothing to do with judiciously determining the limits of viable theory in accordance with some philosophy of scientific method, everything to do with the comfortable familiarity of a Buck Rogers-style conception of extraterrestrial life that was, and still is, another product of scientific imagination.

Scientific naturalism, if it has any value at all as a principle, restricts the spectrum of explanatory processes to those processes which science finds operating in nature. Obvious? But this principle obviously is not to be applied by consulting a botanical list of ossified processes already catalogued, else science would be immobilised and unable ever to discover new processes. Science does discover new processes. It does this both by identifying new particulars (facts) and by creating new generalisations from these particulars (theories), and the entire class of "scientific processes" containing both types of entity inseparably is an evolving meta-process which represents what science actively conceives as "nature".

The notion of "scientific naturalism" thus not only permits nature to contain generalisations from particular facts (theories) but demands it, logically and practically, and among the spectrum of explanatory processes which science today "finds" operating in nature are many such generalisations. Some of these processes have strong claims to being "conventional" - i.e., not in Occam's sense "new entities" - in natural science, even though (like gluons, or gravitons) no particular example of them has ever been directly observed, because they are knitted into the theoretical fabric by intricate webs of implication.

One such web of implication is the one which traces a continuum of processes from physics to molecular biology to unicellular and multicellular organisms, to thee and me, and thence, via the "convention" that life needs only complex organic chemistry and energy, to your hypothetical Martians. Another is that which extrapolates from physics and engineering theory to your hypothetical fusion-powered spaceships. A third might be that which extrapolates from these twin conventions, via some fairly conventional theoretical physics, to the idea of colonisation of the cosmos via intergalactic wormhole travel by an intelligent agency - a mind-altering nanobot neurovirus, say!

We no more know that such nanobots exist than that your quaint Martians exist, but the legitimacy of both grows out of the same network of scientific implication. The latter seems so much more scientifically conservative, for complex social-historical reasons, yet there is not the remotest scrap of evidence for it (outside perhaps of some UFO reports or contactee stories, for which I do not detect in you a strong affection) and it represents a principle which, once conceded, validates the rationale leading to the former. The difference is that whereas my neurovirus is science fiction of 2005, your fusion rocket is science fiction of 1955, and your Martian is arguably more of a folk-tale boggart than is my nanobot.

Your Martian hypothesis is a more utilitarian hypothesis, in the practical sense that we can more readily imagine ways of testing it, but there is no difference of principle. The Popperian falsifiability criterion (to the extent that one wants to adhere to it) abjures hypotheses that can't be falsified in principle; but an hypothesis which is merely very difficult to falsify in practice is allowed in. Science is constantly churning with such hypotheses. And there is nothing in scientific method or history which says that the hypothesis requiring the least ingenuity to test is the most likely to be true in the end.

>Ufologists should not assume that just because reports
>cannot be explained easily in terms of well known phenomena
>they should be ascribed to ETs or more exotic variants.

This is sensible. But your previous argument was not merely that one should be careful when using the hypothesis of non-human mental agency (i.e. ET), but that such notions had no place in

"natural science".

>Changes in explanation of natural phenomena from personal
>agencies to mechanical forces don't seem to be because of
>specific refutation but rather from changes in general world
>view which might be linked to social changes.

To the extent that one can separate specific refutations from their cultural context, this is one way of looking at it. But you presumably aren't suggesting that the world-view of science is arbitrarily selected from a value-free range of options by social forces? Obviously the success of the general world view is coupled to the success of the specific problem-solving strategy that it sanctions. If experiments never work they are not going to change the world very fast. The main reason that the world view of mechanical causes has succeeded is that it has been so successful! But this is because so many problems are mechanical problems (i.e., the phenomena don't exhibit that particular quality of reactive/proactive complexity that we call intelligence). It doesn't mean that all problems now and evermore have to be mechanical problems.

>It's interesting that Cathy mentions laboratory experiments in
>restricted sensory environments because many anomalous personal
>experiences seem to occur in just such circumstances (dark
>rooms, night, lonely roads, ganzfield experiments etc)

This is interesting in its own right, but doesn't bear on the question of whether or not "trans human intelligences" can ever be a valid scientific hypothesis for new phenomena.

Regards

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:43:58 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:10:07 -0500
Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing -

>From: Steven G. Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:40:58 EST
>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 14:25:01 -0400
>>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

>>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 10:16:23 -1000
>>>Subject: Re: The UFO Phenomenon - Seeing Is Believing

<snip>

>>>The latest whistleblower/contactee that offers testimony with
>>>serious exopolitical significance is Charles Hall whom I
>>>recommend to the List as someone who is both credible and
>>>significant- see:

<http://www.exopolitics.org/charles-hall.htm>

>>I take it you have seen some evidence on which to base
>>acceptance of the tall whites parading around Hall's part of
>>Nevada? You have checked his military and college records? I
>>suppose you want everybody to accept Bob Lazar and Michael Wolf
>>Kruvant as whistleblowers in the know? They don't check out.

>>>I think that the Peter Jennings special may ultimately
>>>dissappoint since its main premises are inappropriate to the
>>>>true challenge in understanding the UFO/exopolitical phenomenon
>>>before us.

>>I read with great disappointment Alfred Webre's Exopolitics
>>book. It is loaded with proclamations without providing any
>>evidence to support them. What newsman will accept those on face
>>value? Why should they?

<snip>

>But we do the best we can.

>Steve Bassett

But if "we" are disinformation agents, agents provocateur, "we"
do the worst we can, and try to contaminate those doing their
best with half-truths, crackpots, shoddy work.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Escamilla

From: **Becky Escamilla** <midwaytoroswell.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 16:00:50 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:14:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon - Escamilla

>From: Terry Groff <terry.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:05:31 -0600
>Subject: Re: Ufology Needs A Ribbon

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 02:12:53 EST
>>Subject: Ufology Needs A Ribbon

>>Say, I was just thinking.

>>Every other cause celebre has a ribbon to bring attention to it.

>>There are blue, red, green, and of course yellow ribbons.

>>Ufology needs a ribbon to commemorate those people who have suffered
>>through this for half a century.

<snip>

>>How about Silver Ribbons?

>Or how about 'gray' for the color of some ET's :-)

>or perhaps a combo of both

We have a metallic silver ribbon that stands for our campaign, "The Age of Extraterrestrial Awareness (TM)," that we started years ago. We used to hand them out for free to visitors, with our write-up on our campaign.

This year, we're handing them out, along with armbands.

While we're on the topic of what ufology needs, did you also know that we also have an "Alien on a Tortilla (TM)?" This is also the year that this is being released:

<http://www.geocities.com/alienonatortilla tm/>

<http://www.prweb.com/releases/2005/2/prweb206052.htm>

Of course, when it comes to UFO Researchers who've lost their lives, an armband seems like it'd be more appropriate, but if a ribbon is going to be used, I'd use a "black silky ribbon," with something like, "Now...among the Heavens & those they sought to Know," or "Among the Stars," stamped or written on it in silver ink.

- Becky

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:06:13 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:16:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 17:07:03 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

Hello Peter,

<snip>

>Some versions of the ETH, such as _ufo reports are generated by
>fusion power spaceships from Mars_ would be finite and testable
>and fit into scientific naturalism, but unknown beings from
>unknown locations having unknown powers and motivations
>wouldn't. Ufologists should not assume that just because reports
>cannot be explained easily in terms of well known phenomena they
>should be ascribed to ETs or more exotic variants.

I'm afraid I don't think this will work.

I can see why you might want to argue this way - but let's take your first example, to do with fusion powered spaceships from Mars. This seems clear enough, but is it falsifiable? I don't think it is. For example, we have some idea what the surface looks like from probes that have been sent there, and no Martians have been seen. Does this mean we can regard this particular version of the ETH as falsified? Well no, because a proponent of this hypothesis could always say, well, maybe the Martians are living underground. We could send more probes to dig tunnels under the Martian soil and still find nothing - a proponent of the theory might then say we were looking in the wrong place. And if by some means - say, examination of possible fuel residues or some such - we were able to prove that UFOs didn't use fusion power, the Mars-ETH theorist could always say ok, maybe they don't use fusion power, maybe they use solar sails instead. And this will always happen, because unless the particular version of the ETH is specified to a precise level of detail (which would probably render it trivial in any case) it will always be elastic enough to mutate in order to accommodate any new evidence. I have seen truckloads of theories come and go in the social sciences and believe me, this is absolutely par for the course.

Of course your Mars/fusion power version of the ETH has the advantage of assuming only entities which, while not actually known to exist, are at least thought to be possible. But I'm not at all sure that this is a reasonable assumption to want to make. It seems to me to make the critical mistake of confusing what we can find out about, with what might actually exist - in effect, it makes the really quite stringent assumption that the universe contains very few unknown truths. On the other hand, Occam's Razor tells us that we should not deploy ad hoc explanations - that is, long chains of explanation which depend on numerous entities for which we have no evidence, and whose only purpose is to account for the known evidence retrospectively. These sorts of theories are sometimes pejoratively referred to as just-so stories, as I'm sure you know, and in this sense I think you have a good point. Occam's Razor tells us that, while the universe undoubtedly contains numerous unknown truths, the chances of our being able to

determine what these are just by guessing is pretty remote.

On this basis, I agree that it looks as if we shouldn't give the ETH the time of day. But things aren't so simple, because there is the issue of prior probability to consider. The Fermi paradox tells us that extraterrestrials should probably have reached the solar system long ago, and on statistical grounds alone, we should expect that any such extraterrestrials should be millions of years in advance of us. And we should therefore not expect that we can determine the limits of their technology. Clarke's law is applied here, not as an excuse for making ad hoc assumptions about unknown technologies, but for precisely the opposite reason - to enable us to refrain from making any ad hoc assumptions at all.

In effect, if we adopt the principle that extraordinary hypotheses demand extraordinary evidence (which is really just an expression of good Bayesian principles) then the Fermi paradox tells us that the ETH is actually not all that extraordinary. And since in Bayesian analysis, the probability of something is a function of both the evidence for and against it, and its prior probability, the Fermi paradox appears to tell us that the evidence needed to support the ETH does not need to be especially good. And we can argue this without paying any attention at all to issues such as spaceship propulsion or alien evolution - indeed we should not pay attention to these issues, because we have no reliable information about them and our theorizing about them will thus be completely ad hoc.

I'm not pretending for a moment that this is a watertight line of reasoning and I'm not presenting it as such. I also agree that it doesn't make the ETH any more falsifiable. But it is another way of looking at the problem, and it illustrates - I hope - why any testable versions of the ETH should contain an absolute minimum of ad hoc theorizing, or they will always be unacceptably elastic.

There are other issues one could consider here too. For example, one can think of technology as a means of increasing the frequency of occurrence of statistically unlikely events. A highly advanced technology is thus one in which many improbable events are contrived to occur at any given time - which implies a condition of extremely low entropy. But our naturalistic methods are not well adapted for conditions of very low entropy - our statistical methods, for example, tend to assume that whatever is not signal is random noise - a condition of zero information and maximum entropy. Arguably the reason why the methods of the physical sciences seem to fail so badly in the social sciences, is precisely that the social sciences take place against a background of high information and low entropy.

>Changes in explanation of natural phenomena from personal
>agencies to mechanical forces don't seem to be because of
>specific refutation but rather from changes in general world
>view which might be linked to social changes.

I'm sure this is true, and there are other issues to be considered here too, such as the role of reductionism and what I've previously referred to as "theoretical convergence". The key issue is the point at which one is able to justify the use of inductive reasoning.

>It's interesting that Cathy mentions laboratory experiments in
>restricted sensory environments because many anomalous personal
>experiences seem to occur in just such circumstances (dark
>rooms, night, lonely roads, ganzfeld experiments etc)

Yes, this is undoubtedly true (although not in the case of the Ganzfeld experiments, for reasons I won't go into just now). But this illustrates why it is so important to have a good understanding of the actual mechanisms of perception, so that one can understand what sorts of errors will occur in conditions of sensory restriction, and what sort will not.

>Apologies for only be able to send this rushed summary, but you
>all know computers.

Yes, don't I just.

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 18:19:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:16:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - White

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 12:20:35 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Infrasound UFO Detection

<snip>

>The microphones used were sensitive to 1-16 Hz.

Anyone know of reasonably priced 'something-phones' which can detect 1-16 Hz in air on the market today? (They could help in our efforts to detect the presence of signals.)

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Crop Circle Documentary Biased

From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:29:01 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:21:41 -0500
Subject: Crop Circle Documentary Biased

BLT's Nancy Talbott emailed me this week about a crop circle show which aired in the US about a week ago. Here is a section of her note to me, together with a document in which she comments on the show.

Dave Haith

National Geographic recently released a new crop circle "documentary," in which I participated... and it was pretty awful... biased..... So I've written a comment about what I know about how it was made, why, etc. which I'm enclosing so you can read it.

I thought it was important to write this, mostly because National Geographic is expected to be a 'cut above' other, similar shows - and this one definitely was not.

Nancy Talbott

Comments on

National Geographic's, Beyond The Mystery, Crop Circle Show

Nancy Talbott

Another 'documentary' on the crop circle phenomenon has recently been aired here in the U.S., this one under the auspices of the well-known National Geographic organization. Since it is generally expected that this organization will provide accurate, comprehensive information (when such is available) to the public and present opinions which reflect actual scientific inquiry -- and since these standards have eluded this production -- I felt I should write what I know about the making of this show.

In the spring of 2004 an independent TV producer called me saying that he had been hired by National Geographic to produce a crop circle show; he said that he knew little about the subject and wanted to learn about the scientific approach to the phenomenon, requesting whatever information I could provide. We had a long talk, in which I outlined the BLT Research Team's work over the years, providing for him all of the names, credentials and contact information for the many professional scientists involved--people I strongly urged him to contact. In addition to providing info about BLT we also discussed many other people and organizations which take, or have taken, a serious approach to the study of the phenomenon in several different countries. And these names and contact info were also supplied, with strong encouragement that the producer contact these people.

After a long conversation the producer stated that National Geographic had given him only a very short time-period in which to produce this show, as well as very limited funds, admitting that he didn't have the time needed to do a really in-depth

evaluation -- and then said that he had decided to go to the UK to film some of the "hoaxers" making a circle.

I responded with angst, telling him that shows of this caliber had been done at least a dozen times, and that the public would certainly expect something more professional from National Geographic. He reiterated that he didn't have much time, that he needed to get dramatic footage and, surprisingly, that he "had two kids to feed and needed the money."

Although I now realized that he had apparently previously decided to shoot his film in the UK, he did indicate that he would get in touch with many of the people I had suggested. He sounded like a nice guy to me and rational. He was openly of a skeptical bias, and apparently under-the-gun financially, but he sounded genuinely interested in the phenomenon and interested in learning about the scientific work. And, so, I had some hope that he would make the effort to inform himself and, as a result, produce a responsible show. I was definitely left with the impression that he would contact the various professionals I had suggested.

It's a good thing I don't hold my breath about these things anymore. As Bertrand Russell once said, "it's a good thing to have an open mind...just not so open your brains fall out." What this nice producer actually did was go to the UK so as to hire what the TV show states is the "most expensive" group of acknowledged circle-makers, rent a field on the beleaguered farmer Hughe's property next to Silbury Hill and all sorts of cranes and other equipment...and then spent 2 weeks or so talking with many of the people in the UK who mechanically flatten crop circles for their own amusement. I wonder if the President and/or stockholders of National Geographic know that quite a bit of the company's money was spent hiring hoaxers who, it is stated in the actual show, are criminals involved in a "risky" business ("every time they go into a farmer's field without permission, they are committing a crime")?

I thought it was also pretty interesting to note, again in the actual show, that this group of hoaxers did all of the measuring for their National Geographic circle in daylight...and, so far as I could tell, flattened the formation in daylight also...and, over several days. I thought these guys were supposed to do this stuff in the dark?

It was also interesting, in the finished product, to note that the announcer immediately established the bias which permeates the whole show by referring to all people interested in actually studying the phenomenon as "believers." And to realize that none of the professional scientists whose names, and published papers, were provided were even mentioned by name, much less contacted for an interview. It was less interesting and quite depressing to see that only a very few of the scientifically-derived facts (which I provided, at great length, and in detail) were dealt with at all-- and these few in a totally superficial manner. And so now I wonder if the august National Geographic incorporates this sort of prejudice into all of its presentations?

At the end of the summer I got another call from the TV producer who, this time, wanted to know if he could use "2 or 3" of the BLT photos in his production. Since I was aware of how he had spent his time (and his production money) in the UK and by now also knew that he had not contacted any of the scientists or other people I had suggested here in the U.S. and only one or two of the people I had suggested in Europe, I refused permission to use the photos. It seemed clear that he was not interested in representing a balanced approach which included the scientific work, instead opting for superficiality -- all that he apparently felt the public required.

I don't know what was going on down at the National Geographic offices, but I started then to get many calls from him and various assistants trying to convince me to let them use some of the BLT photos. I continued to say "no" because, without interviews with the scientists involved, I felt there was too much risk of the photos being used out of context or in an irresponsible manner, a situation which would not be fair to the scientists, the circles, or the already inadequately informed public.

After many calls back and forth the producer finally said that, although National Geographic could not afford to travel to the various locations required to interview the scientists, Boston was close and he was willing to interview me. Of course he had had enough money and several weeks to cover the hoaxers...and I was to be allotted just a few hours...but I thought it was the best offer the scientific evidence was going to get. And given that the show was for National Geographic I expected professionalism.

My interview lasted 3 hours. Although I knew the producer expected to simply ask me a few questions I, realizing that he might not be well-enough informed to ask intelligent questions and would most likely ask instead questions aimed at getting "sensational" answers, put together a very solid 2-1/2 hour lecture which I insisted he film. I covered all of W.C. Levengood and John Burke's early plant and magnetic material work (pointing out Rodney Ashby's magnetic material work in the UK also), then presented the X-ray diffraction study results obtained by Dr. Iyengar, Dr. Raghavan and Dr. Reynolds, and finally described in some detail the BLT studies currently in progress (long-term growth study, the mycorrhizal fungi study, and a re-examination of the magnetic particles in crop circle soils). I believe I presented this information clearly, in depth, and in the context that would have been provided by the various scientists involved.

The producer tried repeatedly to interject questions that did not help me develop the information I was trying to present, which at the time I attributed to his lack of knowledge rather than to any nefarious purpose. And I persevered; as those of you who have seen one of my lectures know, I tend to hammer it home in spite of any distractions. It is my impression that it is the scientific evidence that will eventually make the circle phenomenon available to the larger public -- not my (or anyone else's) personal impressions.

It is my own fault that, at the very end of the interview, I answered one of his questions. He had read on the BLT web-site my personal account of having actually seen a crop circle form in the Netherlands in 2001 and, after a very brief mention of this event, he asked me for my personal impression regarding the cropcircle causative mechanism. Because I had just presented 2-1/2 hrs. of solid scientific data and discussed at length the hypotheses suggested by several of the professional people, I was sure that this would be the content he would find of interest, rather than any personal remark I might make--and so told him that my experiences over the years had enlarged my perspective to include the possibility that a consciousness of some sort is involved. Thus I joined the ranks of the "believers."

The final show did make it clear that this was a question I, personally, was considering--that this was not an idea held necessarily by any of the scientists-- but why did this producer, or National Geographic, not feel that the public deserved to hear what the various scientists who have done the actual laboratory research think?

The reason is a very bad one. The work that has been done by BLT and its professional consultants has slowly come to be respected in the crop circle community...and elsewhere also. I, as the most visible spokesperson for BLT, am identified in the public eye with much of the professional scientific work and, if you want to try to discredit the scientific results--but can't because you have no real ammunition--well, go after the spokesperson. In the beginning of the show the announcer refers to the BLT work as authoritative (we are called "experts"), but pointedly does not state that the scientific work is authoritative. Indeed, this show doesn't concern itself with the actual research at all. [Remember, National Geographic couldn't afford the time or the money to talk to any of these scientists. I now wonder if the scientists' names were deliberately left out to reduce the possibility of lawsuits based on misrepresentation of their work?]

It appears to me that National Geographic indulged their a priori bias and failed to value or take seriously their professional responsibility to the public. I suspect that they did not interview the majority of competent researchers because they had already decided to dismiss the possibility of a real,

unknown phenomenon, and I suspect that they mis-used the information provided by the other serious people they did interview. It further strikes me as a very strange and unabashed emotional response to deride the impression that a "consciousness" may be involved in this phenomenon. The magician Randi was upset enough to suggest that those of us curious about the circles should "get a life." Of course he said the same thing about the hoaxers...maybe he thinks being a magician is a serious pursuit?

A few final notes. Near the beginning of the show the suave-sounding announcer, attempting to establish the phenomenon as nothing more than one produced by mechanical flattening of the plants by humans, raises this question: "why don't the crop circles form in front of witnesses?" Isn't it curious that the producer of this show knew that I had seen one form...and yet didn't mention or go into this? I'll bet he also knew that other people have seen them form from time to time, and ignored this information also.

At another point in the show their expert "Grain Doctor" suggests that apical node elongation is due simply a flattened plant's recovery process--cell elongation caused by the plant's natural inclination to reorient itself to the light and to gravity. Point #1: if this were true, why don't we see apical node elongation in all crop circles? (We don't, you know.) Point #2: the producer was provided with the BLT control study which clearly demonstrates that the degree of node lengthening documented in mechanically-flattened plants in that study was markedly less than that which has been regularly observed in thousands of flattened crop circle plants. Did you notice that the BLT photo held up by the "Grain Doctor" to illustrate node elongation did not include the control plants? If the control photo (which was supplied to the producer) had been shown it would have been clear even to a novice that the 200+% node elongation shown in these samples was massively greater than any elongation caused by cellular development due to natural plant recovery process. Point #3: The producer was also provided with the information that this node elongation has been documented in standing plants inside crop formations--plants in which no "recovery process" ever occurred because they were never flattened.

Why didn't National Geographic present or discuss the BLT Control Study? Why did they fail to show appropriate control photos? And why did they leave out the information that node elongation has been found in standing plants inside crop circles but not in control plants outside the formations?

The "Grain Doctor's" speculations about expulsion cavities (holes blown out at the plant stem nodes) being the result of "rapid growth" will, I am pretty certain, sound quite lame to the biophysicist who did all this work for 10 years, as will this same Grain Doctor's suggestion that no informed plant professional was involved with the research. How then were three papers presenting this research published in peer-reviewed scientific journals? Could it be that W.C. Levengood's years of academic study in college and at graduate school, and his laboratory experience and research as an employed professional scientist--not to mention his intensive examination of thousands of crop circle plants and their controls over 12 years in many different countries--are inconsequential? The good "Grain Doctor" (it was admitted in the show) has never seen a crop circle--much less examined any plants taken from one. So, on what basis is he an authority? Because he now has the title of "Grain Doctor, " apparently bestowed by National Geographic?

And then one has to look at the fact that the massive XRD study was completely ignored, a study which involved 4 scientists with excellent to superb reputations and credentials, all of whom agree that the data produced is competent and points to the involvement of something other than mechanical flattening as the causative mechanism behind many crop circles. Also ignored was the fact that, again this year, several new scientists have become involved in the BLT investigations. And maybe this is the real problem...as Bertrand Russell also wrote, "What men want is not knowledge, but certainty."

It takes both courage and intellectual curiosity to pursue the uncertain; and it looks to me as if National Geographic has, in this case at least, exhibited neither.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

SETI Contradiction?

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:56:02 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:35:50 -0500
Subject: SETI Contradiction?

At:

<http://www.setileague.org/editor/actvseti.htm>

In "Active SETI Is Not Scientific Research," we read:

"An Active SETI signal much more powerful than the normal background emitted by the Earth might call us to the attention of a technological civilization that had not known of our existence. We can not assume that such a civilization would be benign, nor can we assume that interstellar flight is impossible for a species more technologically advanced than our own."

One of SETI's central tenets is that "you can't get there from here," yet this article frets over the possibility of invoking an interstellar attack.

If SETI wonks are willing to entertain the idea of interstellar spaceships, then they should rightfully take scientific interest in the possibility that some UFO sightings are evidence of ET visitation... but somehow I don't see this happening.

The rest of this is laughably anthropocentric; it implicitly "congratulates" humanity by assuming we have something a technologically superior civilization might want (which I personally find pretty doubtful). Secondly, it assumes that a space-faring ET civilization isn't likely to know we're here unless we send them an unmistakable signal; little mention is made of the radio leakage we've been emitting for decades. Both notions are, at the very least, rather profound pats on our collective back.

And of course there's the obvious: If working up the courage to send a directed signal is "not active research," then who's to say aliens (who, according to SETI dogma, seem to think just like us in all other essential respects) don't share this viewpoint? In this case, no one in the galaxy is transmitting because everyone's waiting to receive a signal first.

So what are we listening for?

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot.nul)

MTVI: <http://www.mactonnies.com>

Posthuman Blues: <http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

Now available!: "After the Martian Apocalypse"

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/074348293X>

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:36:46 -1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:37:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Goldstein

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers ->
>Date: 2005/02/08 Tue AM 04:04:13 HST
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

>For those of you interested in a large, colour image of
>Area 51:

><http://www.lasvegasnow.com/area51/Area51-072503-LG.jpg>

>[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

One thing I observed that I had not seen in other photos is that
this picture shows the longest runway with X marks along its
length. That usually means a closed runway. I wonder why?

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:44:10 -1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:39:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Goldstein

>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 05:52:18 -0800
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

<snip>

>Norio sent me an e-mail a week ago that was posted to my site:

><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/norio.html>

>Everyone is surprised...

Hello Royce,

I was also surprised at his turnaround. Years ago I had seen plenty of him in action as "Norio, the extremist". Another "extremist in action" was Gary Schultz. I wonder whatever happened to him. He was even more crazed than Hayakawa.

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:17:01 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:41:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
>Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>INEXPLICATA
>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
>02.08.05

>Source: Terra.cl
>Date: 02.08.05

><http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

>[Click 'Ir A Galeria' below thumbnail]

>At Iquique
>Incredible UFO Photo In Northern Chile

>This extraordinary chance photo was taken in the northern part
>of our country and shows the transit of an unidentified flying
>object (TERRA.cl)

>IQUIQUE, February 8, 2005.- On Friday, February 4, Carlos Bruna,
>an official with the Controllorship of the Republic in the city
>of Iquique, visited the Tres Islas Beach, some 10 minutes away
>from this northern city, to take a break. Since he had acquired
>a digital camera in recent days, he began taking photos of the
>mountains and their contrast with the blue sky.

>To his surprise, upon loading the photos into his computer, he
>saw that one of the images showed a lens-shaped object,
>expelling some sort of white energy, was flying high above one
>of the mountains.

<snip>

Hi Scott!

This is just another of many recent examples of a UFO which was not noticed by the witness until after he looked at the picture he took. Fortunately, this UFO can easily be explained. It is a lens flare! Just click on 'Anterior' to see the entire picture and you will see a very bright light source of the same angular size and appearance as the UFO just opposite the optical center of the photo which was the cause of this lens flare.

For those of you who still have doubts about the lens flare explanation, if this was indeed a bright UFO almost as big as the Moon in the sky overlooking the harbour, why do we not see reflected lights of this UFO off the water's surface just like we would see with the light from the Moon, especially when we do see the much fainter city lights on the far shore reflecting off the water's surface?

Although the Washington, D.C. flying saucers that invaded the U.S. capital in 1952 were indeed "real", that other famous lens flare picture of the Capitol building with dozens UFOs above it is not proof of this important UFO incident.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 00:10:44 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:46:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gates

Actually "Area 51" was outed by a photograph, not taken by a Soviet Sat, but one taken by the US Geological Survey as part of a mapping run in 1968.

This photo is interesting in the fact that on the flight line you have a B-52, all black, but looks similar to the fictional B-52 immortalized in Dale Browns' novel "Flight of the Old Dog."

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

CI: The Biggest Planetary Anomaly Yet?

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 21:11:51 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:48:48 -0500
Subject: CI: The Biggest Planetary Anomaly Yet?

Cydonian Imperative
2-8-05

The Biggest Planetary Anomaly Yet?

by Mac Tonnies

Illustrated, linked version:
<http://cydonianimperative.blogspot.com>

Richard Hoagland, after viewing the Cassini spacecraft's exquisite images of Saturn's moon Iapetus, has ventured the seemingly outlandish notion that the moon is not what it appears upon casual inspection. Rather, Hoagland asserts in a new addition to his website, Iapetus is an artificial world - a literal spaceship masquerading as a crater-pocked moon.

His evidence is a mixed bag of genuine anomaly and overzealous pixel-chewing that supposedly shows indicting structural detail - despite the inherent limitations of spacecraft image resolution. The latter technique is likely to be dreadfully familiar to even occasional Enterprise visitors. But there's no denying the eccentricity that forms his model's skeleton.

Iapetus has long been an object of mystery; before visited by robot probes, its "yin-yang" coloration prompted mainstream scientists to wonder if an extraterrestrial intelligence had modified the moon to function as a celestial beacon. And as Hoagland takes pains to note, Arthur C. Clarke's novel "2001: A Space Odyssey" culminates in a psychedelic rendezvous with an alien monolith on Iapetus.

[image]

Iapetus' "Great Wall" is visible in this photo taken by the Cassini orbiter.

Cassini's new images - vastly more refined than its mechanical predecessors' - show a wall-like uplift that extends across Iapetus' surface, tantalizingly near the moon's equator. And while the European Space Agency has hazarded geological explanations, all seem witheringly quaint compared to Hoagland's reconstruction, which contends the wall isn't the product of natural forces but to "god-like" megascale engineering.

And that's not all. Hoagland meticulously notes internal features in the "Great Wall" that appear eerily manufactured, craters and depressions that he interprets as structural decay, and honeycomb-like terrain that bears at least a superficial resemblance to architectural forms.

[image]

In this over-contrasted photo, the sun-lit portion of Iapetus reveals an anomalous faceted effect.

Moreover, Hoagland stresses the Saturnian moon's atypical shape; rather than a sphere, Iapetus is a pronounced ellipse. While this could conceivably be the result of tidal forces, celestial mechanics are less suited to explain evident faceting along Iapetus' limb, seen above. Hoagland goes on to liken Iapetus' weird angularity to a sort of cosmic Epcot Center, insinuating a (mostly) hidden interior held together by a vast Platonic tress-work.

What are we to make of this?

Fortunately, many of Hoagland's claims can be verified. For example, the "Great Wall" really is an enigma, not a false unknown.

According to a European Space Agency website, "The most unique, and perhaps most remarkable feature discovered on Iapetus in Cassini images is a topographic ridge that coincides almost exactly with the geographic equator. The ridge is conspicuous in the picture as an approximately 20-kilometre wide band that extends from the western (left) side of the disc almost to the day/night boundary on the right. On the left horizon, the peak of the ridge reaches at least 13 kilometres above the surrounding terrain. Along the roughly 1300-kilometre length over which it can be traced in this picture, it remains almost exactly parallel to the equator within a couple of degrees. The physical origin of the ridge has yet to be explained."

Hoagland's conspiratorial allusions to H.G. Wells and his implicit assumption that Arthur C. Clarke somehow knew what to expect are less impressive. Nevertheless, there's an element of genuine strangeness on Iapetus that speaks volumes. My hope is that the scientists at Cassini's helm will look closer - and muster the courage to advance unpopular hypotheses if the evidence warrants.

-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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Subbotin

From: **Nikolay Subbotin** <paragloss.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 11:18:03 +0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 11:05:58 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Subbotin

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 09:47:48 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>This is something I'm interested in myself in conjunction with
>my UFO Tools website.

><http://www.terrygroff.com/ufotools>

Ok! It's really good! But now we have only one) professional program - that Larry Hatch wrote - for working with UFO databases and put it to GIS-map.

Can we try to create new software for Win32? I buy pro-components for Delphi 6.0 that helps to create professional vector maps (with many layers).

Now we need to create a new base classification of UFOs.

I see that ufologically, around the world, one of the main problems is we have no basic classification system. Yes, we have Hynek's, Walle's & Zigel UFO classification systems, but we don't have a world standard! It is a problem in Russia too.

Regards,

Nikolay Subbotin
RUFORS

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

UFO Over Hawaii Puzzles Astronomers

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 22:20:11 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 11:08:05 -0500
Subject: UFO Over Hawaii Puzzles Astronomers

Source: WorldNetDaily

http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=42767

02-08-05

Go the site for an image!

UFO Over Hawaii Puzzles Astronomers

Mysterious streak captured by camera positioned on active volcano

An unidentified streak moving through the night sky above Hawaii has sky watchers puzzled.

The streak, which can be viewed in motion on a NASA website page, was captured on film by a camera positioned on a volcano in Haleakala, Hawaii. It moves from southeast to northwest.

According to the NASA site, the streak was spotted on the night of Dec. 17. Another camera trained on the night sky in Hawaii, in Mauna Kea, also captured the image.

While the streak may have been disregarded as a satellite, NASA says no record of a satellite in that position exists on a website that documents bright satellite events.

NASA includes an online discussion board for people to speculate about what the streak might have been.

One poster wrote: "What is truly bizarre is that this object is visible for a good 55 minutes at Haleakala and close to 30 minutes at Mauna Kea. Usually, satellites take a few dozen seconds or, at the most, a couple of minutes to cross the entire sky.

"If this object is a satellite, it is either very slow moving or at a very high altitude. I checked all the possibilities at Heavens-Above and no satellite passes seem to fit this observation. It is also impossible to be a meteorite."

c. 2005 WorldNetDaily.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 08:56:58 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 11:10:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Shough

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:07:41 +0100
>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>I am also answering to Josh Goldstein who asked for details.

>Firstly, Jan Aldrich has just confirmed the case, being himself
>one of the researchers on the case. See his message passed on
>February 5 about the ABC UFO Special, which is going to present
>it. This is a very serious question, and so, let's quote him
>here:

>"Tom Tulien and I interviewed the primary witness on the Minot
>B-52 case several years ago. His story was fantastic, but later
>interviews by Tom Tulien and others showed that crewmen
>supported the story and gave their observations from their
>positions on the aircraft. (Aside: This case is discussed in
>several UFO books, but with the wrong date, and the significance
>of the case is not communicated to the reader.)"

<snip>

>already pretty well known information, and I am surprised,
>Martin, that you don't know about it!

Gildas

Ah, that Minot case! Well I did "know about it" actually, but
didn't recognise the date, or your summary, because I didn't
know about the silo door, which was the focus of your
description. In fact I exchanged some brief emails with Jan
about the case perhaps a year ago now - but in the context of
the RADCAT radar catalogue. I plead guilty to not having every
detail of every case burned on my memory.

<snip>

>Date: 24 October 1968 (not 1956, date given in the "Hynek
>UFO report", and in the Mufon UFO Journal No 282 of
>October 1991). Minuteman missile base of Minot, ND.

Hynek gives 2_8_ October, as well. Not surprising there's
confusion. Anyway I'd like to know much more about this very
interesting case. I understand that a lot of time and money has
been spent on it and there's quite a lot of data, including
extant radarscope photos. But I haven't seen these results. The
account you quote is certainly dramatic and intriguing, and on
the face of it does seem to show "intent" with respect to a
missile silo.

Regards

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gevaerd

From: **A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO** <gevaerd.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 07:20:16 -0200
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 11:13:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants? - Gevaerd

>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 07:00:06 -0800
>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 05:52:18 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Hayakawa Recants?

<snip>

>In Norio's world, there are now no ETs, but there do live
>demons.

>With this in mind, he had once decided that Area 51 was home of
>demonic projects and that he and Anthony Hilder were missioned
>to bring this to the attention of the world and thus he and
>Anthony formed "marches" on Area 51.

>Now, he changes once again and it looks like his influence comes
>from PNAC and the neocon agenda (just my guess).

>Several have tried to argue the UFO evidence with Norio but to
>no avail. You cannot argue evidence against a deep emotional
>belief.

Hi Bill.

It is very sad. And the same thing happened to many other UFO
researchers in Brazil and South America as well.

The most famous of them is Brazilian UFO pioneer of the 50s
Hulvio Brandt Aleixo, responsible for 7 out 10 of the very good
and classic UFO abduction cases of the golden days.

Since the beginning of the 90s, because of his extreme religious
beliefs (he is an old-fashioned fervent catholic) he has been
proposing that aliens are demons or come from hell to take over
our bodies, souls, the planet, whatever.....

It is very sad indeed.

A. J.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Salla & Bassett

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 00:41:52 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:13:04 -0500
Subject: Salla & Bassett

Michael Salla, Stephen Bassett,

Since both of you posted here over the last couple of days I am posting my response. In my opinion, Michael Salla, Exopolitics, the Paradigm Research Group, Stephen Greer, and the Xconference are causing great damage to legitimate UFO research by trying to present speculation and conjecture as factual truth.

For example, Michael Salla presenting his speculation on Eisenhower as Ike factually communicating with Nordic extraterrestrials. Not "I speculate that..." or "I theorize"... but promoting as truth anecdotal stories and claims with no further evidence to support such claims as the truth.

Promoting untruths, for example, the underground Dulce base as truth. Promoting the "Tall White Story" as truth when it is based on one man's anecdotal story with no legitimate investigation to determine if there is any real evidence.

The above are only a few small examples out of many speculations that you promote as truth with no qualification. Out of this you have formed your theories and speculative ways to be galactic ambassadors with all the alien races we are allegedly in contact with. On top of it all you try to present this muddy mess to the government and actually believe you are going to convince the government to take you seriously enough that they will tell you all they supposedly know.

Anyone who looks at your information who is clear minded enough to know what kind of evidence is required to go from speculation, conjecture, and theory to evidence, facts and truth can see right through what you are trying to do.

On top of it all, on UFO UpDates you justify your efforts with the most absurd rationalizations to allow sloppy thinking with no qualification. Your efforts are a sham, pure garbage in my opinion. What you are doing makes a laughing stock out of Ufology to the people who matter. Your following are "blind believers" with no ability to think in order to determine what is or is not true.

My fellow Listerions, I strongly suggest that you read the archives concerning the above people and their efforts before responding to support them. In addition, if you look at the Exopolitics website, Stephen Bassett, Stephen Greer, and the Xconference information and you don't agree with what I am saying then you do not know how to think clearly. If that is the case then I feel sorry for you because you have not learned how to take the first step to distinguish between fiction and fact.

Josh Goldstein

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Don't Get Me Started The Truth is Not There

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:18:59 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:18:59 -0500
Subject: Don't Get Me Started The Truth is Not There

Source: Ultimate AV

<http://www.guidetohometheater.com/scottwilkinson/205sw/>

February 2005

Don't Get Me Started The Truth is Not There

Scott Wilkinson

Most of the content on this Web site concerns how to get the most out of watching movies in a home theater. However, I readily admit that I spend most of my tube time watching television programming, both HD and SD. Now, don't get me wrong=97I love watching a fine film from a high-quality DVD on a big screen with surround sound in cozy comfort. But I also love to watch TV, and a quality home theater system enhances this pastime as well.

For me, one of the most fascinating aspects of broadcast television is the way in which it both reflects and impacts our society. Among the most significant examples of this inter-relationship is the growing appearance of pseudoscience (UFOs, ghosts, Bigfoot, etc.) in series such as Unexplained Mysteries as well as various TV movies and specials. These programs offer intriguing premises and dramatic re-creations of alleged paranormal incidents without the hard evidence to qualify them as credible news sources. In addition, undeniably fictional shows that focus on these themes are gaining in popularity by leaps and bounds. Yet increasing numbers of viewers unquestioningly accept these shows as fact, finding them as believable as CNN.

If you think this is preposterous, think again. Wayne Anderson, a physics professor at Sacramento City College in California, asked his students to write a paper on whether or not they believed that the U.S. government is engaged in a UFO cover-up and to cite evidence in support of their position. He was shocked to find that most of the "evidence" cited to support a cover-up came from television programs such as The Roswell Incident, Alien Autopsy, and even The X Files.

What's wrong with this picture? Why did college students think it reasonable to use television-entertainment programming as scientific evidence? One important reason might be the apparent decline of scientific competence among American students. This was demonstrated a few years ago in a test administered to 120,000 primary and secondary students around the country as part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Shockingly, over 40 percent of high-school seniors and 33 percent of fourth and eighth graders did not meet the minimum academic requirements established for the test.

These anecdotes seem to indicate that basic education in this country simply does not prepare people to think critically about scientific issues. As a result, they have no reason to doubt

unsubstantiated pseudoscience, which thus flourishes and becomes even more pervasive. People might want the truth, but without a decent education that includes a conceptual grasp of the scientific method and logical thought, they tend to accept any answer that's fed to them between commercials for Burger King and McDonald's.

Even worse, seeing is no longer believing, despite what some promos for The X Files have proclaimed. The technology of digital image manipulation is now so advanced that it's difficult or impossible for most people to distinguish between genuine photographic images and computer-contrived counterfeits. (Forrest Gump was both hailed and reviled for its innovative use of computer-based historical revision.) This technology can easily be used to conjure "evidence" to support any cockamamie contention, not to mention more ominous applications such as electronic avatars of political leaders that can be manipulated by those who hold the real power (whoever they may be).

This frightening notion was explored in the final episode of the fourth season of sci-fi saga Babylon 5, one of the best series ever to grace the television landscape and now available on DVD. This episode includes several segments that "flash forward" to various points in the far future of the show's primary story (which is set about 250 years into our future).

During the segment set in the year 2762, an EarthGov propagandist is programming holographic simulations of people from the show's main story to create a false historical record of the plotlines viewers have already seen. As this character reports to his superiors at PolitDivision, "The purpose of this simulation is to provide reverse correct infospeak as support for changes in Earth policy...Intent is to deconstruct historical figures revered by polsector, thereby legitimizing current government policies."

In this chilling segment, the propagandist also refers to "realfacts," which reflect actual reality, and "goodfacts," which the government generates and disseminates to the general public to further its own goals. This episode is fictional, of course, but writer J. Michael Straczynski offers a prophetic vision of what could happen if we abandon our skeptical scrutiny of television shows that promote pseudoscience and other questionable agendas.

On the other hand, maybe the shows about government conspiracies are right. After all, I've seen plenty of reports about dwindling government funding for public education="no child left behind" can't possibly work if there's no money to pay for it. Maybe this is a deliberate plan to reduce the educational level of the population so that we will accept whatever we see on TV, which, like the government, is obviously controlled by the corporate/media elite (or aliens, which could be the same thing). Maybe Mulder and Scully should look into it... (Cue whistle theme; fade to black.)

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Christianity Extraterrestrial Religion?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:21:47 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:21:47 -0500
Subject: Christianity Extraterrestrial Religion?

Source: Phenomena Magazine - UK

<http://tinyurl.com/4sgxt>

02-09-05

Phenomena Guest Column

Christianity - Extraterrestrial Religion?

By: John Lash
Author of Metahistory.org

In 1968 a Swiss innkeeper named Erich von Daniken published *Chariots of the Gods?*, which became an international bestseller and remains in print today. According to von Daniken's sensational theory, "ancient astronauts" from an advanced civilization visited the Earth in times long past. He found proof of their presence in rock-carvings, religious artifacts, ancient myths, and, of course, megalithic monuments such as the Giza pyramids.

Von Daniken provocatively asked "Did God Drive a Flying Saucer?" With this question planted in the mainstream mind, God, angels, and everything Biblical instantly attached itself to UFO speculation, but von Daniken did not explore these associations. A less-known but far more intelligent study, which appeared in the same year as *Chariots*, did just that. *The Bible and Flying Saucers* was written by Barry H. Downing, a Presbyterian pastor with degrees from Princeton Theological Seminary and the University of Edinburgh. The scope and depth of his book reflect his learning, a far cry from von Daniken's shenanigans. But this book also reflects the author's steadfast faith in Christian tradition: to be specific, his assumption that God and His angels, even if they are ETs who navigate in UFOs, are implementing a divine plan for the benefit of humanity.

Downing may be considered the founder of Biblical Ufology, the genre of studies proposing that many events in the Bible reflect extraterrestrial intervention. Visions such as those seen by Ezekiel are taken as close encounters. Angels, such as the one who announced the birth of Jesus to Mary, are regarded as aliens of a superior evolution. Some interpretations even regard Jesus as an extraterrestrial who comes to Earth from a more highly evolved world, or is cloned as a "93model human"94 by technologically superior space brothers. Imagine the headline, "Jesus "96 The First Designer Baby!"

Biblical UFOlogists assume that space aliens or ET-like entities act in a kind and benevolent manner toward humanity, consistent with the fulfillment of a "Divine Plan." Downing wonders if "Biblical religion was planted and nurtured by persons from another world." He does not merely speculate on the presence of "93ancient astronauts"94 on Earth, but he considers their possible

role in initiating and directing the religious experience of humanity. This issue involves a much deeper cut into the human psyche than von Daniken undertook.

Biblical Ufology is widely developed today, but an optional interpretation that could not have emerged until some time after Downing and von Daniken wrote has yet to be considered. This option arises with the view of alien intervention proposed by the Gnostics of the Mystery Schools. Although some of the Gnostics' views can be found in obscure arguments written against them by early Christians, original Gnostic material was not available until the Hag Hammadi codices, discovered in 1945, were translated into English in 1978. The Mysteries were destroyed in the 4th Century CE, when the Nag Hammadi cache was buried, but they are known to have preexisted Christianity for thousands of years.

Gnostics were psychonauts of extraordinary scope and finesse. Their cosmology, centered on the figure of the Goddess Sophia, presents a complete and coherent description of the origin and methods of an inorganic predatory species called Archons. Although Gnostic texts describe firsthand encounters with Archons who "abduct souls by night," their teachings do not emphasize physical threat. Rather, they warn that the Archons affect us most profoundly in our minds, especially through religious ideology, through beliefs about God and what God wants for us.

One of the most sensational ideas of the Gnostics is that Jehovah, the Father God of Judeo-Christian religion, was an Archon, an inferior deity not to be confused with the true Gods, called Aeons, who inhabit the cosmic center (galactic core?) Jehovah is said to be blind and mad, a demented alien who nevertheless has some god-like powers. Although he does not create the world we inhabit, he believes that he does. "Opening his eyes, the chief Archon saw a vast quantity of matter without limit, and he became arrogant, saying, 'It is I who am God, and there is no other power apart from me.' " (The Reality of the Archons). Of course, this is exactly what Yahweh-Jehovah says in the Old Testament. Over and over again, Gnosticism presents a view of Judeo-Christian religion that turns it completely inside out.

Fortunately, the Nag Hammadi cache, meager as it is, contains quite a lot of clear information on the Archon God and his insidious tactics. In the Second Treatise of the Great Seth, an unnamed Gnostic Master says, "The Archons devised a plan about me to release their error and their absurdity." (This line recalls Jacques Vallee's pithy comment in Messengers of Deception: "The way to a man's belief is through confusion and absurdity.") The text explains how the Archons induce a false plan of salvation into the human mind, a counterfeit of the true path of self-liberation we can take by developing our innate potential of Nous, "divine intelligence." The Gnostic teacher, called Phoster or Illuminator, openly ridicules Abraham, Moses and the prophets for accepting the Archons as divine and putting faith in an imposter god who works against humanity. The Second Treatise says that the "doctrine of the aliens" is "a great deception upon the human soul, making it impossible for humans to find Nous, the self-liberating mind, and thus come to know true humanity."

What Gnostics meant by "the doctrine of the aliens" is the ensemble of beliefs at the core of Judaic and Christian religion =97and, by extension, Islam. All three of the "great world religions" derive from the revered Patriarch Abraham, thought to have lived around 2000 BCE. Because the history of the ancient Hebrews is taken as exemplary or symbolic of humanity as a whole, our species' "sacred history" begins with Abraham, but Gnostics considered that Abraham was a dupe, the psychological "vector" for the intrusion of the Archons. In effect, they trashed the notion of a =93Divine Plan=94 overseen by Jehovah, and exposed Judeo-Christian salvationism (the Redeemer Complex) as an extraterrestrial religion, alien to the Earth and hostile to human potential.

Doing so, they did not leave us without alternatives, however. Gnostics taught what they embodied: the illuminist path of experimental mysticism, contrasted to blind belief in salvationist dogmas. Against the religious deceit of the Archons, the Second Treatise invokes the "hope of Sophia,"

affirming our bond to the Wisdom Goddess whose body is the Earth.

For more material on Gnosticism and Alien Intervention visit John Lash's website at Metahistory.org.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais

From: **Gildas Bourdais** <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 11:16:19 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:26:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 5:38:25 -1000
>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 17:07:41 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Nuclear Reactors & UFOs?

<snip>

>Thank you for the information. I suppose that back in 1991 I
>read about the skeleton of the case with a wrong date and I had
>forgotten about it. This sounds like a more amazing case than
>the other two USAF missile base episodes. I look forward to
>seeing this case on TV.

Hello Josh

Why two cases?

I think that there are many more!

Gilads

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 or 53 - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 11:57:26 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:28:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 or 53 - Miller

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 22:23:15 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 17:23:39 -0000
>>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>I am intrigued by the way by these words from Gareth J.
>>Medway about the MJ12 papers. They strike me as very
>>profound and insightful and I am overwhelmed by the sound
>>logic applied;

>>"Christopher Allan concludes that, if we can't prove MJ-12 a
>>hoax, we can certainly ask why, if the events described
>>therein did occur, there is no proof. I agree: if the
>>Roswell story had been genuine, then confirmation would have
>>come to light by now, just as Moore anticipated. It has not
>>done, so claims about it can be dismissed."

>>A quite brilliant logical dismissal with incredibly
>>sophisticated and original reasoning. He's hit the very point
>>that's eluded all before him. Another Magonia first!!

>I'm glad you appreciate that, because it is a vital point.

>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>with little contact with the outside world. One of the ways
>this is manifested is in its inability to understand that
>some UFO events - if they had in fact happened as described -
>would have had a major impact on the outside world, and not
>be confined to the 'paper trail' which many ufologists are so
>assiduous in tracing.

>Roswell, as generally accepted by many ufologists, represents
>a major turning point in human history: an extraterrestrial
>civilisation has come into contact with the major political,
>scientific and industrial power on our planet. The earth's
>greatest centre of scientific research suddenly found itself
>in possession of a piece of advanced technology from another
>planet.

>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit
>of paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the
>end of the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and
>filed away and everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s.
>I find that hard to believe.

>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us
>how the world is different today than it would have been it

>Roswell hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed
>nothing, it was an event of negligible historical importance?

>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

Calm down John, calm down.

The Trindale episode here largely passed me by as my eyes glazed over at the tedium of the debate, but I do now see the point that your favourite Ufologist, Mr. C. and others made about the disingenuity of your style of argument.

These days, Roswell isn't so much about how us believers clasp it to our breasts like some precious ornament only to snap and snarl at anything of a Klassburtzian hue that strides towards it, so much as how you sceptics seem to think that it's our Holy Grail and that even confronted with proof to the contrary, we'd still claim it to be a valid case even if you could show it was five Mogul balloons, a rabid cat and a parrot with a ukelele.

We do love Roswell John, quite a bit, but our feet aren't encased in cement. What makes you think they are? There's no wild ramblings on this List, at least not lately. Who have you been talking to?

No, my interest was in the marvellously arbitrary nature of the time line that Medway imposed beyond which he was happy to declare that Roswell _never_ occurred. We need to know John, how was it arrived at?

Was it;

- a. 5 minutes after the event?
- b. 5 weeks after the event?
- c. Two and a half years after?

What happens if "a line is drawn" only for a major event to occur the day after that goes some way to confirming the original facts? How does this affect the permutation and indeed, the mind of the "line drawer"?

I have a theory.(cough). My theory is as follows;

If T = the event, W = time, E = the point of decision, R = ratio to percentage of likelihood, and P = probabilities involved, then add T+W+E+R+P and you get a very clear and lucid idea of exactly what I think, at least about Mr. Medway.

Stuart Miller

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:22:48 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:37:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>with little contact with the outside world. One of the ways this
>is manifested is in its inability to understand that some UFO
>events - if they had in fact happened as described - would have
>had a major impact on the outside world, and not be confined to
>the 'paper trail' which many ufologists are so assiduous in
>tracing.

>Roswell, as generally accepted by many ufologists, represents a
>major turning point in human history: an extraterrestrial
>civilisation has come into contact with the major political,
>scientific and industrial power on our planet. The earth's
>greatest centre of scientific research suddenly found itself in
>possession of a piece of advanced technology from another
>planet.

>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>to believe.

>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell
>hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>was an event of negligible historical importance?

>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

Hello John:

I hope you aren't suggesting that most mainstream ufologists
consider Roswell the crash of an alien space craft.

Sure some still do, but if I sense this correctly, they are
far from a majority unless you are counting all the internet
pinheads as 'mainstream'.

Maybe we should take a poll right on this list. I could be wrong
too. Personally, I do not think Roswell 1947 was the crash of
an alien space craft.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: How UFOs Relate To The New World Order - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 12:33:07 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 15:38:54 -0500
Subject: Re: How UFOs Relate To The New World Order - Shough

>From: William Bolt <ab5sy.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 09:19:26 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: How UFOs Relate To The New World Order

>How UFOs Relate To The New World Order

>By Henry Makow

>Thanks to extraterrestrial contact, the technology already
>exists to release humanity from its dependence on its dwindling
>reserves of polluting fossil fuels, which is the cause of war.

<snip>

>Nick Cook, the Aviation Editor of Jane's Defense Weekly, also
>confirms these conclusions in a book "The Hunt for Zero Point."
>He traces the development and suppression of zero gravity
>technologies over the last 80 years.

Nick Cook 'confirms' no such thing. He traces a lot of rumour, anonymous tip-offs, various bits of blue-sky aerospace research and some plausible inference, but there's nothing conclusive in there.

However, his start point is the recommendation in the 1947 AMC Twining memo that a programme to construct "flying discs" should, if authorised, be set up independently of what was to become Project Sign. What if it was set up? he asks. This is the very same question that I put at the centre of an unpublished book ("Vital Intelligence" - ah, what a sad loss to the world!) back in about 1989, and is of course therefore highly perspicacious and intensely interesting. :-)

<snip>

>The purpose of this cover-up is both economic and political. At
>the end of the Nineteenth Century, London-based bankers
>established their power and wealth on the basis of large
>international cartels. In the US, they used their control of the
>railroad to favor their agent J.D. Rockefeller with low rates
>enabling him to eliminate competition.

>The same principle applied to the coal and steel cartels. Later
>they expanded to defense, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and media.
>They run the US from London through their American partners.

>As my readers know, the goal of these bankers and their allies
>is to formalize a thinly veiled totalitarian world government.
>The presence of extraterrestrials and new technology is
>interfering with this plan. The bankers have trillions of
>dollars invested in old technology. They will release the new
>technology only if and when it suits them. In the meantime, they
>use it to keep us enslaved, and to ward off more advanced
>civilizations.

Good lord! London bankers run the US and control the enslaved world through a Satanic network of Freemasons, manipulating us to feel a terror of aliens... now it all makes sense.

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:35:25 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:24:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 13:18:44 -0400
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 04:46:45 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 08:17:33 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

><snip>

>>>I've begun checking into the other entertainers performing
>>>with the Dick Drake trio at Harrah's hoping maybe the Drake
>>>bunch told them about the sighting. An internet search confirms
>>>at least two of them dead. However, a relative of one of them is
>>>interested in digging into it, so with a little luck maybe there
>>>will be further to report soon.

>>I have to say this is one fine piece of legwork by Dave
>>Rudiak. There was a Dick Drake Trio, they did play in Reno
>>(accordion and all!) and now we know which club (Harrah's which
>>has since eaten up two city blocks).

>>My initial suspicions were groundless. If we get real lucky,
>>maybe someone who knew Drake or one of the sidemen will be
>>found; somebody who might confirm hearing them talk about their
>>experience on US Highway 395.

>You could try contacting the American Federation of Musicians
>[Union] in NY.

><http://www.afm.org/public/home/index.php#>

>They should have them listed or a history of them.

>However a search in these two locals [below] of the AF of M
>might be more productive. If any of these musicians are still in
>the business, they will show up here. Check past presidents of
>the local or the treasurer.

>Even after 40 odd years Drake might still be playing though
>more likely he's moved on to another line of work.

>The Las Vegas Local 369 of the AF of M is:

><http://www.afm.org/369/>

>The Reno Local 368 for the AF of M is:

><http://www.afm.org/368/>

Don, Dave:

I think a better bet would be local #47 for Los Angeles. They were traveling up from that general area. There are other locals around there however.

If they are anything like local #6 (San Francisco) where I was a member, they won't have good records. Those get all messed up and eventually discarded as union officials dig thru the safe to rifle the general fund.

At most, you might find that they were indeed members and little else.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Youngsters Outstripped At Some Visual Tasks -

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 12:53:32 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:26:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Youngsters Outstripped At Some Visual Tasks -

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 18:26:21 -0000
>Subject: Youngsters Outstripped At Some Visual Tasks

>So, does this mean that older people are more likely to notice
>an UFO?

<snip>

>To explore the effects of this change, researchers tested people
>between 18 and 31 years old, and others aged 60 and above.
>Subjects viewed a computer screen showing moving, vertical
>black-and-white stripes. They then had to decide in which
>direction the bands were travelling.

>Previous studies have shown that, as the number of stripes in
>view increases, young people become much worse at identifying
>their movement. Scientists think that the stripes' large, stark
>borders activate the brains inhibitory mechanisms. The mind
>starts disregarding these monotonous forms.

Hi Joe

It should mean they're more likely to spot running zebras. :-)

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 08:02:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:27:56 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Kaeser

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:27:14 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

<snip>

>I have thought for some time that a "killer app" for UFO
>research would be to leverage the internet for what it is best
>able to do... link far-flung data with ease.

>Imagine a subscription website, where the work of Sparks,
>Aldrich, etc., were linked to appropriate audio files in Wendy
>Connors project, and the Brian Vike, Peter Davenport style sites
>were cross-linked by similar traits, locales, or event details.

>The internet was created for exactly this purpose...to reduce
>duplicated effort by providing "living" documents. When new data
>is added, the links remain up to date, since the data is managed
>by individuals far and wide.

Hi Kyle,

In a perfect world, this would be great.

But, how is this information going to be vetted, or is it simply to become a collection of thoughts, beliefs, theories or (gasp!) actual raw data? If you review the UFO information that currently exists on the Internet, there are many sites that simply collect sightings and have no way to verify if the person providing the information even exists.

Many authors seem to mix beliefs and theories with what they believe are known facts, so their material becomes skewed in the eyes of others, while some good researchers seem to rely on collections of data that is perhaps suspect in their findings. Will it simply be up to the visitor to make up their own mind on the validity of the data? Of course, those in this field have rarely agreed on anything, so I'm not sure how you even begin to come up with a consensus to begin a vetting process.

Of course, the real problem would be subscriptions, which rarely work on the Internet (with the exception of Adult and Personals sites). There has been a hope that subscription data services would catch on and become the norm, but that hasn't really happened. This is changing, but the key them becomes marketing and sales, which are areas that the UFO community haven't really excelled at (IMO).

But, even if you get subscriptions, how many do you honestly think will joining up? Groups that self-produce UFO material for sale often have two to three hundred copies printed (if its thought that it will sell well) and then it's re-printed if the sales continues into a second and third year. But more often than not, the initial printing lasts for several years. There's a hard core of researchers and interested individuals to sell a solid number of publications, but that usually appears to be a finite number and most (self-published) UFO publications go out of print after five years or so.

One of the problems faced by the Air Force in their declassification effort was the coordination of all the reviewers and how they each judged documents and what was considered in that review. It's mentioned that this site would be "managed by individuals far and wide", but I'm not sure what mechanism would be in place to coordinate that effort, not to mention the expertise needed to keep the site updated and fresh.

I guess my point is that while this idea is a really good one, it's also one that's been considered in various forms numerous times in the past decade. The software that would be needed to put this together is pretty much "off the shelf" software that would have to be configured for this, and the real issue would be the web site creation, and the vetting/preparation of the material for the site. This is more bureaucratic, as opposed to technical, and that is where this field becomes a fractured mess.

Somehow I don't think the problems facing the UFO field will be solved by a software program.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 08:00:03 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:29:18 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Groff

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:27:14 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Nikolay Subbotin <paragloss.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
>>Subject: UFO Research Software?

>>Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any
>>software for professional UFO research.

>>In Russia, we're now trying to create special programs. Is it
>>of interestt to you?

>>I think we can work together on this.

>What would the software you are working on actually do?

>I have thought for some time that a "killer app" for UFO
>research would be to leverage the internet for what it is best
>able to do...link far-flung data with ease.

>Imagine a subscription website, where the work of Sparks,
>Aldrich, etc., were linked to appropriate audio files in Wendy
>Connors project, and the Brian Vike, Peter Davenport style sites
>were cross-linked by similar traits, locales, or event details.

<snip>

Hi Kyle, Nikolay

Actually a friend of mine, Jerome Beau, has been working on such
a project for quite a while now. It's called UFO.nul and can be
found at

<http://rr0.sourceforge.net/>

I wrote about it before.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2003/jun/m16-004.shtml>

It's quite an endeavor for one man to take on but he is trying.
I've tried to help with the translation to English but since I
don't know JAVA programming I couldn't help in that respect.

If anyone wants to help, this is an open source project and
everything is available to you.

Jerome can be contacted at

rr0.nul

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Fort Wayne Media Watch - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:13:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:31:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Fort Wayne Media Watch - Reynolds

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 10:32:03 -0800
>Subject: Fort Wayne Media Watch [was: Socorro & Balloons]

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>I suggest we just ignore this group of adolescents. Let them
>invent the "new Ufology" on their own without the help of the
>fossilized old Ufologists, whose knowledge they ignore anyway
>while heaping abuse upon them. With no one to act as a foil,
>they will have nothing more to blog about. My bet is that the
>"new Ufology" will die in a month or two as the adolescents
>quickly grow bored with themselves and seek yet another blogging
>gig.

David...

Thanks for the longish "tribute" to our adolescence and
goofiness.

If you go to:

<http://www.ufolab.us>

you'll find, among other web-sites by UFO investigators here
(which I set the site up for), near the bottom, a few web-sites
of ours which deal with the the UFO phenomenon.

One deals with our assertion back in the late 1960s that Edward
Condon shouldn't get the Air Force contract because he was
ousted from security clearances (by the Navy) because of alleged
Communist affiliations..

You will find responses from the Air Force and government
officials to our complaint, which issued Condon new security
clearances so he could do their dirty work.

Since this was 36 years ago, we're hardly adolescent.

More importantly, when I listed the NASA list of balloon
traverses over the continent, it was so persons could check and
see for themselves what the site contained, rather than my
telling them, which would be hearsay evidence.

And my association with Larry Robinson's balloon theory for
Socorro arises from Mr. Robinson's remembrance of a magazine
article he saw in the 60s which accounted for the Soccoro
sighting.

I've been in contact with Larry Robinson, and one of my guys at
the university where he works (Indiana) confirms that Larry
Robinson is considered a reputable, decent man, who would have
no reason to lie about seeing a magazine article. (Mr. Robinson

isn't promoting his story for remuneration or fame, or ego.)

As for MediaWatch, we've been around for fifteen years, have a track record which is exemplary, and noted for pointing out media malfeasances when they occur.

My "badgering" as you put it, wasn't to get a response from you (or anyone else) post haste. It was a literary ploy, to accent my query...rhetorical device if you will.

But, again, you miss the point, and if you miss the point of my simplistic ramblings, how much more have you missed in the Socorro episode or that of Roswell? You tell me...

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:14:18 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:32:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:44:00 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

Hi, Alfred,

>>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>>with little contact with the outside world.

>Stark irony there when the truth seems to be that the air
>inside that little bubble seems to be of 'psychosocial'
>manufacture, too much nitrogen and not enough O2. In other
>words, you're hallucinating the high ground, Mr. Rimmer.

Well, exactly. The notion that "most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble, with little contact with the outside," is of course a witless ad hominem. It appears that since nobody else will congratulate them on their cosmopolitanism and wisdom, pelicanists are forced to do it for themselves. We are to believe, one presumes, that by way of contrast with those uncool ufological Poindexters, pelicanists are sophisticated, cosmopolitan men (and, far, far less often, women; the female of the species is rarely sighted within the flock) whose manifest brilliance only UFO nerds, our glasses held precariously together by masking tape while our pens leak ink into our wrinkled white shirts, would ever presume to question.

When pelicanists are reduced to squawking sentiments like the above, one can only infer that insults - and, depending as they do on the crudest and dopest of stereotypes, not even very interesting ones at that - are all they have left. It's really pretty sad when you think about it. It comes, I'm afraid, out of losing all those arguments on matters of actual substance.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 11:22:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:34:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Friedman

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 14:32:44 +0000
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 11:45:15 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2005 20:02:18 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Sat, 5 Feb 2005 15:11:15 -0400
>>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>>Dick, once again you have made a claim unsupported by any
>>>>evidence about secret science:

>>>>If you would pay attention to what I say, you wouldn't keep
>>>>going off on the tangent of technology development done in
>>>>secret. I gave you a specific example of what I was talking
>>>>about. Do you care to defend that as legitimate science?

>>And just what example is that and how do you know what was done
>>with it? If you are talking about the Socorro stuff.

><snip>

>I give up trying to communicate with you. This is going nowhere,
>so I decline to participate any longer. You are playing word
>games, not thinking, reasoning, and communicating rationally.

I certainly agree that we disagree and this is going nowhere.
Try looking in the mirror Dick if you want to see why.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Boone

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 10:36:01 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:35:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Boone

>From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:29:01 -0000
>Subject: Crop Circle Documentary Biased

>BLT's Nancy Talbott emailed me this week about a crop circle
>show which aired in the US about a week ago. Here is a section
>of her note to me, together with a document in which she
>comments on the show.

Gad! That's so fiendish and underhanded!

It's gotten to the point where you don't know whom to trust.

That reads like a 'wolf in sheep's clothing' situation.

For all of you researchers who have your solid conclusions I would say tell the documentary people to shove it.

'You' know your facts are straight, pro or con so why entertain so-called news people who lack objectivity.

This 'free press' society is nothing more than a smear campaign machine hiding under constitutional protections. It's been this way for centuries and used by politics the most.

Opinion control nonsense to cover up crimes.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:14:34 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:37:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais

>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:42:56 -0500
>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

>The version of the B-52 Minot issue by J. J. Velasco and quoted
>by Gildas Bourdais is flawed and incorrect.

>Many hearsay items have not been confirmed and are stated, by
>Velasco, as fact, completely crippling the impact of the case.

>The number of errors in this account renders it almost useless!

Jan,

Why don't you give us a correct version?

I wonder - Velasco refers to the Weinstein catalogue, case No 732.

Is it also worthless? I just know that Velasco and Weinstein
have been working together. I am not in contact with them but I
supposed that it was at least a rather correct account.

Gildas

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: SETI Contradiction? - Deardorff

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 09:33:31 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:39:54 -0500
Subject: Re: SETI Contradiction? - Deardorff

>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:56:02 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: SETI Contradiction?

>At: <http://www.setileague.org/editor/actvseti.htm>

>In "Active SETI Is Not Scientific Research," we read:

>"An Active SETI signal much more powerful than the normal
>background emitted by the Earth might call us to the attention
>of a technological civilization that had not known of our
>existence. We can not assume that such a civilization would be
>benign, nor can we assume that interstellar flight is impossible
>for a species more technologically advanced than our own."

>One of SETI's central tenets is that "you can't get there from
>here," yet this article frets over the possibility of invoking
>an interstellar attack.

Good point! I think this does qualify as a contradiction of
note.

>If SETI wonks are willing to entertain the idea of interstellar
>spaceships, then they should rightfully take scientific interest
>in the possibility that some UFO sightings are evidence of ET
>visitation... but somehow I don't see this happening. ...

Indeed.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 13:42:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:41:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 16:35:07 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
>>Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>INEXPLICATA
>>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
>>02.08.05

>>Source: Terra.cl
>>Date: 02.08.05

>><http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

<snip>

>I would really love to hear how the AION arrived at the size
>estimate.

>I'd also like to see a raw version of the image, since it
>appears to me to be cropped from a larger original image. I say
>this because since the object is in the very center of the
>image, it strains credibility to accept that he didn't notice it
>until he was downloading the images. My guess is that the
>original image includes more area, and perhaps even a clue as to
>the reflected object in the image.

>These are just my impressions. I could be wrong.

I'm a bit bothered by the fact that there is no reflection of
the object in the water. If this was shot through a window, as
Kyle has suggested, you would of course get no water reflection,
just the reflection itself of something behind in the room.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii - Cammack

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 19:43:27 +0200
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:44:06 -0500
Subject: Re: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii - Cammack

>From: Ralph Howard <rhjr.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 14:04:12 -0500
>Subject: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii

>A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii (NASA NSL Project)

>Take a look at this:

><http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap050208.html>

>Note: You may have to go to:

><http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/>

>and hit "refresh" to get animation

>"UFO" is not listed as a possible candidate to explain the
>recorded observation.

>Ralph O. Howard
>MUFON of GA

>-----

>A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii
>Credit: Night Sky Live Collaboration

<snip>

Let me ask: if this photo is taken looking up at the sky and the first photo shows a short dash, and then a series of long dashes, and then a shorter one - with the time between each jump (photo frame) assumed to be the same - does that mean the bright object was going up or down relative to the camera at the beginning and end of the streak? (hope that makes sense?!) it just seems that its a photo of something coming up from the ground or out from space and then going onto the ground or into space...

Diana
Cape Town

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 14:28:05 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:45:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Ledger

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:36:46 -1000
>Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers ->
>>Date: 2005/02/08 Tue AM 04:04:13 HST
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

>>For those of you interested in a large, colour image of
>>Area 51:

>><http://www.lasvegasnow.com/area51/Area51-072503-LG.jpg>

>>[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

>One thing I observed that I had not seen in other photos is
>that this picture shows the longest runway with X marks along
>its length. That usually means a closed runway. I wonder why?

Hi Josh,

More than likely they are either working on that runway [there's
no evidence of that, however] or have closed it entirely. Most
likely the latter.

There are no "displaced" arrows in evidence. Traffic is being
handled on RWY 14-32R. As for the reasons, they are handling
heavier aircraft now than before of and/or the base below the
original RWY 14-32 is insufficient to bear heavy loads and it's
just too expensive [hah-what do they care ?] to rip it up and
re-base it and then resurface.

I see what looks like a "bump" marker [heavy white line across
the rwy] at the nor' northwest end of the "closed" RWY 14-32.
Subsidence?

Business as usual.

Refer to my Aurora email to you. How heavy is that?

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Secrecy News -- 02/09/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 13:25:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:46:55 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 02/09/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 15
February 9, 2005

** TWO VIEWS ON PUBLIC ACCESS TO GEOSPATIAL INFORMATION
** IN CONGRESS
** NEW FROM CRS

TWO VIEWS ON PUBLIC ACCESS TO GEOSPATIAL INFORMATION

Are remote sensing data that are collected by the government through satellite and aerial reconnaissance a public resource that should be more fully and openly exploited in the public interest? Or should public access to such information, already limited, be further curtailed in the name of combating terrorism?

Each of these conflicting views informs policy proposals that are now pending in Congress and the executive branch.

Geospatial data that are acquired for scientific and national security purposes "also can have important applications to help meet societal goals," according to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives last month by Rep. Mark Udall (D-CO).

"The full range of applications of remote sensing and other forms of geospatial information to meeting public sector requirements has not been adequately explored or exploited."

Rep. Udall's bill is intended "to encourage the development and integrated use by the public and private sectors of remote sensing and other geospatial information."

See H.R. 426, The Remote Sensing Applications Act of 2005, introduced January 26 and referred to the House Science Committee, here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_cr/hr426.html

In contrast to Rep. Udall, who seeks expanded access to and use of geospatial information, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA) is considering a proposal to withdraw various categories of aeronautical information from the public domain (Secrecy News, 11/18/04).

Where Rep. Udall sees the public as a potential "customer" that is fully capable of making productive use of government data, the NGA seems to view public disclosure of such unclassified data first and foremost as a potential threat. It is a fundamental difference in orientation.

NGA was recently asked to reconsider its attitude towards public access in an open letter from Kansas University map librarian Scott R. McEathron.

"I encourage you to think more broadly in your assessment of

'the threat,' and the collaboration that will be necessary to prevail in this 'war on terror'," he wrote to NGA Director Gen. James R. Clapper.

"I urge you to recognize and exploit the informal collaboration that is already happening between government, industry and higher education in the production, analysis and distribution of geospatial intelligence. Withdrawal of information and data products from the public will only serve to cripple these collaborative efforts," Mr. McEathron wrote.

A copy of his January 28 letter to Gen. Clapper, reposted with permission, is here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2005/01/nga013105.html>

The public comment period on the NGA proposal extends through June 30, 2005.

IN CONGRESS

Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI) yesterday introduced three bills that would amend the USA Patriot Act. The proposals would limit so-called "sneak and peek" searches (S.316); restrict government access to library, bookseller and other records (S. 317); and modify the authority to intercept computer communications (S. 318). See:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_cr/s316-318.html

A bill to require public disclosure of U.S. firms such as Halliburton that indirectly conduct business with Iran was introduced in the Senate by Sen. Ron Wyden (D-OR). "The bill would require the Treasury Secretary to publish a list of the United States companies whose subsidiaries continue to do energy deals with Iran.... My view is that an informed American public is best equipped to hold these companies accountable." See:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/congress/2005/s299.html>

The rules of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence were published in the Congressional Record February 8 and are available here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_cr/hpscirules.html

NEW FROM CRS

In accordance with congressional direction, the Congressional Research Service does not permit direct public access to CRS publications. But the following new and updated reports were obtained by Secrecy News.

"U.S. Military Operations in the Global War on Terrorism: Afghanistan, Africa, the Philippines, and Colombia," February 4, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RL32758.pdf>

"Protection of Classified Information by Congress: Practices and Proposals," updated January 5, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/RS20748.pdf>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to secrecy_news-request.nul with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 14:14:39 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:48:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:17:01 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
>>Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>INEXPLICATA
>>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
>>02.08.05

>>Source: Terra.cl
>>Date: 02.08.05

>><http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

>>[Click 'Ir A Galeria' below thumbnail]

<snip>

>For those of you who still have doubts about the lens flare
>explanation, if this was indeed a bright UFO almost as big as
>the Moon in the sky overlooking the harbour, why do we not see
>reflected lights of this UFO off the water's surface just like
>we would see with the light from the Moon, especially when we do
>see the much fainter city lights on the far shore reflecting off
>the water's surface?

<snip>

>Nick Balaskas

Spot on, Nick!!

I failed to see the full-shot image before. I was looking for a
"parking lot" light fixture as it appears to be one in the
original image, and I assumed there was more to the photo. In
the absence of such a light fixture, I figured it for a
reflected image. On seeing the full image, it is obvious that
the light fixture created the flare.

Thanks and kudos for finding it right there on the site. Guess I
should have taken Spanish in school.<g>

Lens flare, absolutely. In fact, didn't this image or one very
similar appear here some months ago?

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Christianity Extraterrestrial Religion? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:01:11 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:50:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Christianity Extraterrestrial Religion? - Boone

>Source: Phenomena Magazine - UK

><http://tinyurl.com/4sgxt>

>02-09-05

>Phenomena Guest Column

>Christianity - Extraterrestrial Religion?

>By: John Lash
>Author of Metahistory.org

Neato article.

Yet, even having studied my freckles off, interpreting Biblical scripture is an often changing flower.

So considering the broad number of sciences that go into play when investigating UFOs, you then add to it theology and you can find yourself chewin' on the tv remote.

So I look at things simply.

It's real or it ain't. It's hunting you or it's running or hiding from you.

Bullets, fists and well chucked objects work on it or they don't.

That way I can sleep at night.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Space Time And Surface Area

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 14:41:37 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 16:51:28 -0500
Subject: Space Time And Surface Area

Space, Time, And Surface Area... all behind a grain of sand at
arm's length.....

<http://wires.news.com.au/special/mm/030811-hubble.htm#end1>

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:48:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 17:02:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>with little contact with the outside world. One of the ways this
>is manifested is in its inability to understand that some UFO
>events - if they had in fact happened as described - would have
>had a major impact on the outside world, and not be confined to
>the 'paper trail' which many ufologists are so assiduous in
>tracing.

>Roswell, as generally accepted by many ufologists, represents a
>major turning point in human history: an extraterrestrial
>civilisation has come into contact with the major political,
>scientific and industrial power on our planet. The earth's
>greatest centre of scientific research suddenly found itself in
>possession of a piece of advanced technology from another
>planet.

>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>to believe.

What colossal arrogance. Just how in the world do you or anyone
else know what happened after Roswell? There is an enormous
amount of material that is still classified from that era, but
you can psychically determine that nothing relates to Roswell?
Try reading my update on the Majestic 12 Documents at my website
at:

www.stanfriedman.com

The Eisenhower Library still has 300,000 pages of classified
material. The Truman Library has 45,000. The files of the USAF,
CIA, NSC, DIA, NRO, NRL are still loaded with literally millions
of classified pages, and you know John what isn't in them?
Truly amazing.

>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell
>hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>was an event of negligible historical importance?

>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

The government realized there were new technologies to develop
and to make sure their opponents didn't develop. Governments
recognized that admitting the alien presence might well lead to
an Earthling orientation, something no government wants. The
government realized that space is the place. The government
realized it could lie through its teeth and get away with it by

disinforming the press and the scientific community and ridiculing witnesses. .. gives confidence in manipulation. I am not saying the world is better for it.

Maybe you should ask the beliefs of those who have studied the evidence... same goes for MJ-12. It is easier to say that there is no evidence than to examine that evidence. I, for one, vote 4 square for both and I have spent an enormous amount of effort studying both, researching both, dealing with the arguments of the negativists.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 21:52:02 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 17:05:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 22:41:11 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 17:07:03 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>>Cathy, Martin

>>Very quickly. Personal agency is linked to humans and other
>>animals with complex nervous systems, that would include ET
>>quasi animals. In the future it might just include super
>>computers (and of course my own nice and much treasured
>>computer!) We don't expect to see it in such things as rocks
>>and clouds.

>I don't think anyone has claimed intelligent motivation for rocks
>and clouds, have they?

>>Some versions of the ETH, such as _ufo reports are generated by
>>fusion power spaceships from Mars_ would be finite and testable
>>and fit into scientific naturalism, but unknown beings from
>>unknown locations having unknown powers and motivations
>>wouldn't.

>Your objection to some variants of ETH appears now to be that
>they would not be testable, whereas your fusion-powered Martians
>supposedly are testable. Yet your original objection was not
>about testability; it was an assertion that explanations
>invoking "trans human intelligences" had no legitimate place in
>modern scientific naturalism.

That was transhuman intelligences with unknown powers if I
remember rightly

>But exactly what is it that, from the point of view of
>epistemological principle, makes your Martian-fusion theory
>testable, whereas someone else's Zeta Reticuli space-ark theory
>isn't? Or, if I am not drawing a valid distinction here, at
>precisely what point on the spectrum of imaginable cosmic
>intelligences is a proper distinction to be drawn?

>If I understand the implication of your remark, it is that
>intelligences capable of manipulating the nuclear 'strong' force
>would be a valid hypothesis, whilst those capable of
>manipulating, say, the quark-gluon colour force or perhaps the
>gravitational force, would not be. I think this is a rather
>esoteric sort of distinction that could only be defended on some
>very esoteric theoretical grounds of your own, and I don't see
>any connection to "testability".

Well, if you can work out what the properties of a Zeta
Reticullan space ark powered by the quark-gluon colour force
would be, so that you could see if these properties were

reflected in ufo reports, then it would presumably come through the barrier.

>You said (rightly) that the successful advance of scientific
>naturalism was achieved by the steady replacement of animistic
>causal models with mechanistic ones. But this has nothing
>directly to do with testability, everything to do with
>broadening scientific imagination. And your acceptance in
>principle of Martian non-human mental agency has nothing to do
>with judiciously determining the limits of viable theory in
>accordance with some philosophy of scientific method, everything
>to do with the comfortable familiarity of a Buck Rogers-style
>conception of extraterrestrial life that was, and still is,
>another product of scientific imagination.

You misunderstand, the fusion powered space ship was just meant as a hypothetical example of something whose properties we could work out on the basis of our current scientific knowledge. Surely you agree that there is no point in explaining something by invoking processes or phenomena we know nothing about.

>Scientific naturalism, if it has any value at all as a
>principle, restricts the spectrum of explanatory processes to
>those processes which science finds operating in nature.
>Obvious? But this principle obviously is not to be applied by
>consulting a botanical list of ossified processes already
>catalogued, else science would be immobilised and unable ever to
>discover new processes. Science does discover new processes. It
>does this both by identifying new particulars (facts) and by
>creating new generalisations from these particulars (theories),
>and the entire class of "scientific processes" containing both
>types of entity inseparably is an evolving meta-process which
>represents what science actively conceives as "nature".

If by that there will be future scientific discoveries, then agreed. It may well be that in say 2105 someone will turn round and argue that the then newly discovered Chuan-Dangerfield bridgement process, or Gorbinsky's inverse hypercube hypothesis will explain some of those puzzling 20th century ufo reports. But as of 2005 we have no idea what these hypothetical or any other future hypotheses/discoveries might be. Until we discover (or invent) them they are of no use to us.

>The notion of "scientific naturalism" thus not only permits
>nature to contain generalisations from particular facts
>(theories) but demands it, logically and practically, and
>among the spectrum of explanatory processes which science today
>"finds" operating in nature are many such generalisations. Some
>of these processes have strong claims to being "conventional" -
> i.e., not in Occam's sense "new entities" - in natural science,
>even though (like gluons, or gravitons) no particular example of
>them has ever been directly observed, because they are knitted
>into the theoretical fabric by intricate webs of implication.

>One such web of implication is the one which traces a continuum
>of processes from physics to molecular biology to unicellular
>and multicellular organisms, to thee and me, and thence, via the
>"convention" that life needs only complex organic chemistry and
>energy, to your hypothetical Martians. Another is that which
>extrapolates from physics and engineering theory to your
>hypothetical fusion-powered spaceships. A third might be that
>which extrapolates from these twin conventions, via some fairly
>conventional theoretical physics, to the idea of colonisation of
>the cosmos via intergalactic wormhole travel by an intelligent
>agency - a mind-altering nanobot neurovirus, say!

Or any other of a dozen or so science fictional hypotheses we might care to imagine

>We no more know that such nanobots exist than that your quaint
>Martians exist, but the legitimacy of both grows out of the same
>network of scientific implication. The latter seems so much more
>scientifically conservative, for complex social-historical
>reasons, yet there is not the remotest scrap of evidence for it
>(outside perhaps of some UFO reports or contactee stories, for
>which I do not detect in you a strong affection) and it
>represents a principle which, once conceded, validates the
>rationale leading to the former. The difference is that whereas
>my neurovirus is science fiction of 2005, your fusion rocket is
>science fiction of 1955, and your Martian is arguably more of a
>folk-tale boggart than is my nanobot.

But surely we do know that Martians don't exist.

>>Changes in explanation of natural phenomena from personal
>>agencies to mechanical forces don't seem to be because of
>>specific refutation but rather from changes in general world
>>view which might be linked to social changes.

<snip>

>>It's interesting that Cathy mentions laboratory experiments in
>>restricted sensory environments because many anomalous personal
>>experiences seem to occur in just such circumstances (dark
>>rooms, night, lonely roads, ganzfield experiments etc)

>This is interesting in its own right, but doesn't bear on the
>question of whether or not "trans human intelligences" can ever
>be a valid scientific hypothesis for new phenomena.

Sorry that was a reply to Cathy's second postg, I just shoved
everything together because I was in a rush.

Are we at least agreed that explanations in terms of unknown
intelligences of unknown origin, possessing unknown powers and
motivations actually explains nothing at all.

Peter

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 13:52:11 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 17:08:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Rudiak

>From: Ed Gehrman <egerman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 13:12:50 -0800
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>When one's witnessing anecdote is based primarily on
>>observation, I would think that an investigation would zero
>>in on the eyesight of the person relaying information he or
>>she saw. Everything else is peripheral (no pun) to that.

>I haven't been to exactly the spot where Zamora encountered
>the craft and the two small individuals but Wendy Connors
>pointed it out to me when we were driving to the crash site
>and since then I've studied topographic maps and an aerial
>photograph of the area. Six Mile Canyon (which I explored
>carefully by car and foot) sits behind a small range of
>mountains (Chupadera) which are about seven hundred to a
>thousand feet in elevation.

>As the crow (craft) flies, Six mile canyon is less than six
>miles southwest of the sighting area. It would be difficult to
>estimate a departing speed using six mile canyon mountain as
>a reference point to determine distance and time.

Estimates of departure speed depend primarily on the distance
traveled and the elapsed time. Another important factor is
whether the object accelerated smoothly or not. Lowest maximum
speed is achieved with constant acceleration. Higher maximum
speeds are calculated if the object accelerated more slowly at
first and faster later on, as Zamora actually described.

This can lead to big variations in estimated maximum speed.
But, here's the important point. Even with these
uncertainties, are the estimated speeds at the low end of the
spectrum consistent with hypotheses such as a balloon or a
"Lonnie and the Bean" scenario internal combustion engine? The
answer is most definitely not. Even with very conservative
assumptions, the object achieved speeds at least that of a
jetliner, plus the fact that it did this with a completely
silent propulsion system.

>Zamora's stated: "the object seemed to lift up slowly, and to
>get small in the distance very fast. It seemed to just clear Box
>Canyon or Six Mile Canyon Mt. It disappeared as it went over
>the mountain."

>Most of this observation was without prescription glasses.

False. Maybe 10 seconds or so was without his glasses out of
maybe a 30 second total departure time, from blastoff to
disappearing in the distance. The important detail of him seeing
the object disappear in the distance near Six Mile Canyon was

definitely with his glasses on.

>The sun would also be a factor since this was a clear day and
>Zamora was looking directly into the setting sun.

False. Zamora was not looking directly into the sun, and the sun was not "setting" at the time. It was still a full 2 hours before sunset. The sun was at azimuth 262 deg. (a little south of west) and elevation 35 deg. The object departed on a course of approximately 240 deg. azimuth, or to the WSW. Thus the sun was about 20 degrees to the right of Zamora as he observed the object disappear in the distance and 35 degrees above him. During earlier departure, the horizontal angle between the object and the sun would have been even greater.

The sun may have been a nuisance factor and perhaps caused some glare but Zamora was definitely not staring "directly" into the sun. Sheesh!

>My review Zamora's testimony

You apparently didn't review it very carefully, because many of the details you lay out as facts here contradict what Zamora said.

>shows that the only thing we know
>for sure is that the object and the small beings were not a
>figment of his imagination and the object probably looked
>like what he described. But there is definitely a question
>regarding the speed of departure.

I reiterate, even with very conservative assumptions, the speed was much higher than any biker-built "Lonnie and the Bean" type craft could possibly have achieved. And it did it silently too, and flew without wings.

>After Zamora lost his glasses, all his observations are
>questionable.

A sweeping statement. Which observations are you talking about? When he first lost his glasses, he was no more than 50-100 feet from the object. He might not be able to see sharp detail, but it is absurd to claim that he couldn't see the object rise out of the gully and then leave.

>First he ran 100 feet behind his car

According to Zamora, he bumped his car running away and lost his glasses. Then he ran about 50 feet more behind his car, the car being about 50 feet from the object (hence Zamora being no more than 50-100 feet away after losing his glasses). Even an overweight, 31-year-old traffic cop should be able to do that easily in 3-4 seconds, especially when scared and hyped on adrenalin.

>and took his
>eyes off the object while it lifted off.

According to Zamora, he shot maybe 2 or 3 glances over his shoulder even while running. The reason he bumped into his car and lost his glasses to begin with was because he was looking over his shoulder at the time.

>Then while the object
>was in line with his car, he covered his eyes again.

Except for maybe how long it took the craft to rise out of the gully, none of this has anything to do with the ultimate speed of departure. The speed has to do with how far the craft traveled before Zamora lost sight of it and how long it took to do this. In fact, the longer it took for the craft to lift off, the faster it would have had to travel to disappear in the distance in a given total departure time.

>As he watched the craft depart, he was walking back to his car
>(100 ft) and trying to keep the object in sight, but without
>glasses.

"Walking back to his car?" According to Ray Stanford's account, Zamora ran, not walked, back to his car (50 feet, not 100) to call in. Before getting in his car to call in, he stopped to

pick up his glasses and put them back on. Thus total time without glasses approximately as follows:

1. Time to run up hill 50 feet to get get away after losing glasses: ~ 3-4 seconds
2. Observing the craft even with his car going from roar to silent mode: ~ 1-2 seconds
3. Returning to car to pick up glasses: ~5-6 seconds

Total time without glasses was maybe about 9-12 seconds. During about half of this, the craft was still at location but rising. About half of the remainder would be with the craft moving away in silent mode, but still relatively close, probably within a mile.

Even if you want to stretch the estimate a few seconds, this still doesn't change the fact that the rest of Zamora's observations, approximately 2 minutes, were with his glasses on, including when the object disappeared in the distance.

Unless Zamora was severely nearsighted (which he doesn't appear to have been, judging by the image of his eyes through his glasses), he should have been able to observe the craft even without glasses as it moved away initially. It may have been a fuzzy blob instead of sharp, but he still would have seen it and been able to make accurate judgments about its rate of departure and trajectory.

His eyesight also has nothing to do with his hearing. Zamora heard no sound from the craft as it departed in a hurry, a highly significant detail that those trying to debunk the Socorro Socorro sighting are deliberately not discussing, since it rules out any conventional propulsion system.

>Then he recovered his glasses and put them back on. This all >took about 40 seconds, by my reckoning.

A very long reckoning indeed based on an inaccurate rendering of Zamora's testimony plus some very questionable assumptions. According to Stanford's book, your distances are wrong (double of what Zamora said) and Zamora did not stroll back to his patrol car after the object left the scene. He raced back to call in.

Based on interviews with Zamora and on-site reenactment, Stanford placed the total time from blastoff to switch to silent propulsion and departure at only 11 seconds, then maybe another 20 seconds for the object to disappear in the distance. Zamora probably would have had his glasses on for about 2/3rds of the 20 second departure time, including the important disappearance in the distance.

If one assumes smooth acceleration during departure, a 20 second departure time, and a 6 mile distance to fadeout (consistent with what would be expected from human visual acuity), using a little high school Newtonian physics one ends up with a final speed of around 2200 mph! Even if one doubles the departure time and halves the fadeout distance, cutting the speed by a factor of four, one still ends up with a final speed of around 550 mph, i.e., jetliner speed.

This is the point I was making at the beginning. Even using conservative assumptions of time and distance to lower the speed, the speed is still much too high for any sort of simplistic conventional craft.

This is also from a craft making no noise and flying with no wings. Since you are obviously trying to make a case for the "Lonnie and the Bean" scenario (some biker guys slapping together a craft propelled by some different internal combustion engine), you need to be able to explain these details. How could some biker guys build a completely _silent_ craft flying without wings with vertical takeoff and landing capability and capable of jetliner if not supersonic speeds? Even NASA and Lockheed today can't do that.

>(I reenacted the scene with my wife using a stop watch).
>But most importantly, Zamora had to take his eyes off
>the object while he found, picked up and replaced his

>gasses(six seconds).

He knew exactly where he had lost them. Six seconds seems a bit on the high side for him to locate and put his glasses on again once he returned to his car, but this is a minor point.

You also don't seem to be taking into account that he didn't have to be staring at the ground the entire time. He could be alternating where he looked, looking for his glasses and then shooting quick glances in the sky to follow the departure. Even when Zamora was running away from the object at first, he still glanced several times over his shoulder to see what was going on. He would probably be doing the same as he rushed back to his car to call in and locate his glasses.

>When he resumed looking
>for the craft, as he got in his car to began transmitting,
>it

Again you are assuming here that Zamora never looked back at the sky to follow where the object was going. But Zamora was a trained traffic cop and that obviously wasn't his MO. Whenever he had the opportunity, he was checking out what happened to the object, such as glancing over his shoulder as he was running away at the beginning. Again, it would take him but a fraction of a second to shift his gaze from the ground to sky to follow the object and then back again to the ground or his car.

>may have already disappeared over the first rise (about 2500
>feet from the car and over 100 feet higher than his vantage
>point) and dropped down out of his sight.

No, again this is you reinventing the situation instead of paying attention to Zamora's actual testimony. Zamora said he saw the object angle up steeply when it got about a mile away, not dip down or disappear behind a ridge, and saw it rapidly speed away and get small in the distance. To quote a section from Stanford's book (p. 30):

"Zamora feels that the disappearance was due to distance, per se... 'It went away climbing up, fast into the distance.' ...Shortly before disappearing into the distance, the object appeared as a bright, whitish oval getting smaller and smaller as it sped away, upward, and over the mountains."

This description is totally inconsistent with your scenario of the object disappearing behind a relatively close ridge.

>At that point Zamora
>may have begun viewing some other object in the sky like a
>bird or another airplane.

Yeah right! More likely a pelican or flying pig.

>If the "Lonnie and the Bean" account is correct,

It isn't. It's obviously complete nonsense, a dime-a-dozen Net Shaggy Dog story. Nothing about it makes any sense or matches the facts of the case.

>then the
>trashed outer shell could still be in one of the arroyos
>between the sighting site and box canyon. There are
>roads in that region which are totally accessible and
>mostly secluded where the "bean" could have landed again.

Well, you are welcome to waste your time looking for the obviously nonexistent "Bean" craft built by those biker guys.

>This might have given the
>illusion that the craft had disappeared via 1000 MPH speed.

Ah, the old "radical misperception" gambit. I knew it was only a matter of time before somebody tried that.

>Other interesting details:

>Ray Stanford relates that an Albuquerque resident called a
>local TV station on that April afternoon, about 5:25 PM and
>reported an egg shaped object traveling at low altitude and not

>too fast, to the south (toward Socorro). About twenty minutes
>later, a family driving north on Hwy 85 spotted an "ellipsoid"
>craft that was very low to the ground, and as it crossed the
>highway from the north east, almost hit their car antenna. They
>saw it land to the west of them. They noticed a police car
>heading in the direction of the object.

Thank you for pointing out that there were indeed other witnesses to the egg-shaped craft and the landing besides Zamora.

(In addition to noting other witnesses, Stanford also devotes a chapter to other sightings remarkably similar to Socorro, most of them from France from a decade earlier. No doubt the biker "bean" accounts for these as well.)

Stanford gives the time when Zamora first spotted the object as 5:50, but I've seen 5:45 given elsewhere. Socorro is about 80 miles south of Albuquerque. Thus the object probably traveled 80 miles in 20-25 minutes from Albuquerque to Socorro, for an average speed of 190-240 mph.

Although this might be called a conventional speed that could be achieved by a propeller driven craft with wings or winglike airfoil, the Socorro craft had no wings and no external propeller. It was also a VTOL craft like a helicopter, which stays aloft by directing most of its thrust downward rather than sideways.

Very fast military helicopters can achieve 200 mph speeds using very powerful and noisy engines, but the Socorro craft was described as completely silent once aloft and certainly with nothing like big helicopter blades. How do you reconcile a "Lonnie and the Bean" scenario with the silence of the craft and the absence of any obvious means of propulsion?

>There are also two other witnesses who
>observed the object landing and a cloud of dust, but it's
>not clear from their testimony whether this was the first
>landing that Zamora witnessed or the second landing that
>might have happened if the craft crashed a second time.

According to Stanford, the men were only 4000-4500 feet southwest of Zamora and the object and they were headed northeast on Highway 60, i.e. in the direction of Zamora and the object. There is no question that the landing they described was the same one described by Zamora. How you could think this would be linked to a second landing where the biker guys supposedly crashed is beyond me.

Since you seem to have Stanford's book at hand, you should be paying attention to the actual details in the book instead of reinventing them in order to justify a "Lonnie and the Bean" scenario.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 15:55:56 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 17:10:54 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - King

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 08:00:03 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:27:14 -0600
>>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>>From: Nikolay Subbotin <paragloss.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
>>>Subject: UFO Research Software?

>>>Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any
>>>software for professional UFO research.

>>>In Russia, we're now trying to create special programs. Is it
>>>of interestt to you?

>>>I think we can work together on this.

>>What would the software you are working on actually do?

>>I have thought for some time that a "killer app" for UFO
>>research would be to leverage the internet for what it is best
>>able to do...link far-flung data with ease.

>>Imagine a subscription website, where the work of Sparks,
>>Aldrich, etc., were linked to appropriate audio files in Wendy
>>Connors project, and the Brian Vike, Peter Davenport style sites
>>were cross-linked by similar traits, locales, or event details.

><snip>

>Actually a friend of mine, Jerome Beau, has been working on such
>a project for quite a while now. It's called UFO.nul and can be
>found at

><http://rr0.sourceforge.net/>

>I wrote about it before.

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2003/jun/m16-004.shtml>

>It's quite an endeavor for one man to take on but he is trying.
>I've tried to help with the translation to English but since I
>don't know JAVA programming I couldn't help in that respect.

>If anyone wants to help, this is an open source project and
>everything is available to you.

>Jerome can be contacted at

>rr0.nul

Hi Terry,

Excellent, excellent, excellent!! Sourceforge has helped me replace almost all my MS apps with ones that "just work". I never thought to search on UFOs <sheepish>. I applaud Jerome and this rather daunting undertaking. And to support the Open Source community in the process is icing, indeed.

I've been needing an impetus to pull out my Java 2 reference. Never too late to learn a new trick.

I'm currently on my 3rd pass through a massive scanning project which is long overdue, however. As soon as that's done, I'll dive into the "Sun".<g>

Thanks for the lead and best to you both,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 22:03:55 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 17:17:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Hall

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 00:41:52 -0800
>Subject: Salla & Bassett

>Michael Salla, Stephen Bassett,

>Since both of you posted here over the last couple of days I am
>posting my response. In my opinion, Michael Salla, Exopolitics,
>the Paradigm Research Group, Stephen Greer, and the Xconference
>are causing great damage to legitimate UFO research by trying to
>present speculation and conjecture as factual truth.

>For example, Michael Salla presenting his speculation on
>Eisenhower as Ike factually communicating with Nordic
>extraterrestrials. Not "I speculate that..." or "I theorize"...
>but promoting as truth anecdotal stories and claims with no
>further evidence to support such claims as the truth.

>Promoting untruths, for example, the underground Dulce base as
>truth. Promoting the "Tall White Story" as truth when it is
>based on one man's anecdotal story with no legitimate
>investigation to determine if there is any real evidence.

<snip>

>On top of it all, on UFO UpDates you justify your efforts with
>the most absurd rationalizations to allow sloppy thinking with
>no qualification. Your efforts are a sham, pure garbage in my
>opinion. What you are doing makes a laughing stock out of
>Ufology to the people who matter. Your following are "blind
>believers" with no ability to think in order to determine what
>is or is not true.

>My fellow Listerions, I strongly suggest that you read the
>archives concerning the above people and their efforts before
>responding to support them. In addition, if you look at the
>Exopolitics website, Stephen Bassett, Stephen Greer, and the
>Xconference information and you don't agree with what I am
>saying then you do not know how to think clearly. If that is the
>case then I feel sorry for you because you have not learned how
>to take the first step to distinguish between fiction and fact.

Amen and hallelujah! I just received a notification of the
forthcoming Nevada UFO conference that has one of the wildest
and wooliest line-up of speakers I have ever seen anywhere at
any time. New Age, ranting, speculating, axe-grinding, garbage-
spewing, you name it. Therein we see Michael Salla about to
launch off on another myth: Nazi flying saucers. If anyone needs
a snapshot of what is wrong with Ufology, all they need to do is
look at this line-up of speakers. Oh, but we must remain 'open-
minded' and consider 'alternative viewpoints'.

Not from this ilk we don't. This garbage is totally destroying
any notion of '-ology.'

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 9](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:05:04 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 17:18:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sparks

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 18:07:24 -0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>>to believe.

<snip>

>>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>>the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell
>>hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>>was an event of negligible historical importance?
<snip>

>I know we tend to think of alien spaceships as artifacts a few
>hundred years in advance of our current civilization, but
>statistically it's actually extremely unlikely that our first
>encounter with an alien civilization would be with one so close
>to our own in terms of technological development.

>The gap is far more likely to be millions of years, if not tens
>of millions or hundreds of millions, rather than just a few
>hundred. Given such a technological gap I can well imagine that
>scientific analysis of such an artifact might yield little more
>than confusion and bafflement (rather like trying to solve an
>impossible crossword clue :-))

If "they" were "millions or hundreds of millions" of years ahead
of us technologically there is simply no way any of their
"spaceships" (if they even needed to use any) would crash and/or
fail to be retrieved by them to keep us from getting our hands
on their technology. Only a technology that is close to our
level could be expected to "goof" up like that. And we would
still have to answer the question why their stealth technology
would allow us even to see them. A better explanation is that
"they" are actually slightly behind us in technology and
simply have extremely long life spans and thus can make long
interstellar journeys in primitive spacecraft. So in that case
they still would use spaceships that could crash 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #7 - 2005

From: **George A. Filer** <Majorstar.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 13:10:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 08:39:21 -0500
Subject: UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #7 - 2005

Filer's Files #7 - 2005,
Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director MUFON Eastern
Vice President of Skywatch International
February 9, 2005, Web: www.georgefiler.com

Webmaster: C E Warren www.cewarren.com

Strange Tubes on Mars

The purpose of these files is to report weekly the UFO eyewitness and photo/video evidence that occurs on a daily basis around the world and in space. Many people claim it is impossible for UFOs to visit Earth, I ask you only to keep an open mind and watch the evidence we accumulate each week. These Files make the assumption that extraterrestrial intelligent life not only exists, but my hypothesis is that of the over one hundred UFOs reported each week many represent a factual UFO sighting.

Mars - Giant Tube System Infers Life.

UFOs were seen over Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Illinois, Missouri, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. Sightings were also reported in Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Mexico, and the United Kingdom. Watch Peter Jennings UFO special.

Mars - Giant Tube System Infers Life

Below is a short summary of a spectacular tube system found on Mars by Joe Skipper.

[]

Photos courtesy of JPL/NASA
Mars Investigator Joseph P. Skipper writes, "Make no mistake about it, the one thing that is pretty clear is that these are the real giant tube systems on Mars, at least the ones we can see on the Martian surface, and they represent the activity of life of some kind on Mars." If the giant tube systems actually represents intelligent life artificial structure evidence, as it so much appears, those who have been following my reports can perhaps now see a little more clearly why I am very suspicious that the great interconnected ridge lines seen in my report #036 titled "Inca City Ridges" represent a form of colossal tube systems. The tubes are covered with massive amounts of fill forming great interconnected natural appearing ridge systems. In other words, not so much buried as laid out on the surface and covered.

[]

All of the different wide-angle shots of "Inca City" are very distant and would be fuzzy if blown up for a decent closer view. The one exception is the above second AB1-07908 based image from a different narrow-angle strip and I've elected to use it rather than try and blowup one of the wide-angle shots. It shows most

of the anomaly site, even if from a different angle, and without getting too blurry. The dark spot speckling you see inside some of the "boxes" is colony life form fungi spore growth that generates in the presence of water

Just in case some viewers may be skeptical about my speculation as to these monster tubes being covered to appear part of the natural terrain, take a look at report #035 titled "Buried Tube System".

[]

Where the covering fill has been partially removed from and exposing a section of the smooth translucent dome top material, probably to provide light into the interior of one of these tube systems. The hard evidence of colossal tube systems on the surface here makes the case for covered giant tube systems more believable. So you see, while it is still questioning speculation at this point, it is to some extent still informed speculation based on some hard science evidentiary data evidence and not the author's purely wild leaps of emotion and imagination as some may prefer you to believe based on their own preconceptions, prejudices, and/or hidden agendas.

If this structure is what I think it is and as I have suspicion before with respect to other fill sites I've seen on Mars, then it is not a round tube system as we might assume. Rather, I suspect this is a giant pyramid or triangle shaped immense underground long structure and we are seeing only the pointed but rounded peaked top with earth excavated away to form a giant skylight into the much bigger and broader interior still far below ground.

[]

I call it a tube because it is long and for the lack of a better descriptive expression but it is a giant triangular tube like no tube we are familiar with on Earth. I suspect that the sloping sides of what I have called a tram here are simply fill conforming to the sloping sides of the structure underneath. The occluded quality of the material used in its construction is probably also a function of sheer thickness to stand up under the weight of the earth fill covering it. Remember too that we are looking at this thing, not from the perspective of a airplane flying low over it as it might appear as a first impression, but from the view of a satellite camera some 230 miles distant.

The pointed shadow on the right is a result of this area being the tapering end of the excavated depression as can best be seen in the first image here. In this closer view, take note of the sand dunes up against the base of the tube's body. This indicates that finer wind blown material has still collected at the base on the tube and the dunes have been formed from this material in the air currents that the tube's exposure causes tending to act as a dam to winds. Note how the straight as an arrow tube system sits in this raised fill and then goes underground on the right under the hump of fill there. I suspect that the top of this hump of fill covering the structure at that point is the same level as the surrounding level terrain. In other words, when this structure was covered, it is effectively visually hidden. Note that where the fill covers the tube system where it goes underground, the slope of the tram simply comes up and over the tube in a smooth gentle arch or hump and then back down the far side. The pointed shadow on the right is a result of this area being the tapering end of the excavated depression as can best be seen in the first image here.

As for these giant kilometers long tubes reported on here that entire cities could fit into, I am fully satisfied that they at minimum represent the activities of life of some kind but we just can't yet be sure as to what form of life. The most obvious speculation is that these are artificial construct hollow covers providing protective habitat and therefore may represent intelligent civilized life. Thanks to Joe Skipper The links for more detailed reports:

<http://www.marsanomalyresearch.com/evidence-reports/2002/035/buriedtubesys.htm>

<http://www.marsanomalyresearch.com/evidence-reports/2002/036/incacity.htm>

<http://www.marsanomalyresearch.com/evidence-reports/2002/045/realtubes.htm>

<http://www.marsanomalyresearch.com/evidence-reports/2002/046/realtubesII.htm>

Arizona - Daylight Multiple Objects

PHOENIX - The witness went outside to look at 12:33 PM, and saw a slow moving object on January 20, 2005. The witness says, "I grabbed the camera and taped this object for a little bit. It was always moving north or up and from how slow it moved I thought maybe a balloon. Just when I was going to stop tape, this other object coming from the east zipped pass the other object! I followed it for about a minute until another object appeared! This is when it gets strange, these two objects had a whole bunch of friends that I didn't see just moments before. I could only pick and chose the ones I could tape in frame. It was like a convention while I was taping these orbs were making geographic patters, as this is happening I caught others arriving to like check in. I got this all until I moved slightly and lost them. I was so mad! It was like they took off on me, I couldn't find them again. Thanks to Brian Vike Photos, Phone 250 845 2189, and Footage c. 2005 Mike Di Silvestro. Video clips can be viewed at:

<http://www.hbccufo.org/modules.php?name=3DNews&file=3Darticle&sid=3D2312>

Arkansas - Bright Orange Light Moving

ANCHORAGE - The observer looked up and saw a bright orange object moving farther out than where airplanes could fly, moving from the east to west at about 1/4 of the speed of a satellite on January 25, 2005, at 8:50 PM. The object was the magnitude of Venus but maybe as big as 1 1/2 Venus-s, it was visible for about 11 minutes then it went stationary for about two minutes then disappeared. Altogether it moved about a fifth of the sky horizon to horizon. I had a "very" nervous feeling. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

California - Five Disks

SOUTH EL MONTE -- It was a warm sunny day on January 16, 2005 at 3:30 PM...and the sky was clear. Two friends and I had been snowboarding and were relaxing in the Jacuzzi when we saw two objects very high up in the sky. They were white specks that could be balloons, but after a minute of observing they were at the same spot. I pointed them out and the guys said they were stars. It was broad daylight! So, I grabbed my binoculars and saw three more high in the sky! My friend got his binoculars and gave them to me because they had a better optical lens. I was able to distinguish that they were in fact circular disk-like form and white in color and they moved slightly and when they moved they left a tiny trail which disappeared very quickly. Only one out of the 4 had what appeared to be a blue circular disk-like object sort of affixed to it moving half way around it back and forth.

I thought about God's Word and what Ezekiel described what he saw and his description of highly polished bronze "flying wheels" with eyes (portholes) roundabout (all around). In five minutes they were right above our location and four stayed together while the one with the "blue" was at a distance from them. Five minutes later they headed east. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Florida - Disc-Like Object, Flashing Bright Lights

LAKE WALES - The observers were on Highway 60 near River Ranch on January 23, 2005, at 8:10 PM, when I noticed big lights on an object in the sky. It looked like a disk with lots of lights (window like) which was moving about 45 degrees from the horizon. At this same time, I saw bright lights resembling a half-dozen flare that sparked and then were gone. In addition there were little lights flashing all over that were jumping from place to place. We tried to pull off of the highway and my husband got out the binoculars and by the time he got them adjusted, the disk-like object was gone. However, I still saw the bright lights dancing around like grasshoppers were all over

the sky.

((NUFORC Note: Wife's report of same event reported by husband.)) Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Illinois - Parallel Bright Lights

CHICAGO - The witness saw something strange in the sky on January 23, 2005, at noon next to the lake. The object was brighter than a star, in the western sky, about 11 o'clock traveling east. I thought it was a satellite -- but there was something strange about it. Traveling behind the bright light were two vertical lines, placed equidistant that were pulsing together, visible, then not visible. So it looked like this: | |
* It was observed for 45 minutes. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Missouri - Stealth Bomber and Orb

MILLER COUNTY -- On January 18, 2005, the observer took photos of a stealth bomber and an orb.

[]

Two photos were taken at 5:10 PM, on January 18, 2005. The photos were taken around 10 to 15 seconds apart. The stealth bomber was flying from the northeast to the southwest and the orb appears above it to the west. I did not see the orb while watching the stealth fly over. It only appeared in the two photos I took. I may have missed it visually since I was focused on the stealth. Thanks to Brian Vike, Director HBCC UFO Research

Montana - Saucer With Human-Like Entities

COLUMBUS -- Dark saucer-shaped object flew at extremely fast speeds northwest, and then veered southwest on January 20, 2005, at 1 PM. It was very unlike a plane, and had no wings. The witness states, "I felt slightly sick after the sighting, there were human-like objects on board. It seemed to be able to turn without curving.

((NUFORC Note: It is exceedingly rare for a witness on the ground to be able to observe creatures in a fast-moving UFO. We wonder whether this is a serious report. PD)) Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Nevada - Photos

LAS VEGAS -- Joe Held writes, "A contact of mine has given me permission to use these photos and I can report I observed some similar things in Vegas when I lived there.

Picture 1:

[]

Taken at the end of Cheyenne Rd. where it meets I-215 looking south in 2004.

Picture 2:

[]

April 23, 2004, at the end of Cheyenne Rd. where it meets I-215. Looking east towards Las Vegas. This photo was captured on a camera sitting on a tripod with a timer. +2 EV and Speed at 400. I will be posting more photos. Thanks to Joe Held at <http://www.informantnews.com>

New Jersey - MUFON Sighting Report

SICKLERVILLE -- Ernest working on a Blueberry Farm reported seeing a UFO that looked similar to a pale daytime full moon on January 4, 2005 at 9:50 AM. It was maybe 10,000 feet up, and a finger wide. Sometimes the light was seen through the clouds, other times not. The object was spherical with rough edges like

on a round faceted diamond and was spinning rapidly counterclockwise. It traveled in excess of 100 mph S/SW towards Vineland, NJ. It was four human hand widths up from the horizon at 10:18 AM. The object appeared back in its original location, but a little higher in view for 10 to 12 minutes; only in view for about 1 minute at second appearance. It grew larger to over one hundred feet across as it approached before going behind the clouds again between viewings.

He called his friend to check on any astronomical or meteorological events going on that could explain the moon like object and nothing showed up in the space or weather calendar. As they were talking, Ernest got really excited and stated, "It was getting a little larger and that he could see it rotating counterclockwise very rapidly, it's a UFO." There were edges on the ball like a Susan B. Anthony coin.

This is a hot bed for sightings in the past 50 years, and he has seen what he says were other UFOs over the Mullica River in Southern NJ since he was a child. Other members of the community and his family also have stories, including one night when an entire local bar stood outside watching some maneuvers. At 10:13 AM, it was back in sight, but it disappeared behind the cloud cover a minute or so later and he hasn't seen it again (as of 10:27 a.m. EST). He did say there was a momentary glow through the clouds when it disappeared. It wasn't the sun or a sundog, it was rotating and flew away.

Just before the second call ended the actual sun had come out, and the object was in the same area of the sky, but lower and much more solid than the UFO. Ernie has lived in the country Pine Barrens of NJ all his life and is very knowledgeable about his natural environment, since he works outside the majority of the time.

He is also a trained EMT so is good with details and observation. He was definitely excited about something he saw, and the idea of a UFO did not enter his mind until it started to move. Thanks to John Schuessler Director, www.mufon.com

North Carolina

Alan Caviness writes, "For years, residents in an undisclosed area just west of HIGH POINT, North Carolina have experienced strange occurrences of the seemingly "paranormal" variety." The experiences vary widely and involve many different kinds of paranormal topics normally studied by investigators. After 3 years of field studies and monitoring as work schedules would permit, I have determined and confirmed many times over that the overall phenomenon is real and does indeed encompass many aspects of the paranormal world. The colleagues I work with also agree without reservation.

Thanks to Alan Caviness

OHIO - SPECTACULAR SKY SHOW - VIDEO

HICKSVILLE - On January 14, 2005, at about 6:00 PM, the sunset was brightly lit orange and huge clouds were present. I got my camcorder out and was video taping the clouds, then I caught my first strange occurrence on tape. I saw a ball that appeared to be orange or yellow slowly moving straight up into the sky. It took about 5-6 minutes to finally go out of site. Then about thirty seconds later I observed trails of fire falling from the sky. Three fireballs came from different directions and they were all falling to somewhat the same area. The strange part is while they were falling, there was some different thing being shot up into the sky. I've seen shooting stars and these were not. These things were burning up as they came into our atmosphere and took 40 to 90 seconds to burn up or disappear. Jets in groups of two's flew over head for they next 2-3 hours. They were chasing something. I was so scared. Never in my life have I ever seen anything like this.

Thanks to c. 2005 Dusty Crites Video clips can be viewed at:
<http://www.hbccufo.org/modules.php?name=3DNews> =3Darticle =3D2311

Oregon - Two Bright Objects Filmed

Portland - On January 11, 2005, driving to work at 7:35 AM, I saw two bright objects just above the eastern horizon. They were much brighter at first before they sank into the distant haze that you see in the pictures. However, I could not photograph them at first sight due to being on the freeway at A.M. rush hour. The first picture PICT8356.JPG was a very lucky shot, even though the camera auto focused on the shrubs in the foreground, you can still see a greenish caste to the objects. [] The day was just dawning and was nearly cloudless. Very rare to see the blue sky anymore. The objects were moving to the east away from me. They held in view for about nine minutes, so could not have been moving too fast. The 40x zoomed in picture 8369 shows a 4 lobed structure in or around the object. This is the brighter of the two, or upper one. Files I send are full size with text added. I think the objects were very far away, several miles at least, therefore very large. The dark object in Picture 8362 and - 63 seems to have a halo around it as well and is similarly sized to the bright one. Thanks to Brian Vike, Director HBCC UFO Research Home - Phone 250 845 2189

South Carolina - Light With Increasing Brightness

PIEDMONT -- This object was stationary in the northern sky on January 26, 2005, at 5:36 PM. Initially, it could be described as a bright star but almost immediately, the intensity increased exponentially. Then, it faded to a point no brighter than the background stars and traveled west until it completely disappeared. It moved at the same velocity of a commercial jet but there were no beacons, strobes, or navigational lights of any kind. My first thought was that I had witnessed a meteor straight-on... it became extremely bright and then "burned out." But that would not explain the turn to the west and then the disappearance. The second object was exactly like the first but was never bright. It followed a similar path again with no lighting that would identify it as a commercial aircraft. There were aircraft in the sky and it was easy to differentiate. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Wisconsin - Speeding Light Does U -Turn

GRANTON -- I was driving home from work on January 17, 2005 at 8:28 PM, and noticed a white light blinking in the northwesterly direction. It was doing the coolest maneuvers. It was going up and down then made the most spectacular U turn within a second and did more maneuvers. There where lights on its body that blinked, at least a couple and the blinking would follow from the first light to the last light. This object was quite a few miles away so I could not tell if it was making noise or could get a clear look at it. It was also 8:15 P.M. at night, so it was dark.

This object was however large and then the most incredible thing was that the lights would stop, but would still be on and then it would "shoot" into the night sky at an alarming speed. As it moved westerly it did not seem to get smaller. So this gave me the feeling this object was huge. It made some more of those cool maneuvers then shot into space again and then disappeared out of sight! What ever it was it was big and could turn a U turn in a second and shoot upwards with tremendous speed! Kind of like that of the Star ship Enterprise! It was just awesome to watch but yet a little scary too! I have watched the Air Force from Fort McCoy doing dog fights above our house, but I have never seen this kind of movement from them either! Thanks to Peter Davenport www.nuforc.org

Canada - Round Ball of Light over Newfoundland

MOUNT PEARL - Two witnesses just came back from sliding and I looked up and saw a round ball of light, it hovered for a few seconds then took off really fast and disappeared on January 12, 2005, at 5 PM. It was too early to be a shooting star because it wasn't dark out and there were no other stars or street lights on. The weather was clear with some clouds and no wind. The UFO was located in the east, and the entire event lasted about 5 seconds. The UFO was the shape of a round ball of light and made no sound whatsoever. Thanks to Brian Vike

CALGARY, ALBERTA -- On January 11, 2005, at 5:08 PM, my mother and I had just come from a clothing store. As I came out, with my mother in tow, I noticed there were no clouds around, and the

sky was an orangey yellow glow. As I scanned the parking lot, I happened to see an odd looking cloud in the SW part of the sky.

As I pointed out this grayish cigar to my mother, she was looking in the wrong direction. When she did see what I was pointing out to her she said, Oh that's just a cloud. I responded, that's no ordinary cloud. I watched as I descended the stairs and how it changed shape and started moving upwards. As I unlocked the van's doors, I still kept a watch on it. As the cloud disappeared, I saw a grayish cigar like shape going straight up in the sky.

There was no contrail or chemtrail behind them, and this was no plane. Because it disappeared straight up and out of sight. I have never seen anything shoot straight up like that before.

Thanks to Brian Vike www.hbccufo.com

Cyprus - Flash Of Light

LIMASSOL - The observers were watching the sky near the Constellation Orion when they saw a bright flash appear for only one second at a time, then it appeared again, I have timed it and it appeared every three minutes at 10 PM on January 26, 2005. I know that the stars move from left to right but this light moved from right to left and moved up at an angle. It, then, moved at a different angle three minutes later. We don't know what it was and I have tried to film it, but my camcorder isn't good enough to pick it up.

((NUFORC Note: We spoke with this witness via telephone, and he seemed to be an exceptionally credible witness. NUFORC has received a number of similar reports, of peculiar blinking lights in the night sky, over recent months. PD)) Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Chile - Incredible UFO Photo

IQUIQUE - This extraordinary chance photo was taken in northern Chile on Friday, February 4, 2005. Carlos Bruna, an official with the Controllershship of the Republic in the city of Iquique, visited the Tres Islas Beach, some 10 minutes away and with his new digital camera began taking photos of the mountains and their contrast with the blue sky. To his surprise, upon loading the photos into his computer, he saw that one of the images showed a lens-shaped object, expelling some sort of white energy, flying high above one of the mountains.

The AION CHILE organization received the images and they are still under analysis. The photo shows some interesting details, observed Rodrigo Fuenzalida, AION's director. "When I received the material, I found that the mountains were too well outlined, and the colors had a curious clarity. However, upon listening to Carlos, the percipient, I found his account to be an honest one." According to AION's representative in Chile's 1st Region, Mario Pizarro, the UFO image is genuine and studies conducted on site suggest that the object had a diameter of between 3 and 4 meters. Thanks to Aion Chile and Translation (c) 2005, Scott Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology. Mexico UFO Reported Over Plaza Bullring

MEXICO CITY -- On January 9, 2005, several people witnessed an unidentified flying object (UFO) flying over the facilities of the Plaza Mexico Bullring in (Distrito Federal). Although the exact time of the sighting was not given, it occurred during the afternoon, since the bullfights commence at 4 PM. The images were presented on Televisa=EDs "La Jugada" program and the newspaper item appeared in the "El Universal" newspaper <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx>

The video clearly shows a glowing, spherical object that appears to be hanging in the sky, and which, according to witnesses, drifted away slowly until it vanished from sight. I believe, from my humble point of view, that it is truly a flying object of unknown origin, dismissing the possibility that it could be a conventional device or even the weather balloon employed for weather forecasts, since it isn't so shiny and its contour is well defined. An interesting path of investigation is the relationship between UFO sightings and volcanic activity. On that very same day, January 9th, a communique=E9 was issued with regard to a 5 kilometer high fumarole over the Popocatepetl

crater, with ash-fall reports for neighboring communities. Punto interesante an investigar, es la relaci=DN de los avistamientos ovni con la actividad. Ana Luisa Cid F
<http://www.cronica.com.mx/nota.php?idc=3D161313>

UFO Phenomenon with Peter Jennings

Seeing Is Believing -- A Two-Hour Primetime Special Aired Thursday, February 24, 2004, at 8 PM. - Almost 50 percent of Americans, according to recent polls, and millions of people elsewhere in the world believe that UFOs are real. For many it is a deeply held belief. For decades there have been sightings of UFOs by millions and millions of people. It is a mystery that only science can solve, and yet the phenomenon remains largely unexamined. Most of the reporting on this subject by the mainstream media holds those who claim to have seen UFOs up to ridicule. On Feb. 24, "Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - Seeing Is Believing" takes a fresh look at the UFO phenomenon. "As a journalist," says Jennings, "I began this project with a healthy dose of skepticism and as open a mind as possible. After almost 150 interviews with scientists, investigators, and with many of those who claim to have witnessed unidentified flying objects, there are important questions that have not been completely answered - and a great deal not fully explained." "Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - Seeing Is Believing" aired Thursday, Feb. 24 from 8-10 p.m. ET on ABC. The program will be broadcast in High Definition. This two-hour primetime special reports on the entire scope of the UFO experience - from the first famous sighting by Kenneth Arnold in 1947 to the present day. The program draws on interviews with police officers, pilots, military personnel, scientists and ordinary citizens who give extraordinary accounts of encounters with the unexplained.

The program explores the incident at Roswell, N.M., and looks into the strange stories of alien abductions. Among the UFO cases presented: * Minot Air Force Base, N.D., October 1968 - Sixteen airmen on the ground and the crew of an airborne B-52 witness a massive unidentified object hovering near the base. * Phoenix, Ariz., March 1997 - Hundreds witness a huge triangular craft moving slowly over the city. * St. Clair County, Ill., January 2000 - Police officers in five adjoining towns all independently report witnessing a giant craft with multiple bright lights moving silently across the sky at a very low altitude. Today if you report a UFO to the U.S. government you will be informed that the Air Force conducted a 22-year investigation which ended in 1969 and concluded that UFOs are not a threat to national security and are of no scientific interest. But as one of the world's leading theoretical physicists says in the program, "You simply cannot dismiss the possibility that some of these UFO sightings are actually sightings from some object created by ... a civilization perhaps millions of years ahead of us in technology."

"Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - Seeing Is Believing" is produced by PJ Productions and Springs Media for ABC News. Mark Obenhaus and Tom Yellin are the executive producers.

UK - British Defense says Life Forms May Exist

LONDON, Feb 3 (AFP) - Undaunted by the lack of evidence, officials at the British defence ministry are refusing to rule out the existence of alien life forms visiting Earth, the Financial Times reported Thursday. It quoted from a hitherto confidential letter by an official acknowledging the ministry recorded accounts of people claiming to have seen alien life in Britain. According to the letter, obtained under recent legislation on freedom of information, such reports are collected "solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance."

While admitting that "only a handful of reports in recent years have warranted further investigation and none revealed an evidence of a threat," it went on say the ministry was "totally open-minded" about the hypothesis of alien life. Two weeks ago an anonymous caller reported seeing "strange lights" above Kent, southeast England, while another claimed to have seen a flying saucer sailing above Stoke, central England. The defence ministry said such calls were only a fraction of the thousands it has recorded.

Subscribe to Filer's Files to receive UFO CD

So you won't miss a single breaking news story or the increased evidence for UFO and life in the universe. George A. Filer has been bringing you the latest in UFO news since 1995, on radio, television and the internet.

Your dollars do make a difference! We appreciate our loyal subscribers and will continue to grow with your help. Annual Membership is only \$25 for 52 weekly intelligence reports. Don't miss the latest images of UFOs from Earth and Mars. Subscribe today and receive a free UFO Photo CD. Send check or money order to: George Filer, 222 Jackson Road, Medford, NJ 08055. You can also Click: <https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr>

for majorstar.nul You may use Paypal,

Visa, American Express, or Master Charge.

"Life on Mars" UFOs over Mars

Your chance to get your (fingers) on the throttle of significant and up to-date UFO info as well as the real deal on the Mars expedition. Get your official and private DVD copy now for \$25. Send your contact info to: jlpromo2001.nul or mail your check to Fast Street Productions, 37 Surrey Lane, Willingboro, NJ 08046 or pay: "https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr for majorstar.nul

REAL ESTATE!

Get your free report and learn how you can obtain the best real estate agent to help you relocate, buy or sell a home. To get a free copy of this report e-mail me at : Majorstar.nul

MUFON UFO JOURNAL -- For more detailed monthly investigative reports subscribe to the MUFON JOURNAL. A MUFON membership includes the Journal and costs only \$45.00 per year. To join MUFON or to report a UFO go to "<http://www.mufon.com/>". To ask questions contact MUFONHQ.nul or HQ.nul

Filer's Files is copyrighted 2004 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post the COMPLETE files on their Web Sites if they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue. These reports and comments are not necessarily the OFFICIAL MUFON viewpoint. Send your letters to Majorstar.nul Sending mail automatically grants permission for us to publish and use your name. Please state if you wish to keep your name or e-mail confidential. CAUTION, MOST OF THESE ARE INITIAL REPORTS AND REQUIRE FURTHER INVESTIGATION.

God Bless Our Troops

George A. Filer
www.nationalufocenter.com

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 22:21:43 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:02:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Hall

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 11:22:20 -0400
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 14:32:44 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>I give up trying to communicate with you. This is going nowhere,
>>so I decline to participate any longer. You are playing word
>>games, not thinking, reasoning, and communicating rationally.

>I certainly agree that we disagree and this is going nowhere.
>Try looking in the mirror Dick if you want to see why.

Yes Stan, I know. You have said it over and over in various
ways: you are brilliant and I am ignorant.

'Miirror, mirror on the wall...'

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:27:50 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:04:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:22:48 -0800
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>Maybe we should take a poll right on this list. I could be wrong
>too. Personally, I do not think Roswell 1947 was the crash of
>an alien space craft.

Hi Larry,

For what it's worth, my stance on Roswell is as follows:

I am not convinced by the evidence to date that the crash at Roswell was that of an extra-terrestrial spacecraft.

Further, I believe that at this point it is highly unlikely that any new information will come forth which would convince me otherwise.

I remain however convinced that something unusual occurred, and that answers to some very basic questions remain elusive, which is quite intriguing.

Call it... coververassticism? Hmm... feels right. <g>

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:31:04 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:06:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:14:18 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:44:00 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>>>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>>>with little contact with the outside world.

>Stark irony there when the truth seems to be that the air
>inside that little bubble seems to be of 'psychosocial'
>manufacture, too much nitrogen and not enough O2. In other
>words, you're hallucinating the high ground, Mr. Rimmer.

>Well, exactly. The notion that "most mainstream ufology exists
>in a small, insulated bubble, with little contact with the
>outside," is of course a witless ad hominem. It appears that
>since nobody else will congratulate them on their
>cosmopolitanism and wisdom, pelicanists are forced to do it for
>themselves. We are to believe, one presumes, that by way of
>contrast with those uncool ufological Poindexters, pelicanists
>are sophisticated, cosmopolitan men (and, far, far less often,
>women; the female of the species is rarely sighted within the
>flock)

Wow! You've noticed that, too, with regard to the general dearth
of female pelicanists! Why do you think that is? I think it
might have something to do with the better balance of their
right and left brains due to the increased thickness of the
female corpus collosum! [g]. In other words, just another easy
demonstration of the aggregate superiority of your garden
variety double X'er. <lol>

alienview.nul - :| :-
www.AlienView.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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Salla

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 12:37:23 -1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:09:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Salla

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 00:41:52 -0800
>Subject: Salla & Bassett

<snip>

Aloha Josh, thank you for expressing your desire for some clear thinking in Ufology. I welcome any effort to bring clarity to some of these critical topics under investigation and to clarify the different approaches to those doing research in the field of Ufology. It is not my intention at all to dilute Ufology by offering a wide range of unsubstantiated conjectures, but to instead offer analyses of testimonies and other evidence that point the field to some serious problems that are not sufficiently addressed by many UFO researchers using inappropriate research methodologies.

Now I want to respond to your central claim that I am "trying to present speculation and conjecture as factual truth".

First, there is a difference between 'speculation' and 'analysis'. The common sense understanding of 'speculation' or 'conjecture' is an observation that is not grounded in verifiable facts or evidence. In contrast, 'analysis' offers conclusions about the available facts or evidence. Now what constitutes facts and or evidence is one issue, another issue is the difference between 'speculation' and 'analysis'. What you might consider a 'fact' or 'evidence' might be very different. 'Facts' and 'evidence' are not necessarily 'hard empirical data' that can be investigated by a natural scientist using any of the research tools they possess, facts and evidence might also be 'soft' or 'subjective' data that needs qualitative research tools possessed by those in the social sciences. Let me assure you that those who work in some of the various social science disciplines and/or have advanced degrees in the social sciences typically have some training so as to properly investigate 'soft data'. This includes examples such as the testimony of those claiming to have witnessed extraordinary phenomenon without the 'hard data' to back up their claims. This is not necessarily speculation about 'soft data' but can be a rigorous investigation using acceptable social science methodologies. Nor is such an investigation 'pseudoscience' unless you want to call social scientists working with 'soft data' pseudo scientists. I believe this is your first error insofar as you mistakenly associate the investigation of 'soft data' as something not sufficiently ground in hard facts and therefore merits being labeled 'speculation' or 'conjecture'.

Second, I want to examine the next issue which is the difference between speculation and analysis. Just for illustrative purposes, let me say that there are a number of national security agencies that offer analyses on raw intelligence data often in the form of little more than email communications between individuals being monitored. When an intelligence analyst reports on these email conversations and offers an intelligence assessment, what the intelligence analyst is offering is an analysis of the raw data which often is 'soft data' with no 'hard data' to verify it. Those working in the

intelligence agencies don't consider this to be speculation, it's just an intelligence assessment that needs to be understood in terms of how well it interprets and analyses the raw data. An intelligence analyst that does his/her job will be able to offer an analysis of the raw data that meets the scrutiny of peers. If it didn't they would soon cease to be employed as a professional in the analysis of intelligence data. Now a similar thing happens as far as political analysis is concerned which is my own area of competence.

What I'm offering on my exopolitics website are political analyses of the raw data offered by a range of whistleblower testimonies concerning ET related events. Saying that I'm just offering conjecture and speculation demonstrates your lack of familiarity with the qualitative research tools offered by intelligence analysts, political analysts, etc who every day have to deal with raw data that is often soft with no 'hard data' to support to support it. Such analyses are typically relayed on to policy makers for important policy decisions that affect all our lives as recent efforts over intelligence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction vividly demonstrate. I'm offering what I call exopolitical analyses of the raw data offered by whistleblowers such as Charles Hall who may not have 'hard data' to validate their assertions. My analysis of Charles Hall testimony is not conjecture but an analysis based on the raw data presented by Mr Hall. You might like to dismiss all I offer and what Charles Hall has to say as unsubstantiated conjecture, yet in doing so you reveal your lack of familiarity with social science methods in investigating 'soft data'. This is your second error in clear thinking since you don't understand the difference between 'conjecture' and 'analysis'.

Third and finally, you say I am offering my 'conjectures' as truth. That is not the case at all. I'm merely offering my exopolitical analysis of the raw data that I identify as worthy of investigating in drawing conclusions about what is occurring on our planet regarding an undisclosed extraterrestrial presence. My analysis is subject to all the problems of any analyst examining raw data, especially in a field such as this where there is good reason to believe that the raw data is distorted in many ways by many actors. I'm sure that there is much room for improvement in my investigatory methods concerning the 'soft data' I focus on in terms of testimonies, and I'm always open to improving them and refining my conclusions with constructive criticism. What I offer is not some truth but an analysis which tries to paint an accurate picture of what is occurring concerning ETs as described by multiple witnesses who have come forward in the Disclosure Project and other venues.

Finally you conclude, "Your efforts are a sham, pure garbage in my opinion." If one applies the same standards you apply to my research, to your own concluding statement, where is the objective evidence supporting your conjecture? Do you offer any hard empirical evidence that you laud as exemplary UFO research? No, you don't, what you instead offer are your opinions about my research which is purely conjecture on your part concerning an investigatory process for which you show little patience or regard. You also have shown little understanding for some important nuances in how a social scientist might investigate the testimonies of those offering 'soft data' on the UFO phenomenon.

Let me say in conclusion that the investigation of 'soft data' in terms of whistleblower testimonies is a litmus test for Ufology. Will Ufology fully mature as a field by incorporating social science methodologies in investigating such testimonies, or will Ufology dig its head into the sand insisting on 'hard data' that can be measured and quantified, and thereby dismiss as inconclusive the testimonies of many whistleblowers? It's clear you have made your choice, my feeling is that many on the forum sincerely want Ufology to grow and are sympathetic to the approach I have to offer. I wouldn't be posting on this forum if I didn't believe many here are open to taking Ufology to a new level.

In peace,

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:48:25 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:18:42 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - King

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 08:02:38 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:27:14 -0600
>>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

<snip>

>Somehow I don't think the problems facing the UFO field will be
>solved by a software program.

Hi Steve,

Agreed. The internet is not a solution to any problem. It is simply a tool to be used or not.

There is no question that amassing a valuable database of vetted UFO cases is perhaps an impossibility. I feel confident however, that attempts to consolidate, categorize, and archive details of the cases from known archives, and current investigative efforts (not just the lists of anonymous ufo reports).

Just as we have seen in trying to amalgamate the various intelligence agencies data sources, it is not easy. It may not even be possible if the most recent example is any indication (FBI).

But these things aren't undertaken because they are easy. Jerome Clark did it. Project Blue Book did it. Many other on-the-ground researchers have their cases.

What would be good would be simply a method for consolidating this data. Perhaps utilizing an existing method...like NUFORC, or HBCCUFO, and taking time to convert those other databases to the same format.

At any rate, there are many out there building ufo databases. Why not try to get everyone using the same "language"?

On the wiki idea, the project exists as a living document. Anyone can add or edit an entry, but then the community corrects obvious errors and omissions, and the document as a whole becomes more accurate over time. At least that is the way it works on the Wikipedia site.

The process and technology already exists, and those that participate are the arbiters of what is signal and what is noise. The best thing about the format is that there is room for opposing views, so as to form a record of the debate as well as the most current views.

Pipedream? Probably.

The government is probably going to announce disclosure any day now, anyway...<g>

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 18:16:32 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:22:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Sparks

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 13:12:50 -0800
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

<snip>

>>When one's witnessing anecdote is based primarily on
>>observation, I would think that an investigation would zero
>>in on the eyesight of the person relaying information he or
>>she saw. Everything else is peripheral (no pun) to that.

>I haven't been to exactly the spot where Zamora encountered
>the craft and the two small individuals but Wendy Connors
>pointed it out to me when we were driving to the crash site
>and since then I've studied topographic maps and an aerial
>photograph of the area. Six Mile Canyon (which I explored
>carefully by car and foot) sits behind a small range of
>mountains (Chupadera) which are about seven hundred to a
>thousand feet in elevation.

>As the crow (craft) flies, Six mile canyon is less than six
>miles southwest of the sighting area. It would be difficult to
>estimate a departing speed using six mile canyon mountain as
>a reference point to determine distance and time.

<snip>

I thought Dave calculated this already, but I don't time to hunt up the posting, so I'll re-do it for you. Zamora's estimate that the UFO disappeared by distance recession over Sixmile canyon Mtn., about 6 miles away from him (I have studied the topo maps of the area in great detail) is very reasonable and conservative. A 20-foot object would subtend 2 arcminutes at 6 miles and would be nearing the limits of human visual acuity, since the MAR (Minimum Angle of Resolution) is about 1 arcminute or a bit less depending on eyesight, lighting, pupil dilation, etc., which Dave can tell you all about. One could very well make a good case that the distance was actually closer to 12-15 miles at disappearance (to get the angular size down below 1 arcminute) and that in 10 seconds the average speed could have been 1.2 to 1.5 miles per second (about 4,000 mph) or peak terminal velocity double that or about 8,000 mph. But it is being conservative to try to low-ball the extreme velocity, however one can only go so far before it is absurd. Doubling Zamora's timing estimate to 20 seconds only reduces these speeds by a factor of 2x. Any which way you look at it, the speed is going to be "on the order of magnitude" of 1,000 mph, or supersonic.

Ray Stanford is in the process of looking through his files to find data on what appears to be world's leading meteoriticist and sometime UFO investigator Dr Lincoln LaPaz's calibration of Zamora as an eyewitness observer of short duration aerial

phenomena. LaPaz publicly endorsed Zamora in 1964 as a "thoroughly dependable observer" (AP story from Socorro, in Albuquerque Journal, April 30, 1964.) What LaPaz is talking about is accuracy in timing and angular coordinates of objects moving through the sky.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Kimball

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 18:35:35 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:25:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Kimball

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 00:41:52 -0800
>Subject: Salla & Bassett

Josh:

You wrote, in part:

>Michael Salla, Stephen Bassett,

>For example, Michael Salla presenting his speculation on
>Eisenhower as Ike factually communicating with Nordic
>extraterrestrials. Not "I speculate that..." or I theorize"...
>but promoting as truth anecdotal stories and claims with no
>further evidence to support such claims as the truth.

As I have made the same comments with respect to Frank Feschino's new Flatwoods book and the aerial battles scenario recently (ugh!!), you'll find no disagreement with me here.

But...

<snip>

>My fellow Listerions, I strongly suggest that you read the
>archives concerning the above people and their efforts before
>responding to support them. In addition, if you look at the
>Exopolitics website, Stephen Bassett, Stephen Greer, and the
>Xconference information and you don't agree with what I am
>saying then you do not know how to think clearly. If that is the
>case then I feel sorry for you because you have not learned how
>to take the first step to distinguish between fiction and fact.

I've certainly had my disagreements with both Steven Bassett and Steven Greer on this List and elsewhere - Indeed, I believe I once referred to the good Dr. Greer as "Captain Cuckoo," although, technically, it was my soundman who said it - I just endorse it heartily. I think I also said he was nothing more than a "new age snake-oil salesman" - that one was all mine. Bassett and I got in a spat over the last space shuttle disaster (I mentioned something to the effect that he was exploiting it by trying to link it to UFOs, or something like that). I thought his run for Congress was an silly, and said so when I posted the final voting tally on UpDates a couple of years ago. I think he goes way too far with his whole "exopolitics" approach, and is far too credulous. On the other hand, I respect his commitment to the X-Conference - I have, in a different context (UN seminar, back in the days when the UN was cool), some experience in this area, and appreciate the effort - and risk - that such a venture entails.

Take a look at the line-up for the X-Conference. Yes, not everybody on the list is going to meet with everyone else's approval, but I think the inclusion of Stan Friedman, Dr. Bruce Maccabee, John Greenwald Jr., Walter Andrus, John Schuessler, Paul Davids, Dr. Robert Wood, Richard Dolan, and Dr. James Deardorff means that there will be some serious discussion about some serious issues there, by people with either the experience

or the academic qualifications (or both) to make an impact. You may not agree with all of these people (Dr. Wood and MJ-12, for example, or Stan and the Plains of San Augustin, or Dr. Maccabee with Gulf Breeze), but they're not "kooks" who bring ufology into disrepute.

This seems to be the case with all UFO Conferences I've attended, or at which I've appeared. The presence - and the draw - of "New Age" elements is a fact of life. I remember a time, for example, not too long ago (two years, perhaps), when I could walk into Chapters (the Canadian equivalent of Barnes & Noble) and find a section on UFOs. It was small, perhaps two shelves, but it was there. Now, nothing. The books that they do stock are placed on half a shelf in the paranormal section, next to - in the case of my local store in Halifax, N.S. - two full bookcases devoted to Wicca, and another full bookcase devoted to Tarot and Astrology.

Welcome to the modern world.

I'll be at the X-Conference this year, where they'll be screening two of my UFO related documentaries - Stanton T. Friedman IS Real, and Do You Believe in Majic. I'll ignore the snake-oil salesmen, and will try to convince anyone I meet who thinks they're the best thing since sliced (green) cheese that they're... well, not.

Hopefully (and I generally err on the side of "hope" as opposed to "pessimism") most of the people there will be taking the same approach. As for the organisers, I'm sure they know that not everyone they invite (me, for example) is going to agree with them. It is to their credit that they invite us anyway.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:45:42 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:56:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - King

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 13:52:11 -0800
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 13:12:50 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 14:43:33 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

><snip>

>Since you seem to have Stanford's book at hand, you should be
>paying attention to the actual details in the book instead of
>reinventing them in order to justify a "Lonnie and the Bean"
>scenario.

Hi David,

What a lively debate this spawned. <g>

My initial thought was that this was a bar story, as the absence
of any confirmable names, etc were suspect at the least. But I
submitted it as I'd never read of it before.

However, in re-reading Ray's book, it is clear that the craft's
silence on moving off is in conflict with even the "Bean" story.
It strains credibility to assert that a contraption powered by
an "opposing-piston", propane-burning, fan-assisted engine could
run silently, if at all. I also wondered where the guys might
obtain aircraft aluminum in an egg-shaped form. I'm not sure
that would have been terribly easy to do on the sly.

The best arguments against the validity of the Zamora case
require at some point a discounting of Zamora's testimony.

With that brush, any case can be colored "solved".

The worst arguments assert a craft we were not capable of
building at the time, and so therefore must have been a secret
experimental craft. Aviation history however does not provide
any confirmation. It is an alternative view, not proof.

I say worst arguments because this type of argument attempts to
close the debate, rather than further it.

Lonnie and the Bean was a curiosity, and a clever planted story
serving as book fodder. It does not explain the Zamora case.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 21:34:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:01:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Aldrich

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:14:34 +0100
>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

>>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:42:56 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

>>The version of the B-52 Minot issue by J. J. Velasco and quoted
>>by Gildas Bourdais is flawed and incorrect.

>>Many hearsay items have not been confirmed and are stated, by
>>Velasco, as fact, completely crippling the impact of the case.

>>The number of errors in this account renders it almost useless!

>Jan,

>Why don't you give us a correct version?

>I wonder - Velasco refers to the Weinstein catalogue, case No 732.

>Is it also worthless? I just know that Velasco and Weinstein
>have been working together. I am not in contact with them but I
>supposed that it was at least a rather correct account.

Dominique Weinstein has a preliminary report on this case based
on a few interviews conducted during the first year or so of the
investigation.

Velasco's account is confused and incorrect. He had thousands of
reports in the French official files, I don't understand why he
used this one in which he had no involvement. No witness said he
saw the missile silo cover moved nor are there any written
records to indicate that.

Tom Tulien has been working on this case since 1999 as principal
investigator. Several other members of the Sign Historical
Group have assisted him on this case. Numerous interviews have
been conducted with witnesses and other concerned parties. A
number of experts including Air Force historians, pilots, and
radar analysts, etc., have been consulted concerning this case.
In addition records at Maxwell, Minot, Offut and Washington, D.
C. have been consulted.

The official case file exists on the Project Blue Book
microfilms.

The investigation is on-going and keeps growing bigger. Tom is
preparing a report which will be available at the end of March
or the beginning of April. After that Tom, and some of the main
witnesses will be available to discuss this case. Until then,
Tom does not intend to discuss the case with anyone. I support
his decision and also will no longer discuss the case except in
general terms. It is best to have the complete investigation, or
one that is as nearly complete as possible, then to have
snippets and partial information.

Tom apologizes for the delay. I add my regrets also.

Some time ago, I wrote about some 20 projects we suggested to the SCI-FI Channel/CFI in response to their request for items which could be investigated. Among the projects were was one involving UFOs and nuclear facilities. There was no interest shown in any of our projects, and we have continued them without any outside support. Since then, we have added a number of other proposals. The Minot case is just part of one of the projects in which we are engaged.

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947 Coordinator
<http://www.project1947.com/>
Vice Chairman
Sign Historica

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Velez

From: John Velez <johnvelez.aic.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 22:06:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:02:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Velez

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 22:03:55 +0000
>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 00:41:52 -0800
>>Subject: Salla & Bassett

>>Michael Salla, Stephen Bassett,

>>Since both of you posted here over the last couple of days I am
>>posting my response. In my opinion, Michael Salla, Exopolitics,
>>the Paradigm Research Group, Stephen Greer, and the Xconference
>>are causing great damage to legitimate UFO research by trying to
>>present speculation and conjecture as factual truth.

>>For example, Michael Salla presenting his speculation on
>>Eisenhower as Ike factually communicating with Nordic
>>extraterrestrials. Not "I speculate that..." or I theorize"...
>>but promoting as truth anecdotal stories and claims with no
>>further evidence to support such claims as the truth.

>>Promoting untruths, for example, the underground Dulce base as
>>truth. Promoting the "Tall White Story" as truth when it is
>>based on one man's anecdotal story with no legitimate
>>investigation to determine if there is any real evidence.

><snip>

>>On top of it all, on UFO UpDates you justify your efforts with
>>the most absurd rationalizations to allow sloppy thinking with
>>no qualification. Your efforts are a sham, pure garbage in my
>>opinion. What you are doing makes a laughing stock out of
>>Ufology to the people who matter. Your following are "blind
>>believers" with no ability to think in order to determine what
>>is or is not true.

>>My fellow Listerions, I strongly suggest that you read the
>>archives concerning the above people and their efforts before
>>responding to support them. In addition, if you look at the
>>Exopolitics website, Stephen Bassett, Stephen Greer, and the
>>Xconference information and you don't agree with what I am
>>saying then you do not know how to think clearly. If that is the
>>case then I feel sorry for you because you have not learned how
>>to take the first step to distinguish between fiction and fact.

>Amen and hallelujah! I just received a notification of the
>forthcoming Nevada UFO conference that has one of the wildest
>and wooliest line-up of speakers I have ever seen anywhere at
>any time. New Age, ranting, speculating, axe-grinding, garbage-
>spewing, you name it. Therein we see Michael Salla about to
>launch off on another myth: Nazi flying saucers. If anyone needs
>a snapshot of what is wrong with Ufology, all they need to do is
>look at this line-up of speakers. Oh, but we must remain 'open-
>minded' and consider 'alternative viewpoints'.
>Not from this ilk we don't. This garbage is totally destroying
>any notion of '-ology.'

Hi Josh, Dick, All,

Josh Goldstein, you silver tongued devil you... sometimes I am left with no choice but to post. I will say only this, well said and it's about time. Tell it like it is, Josh.

Cleaning house is never easy or painless.

Warmest regards,

John Velez

'Unfettered' citizen at large ;)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Kimball

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 19:03:13 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:11:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Kimball

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 10:36:01 EST
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased

>>From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <UFOupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:29:01 -0000
>>Subject: Crop Circle Documentary Biased

<snip>

>>BLT's Nancy Talbott emailed me this week about a crop circle
>>show which aired in the US about a week ago. Here is a section
>>of her note to me, together with a document in which she
>>comments on the show.

<snip>

>For all of you researchers who have your solid conclusions I
>would say tell the documentary people to shove it.

>'You' know your facts are straight, pro or con so why entertain
>so-called news people who lack objectivity.

From the one side of the story we've been to which we've been
made privvy, this does sound egregious. On the other hand, I'm
sure the producer has his side of the story. However, I
stipulate that some producers are jerks. I've commented on this
subject at length in the past - in a thread called "Media & The
Truth." Still, I feel obliged to once again state:

- a) not all documentary producers are like this;
- b) if you tell us to "shove it", we'll just find someone else.
- c) see (a) and (b) again.

Everytime you give an interview, you're taking a bit of a risk.
But there are ways to minimise that risk. Try the following
(this advice may get me drummed out of the "evil producers
union" but what the heck):

a) first, ask any producer for a resume and a sample of his
previous work on the subject (ie. UFOs). If this is his first
UFO film, ask for a sample of his previous work on another
subject - if he's treated them fairly, odds are he'll treat you
fairly. Check his website (we all have websites). If he won't
provide a previous film or a resume, walk away. If he doesn't
have a website, walk away;

b) whatever legal paperwork (contract, release form) should
include a clause to the effect of: "The producer will have
complete editorial and creative control over all aspects of the
film. The Subject / Interviewee (etc) will be given the
opportunity to screen a fine cut of the film, and will have an
absolute right to require changes only in the case of any
factually inaccurate statements by the Subject, or by others as
they relate to the Subject, or if any statements made by the

Subject are taken out of context within the film" This is probably the best you can hope for, but it's better than nothing. If a producer won't oblige (and the above is a standard term in any contract we sign with a Subject), walk away (as most of Michael Moore's victims should have);

c) never answer any question you do not feel comfortable answering;

d) recognise that any answer you give longer than 30 seconds is likely to be edited, not always to your liking (although (b) above helps prevent your words from being twisted, like Michael Moore does). A 2 hour lecture is a lousy idea. We'll ignore it. Keep your answers short and to the point. In television, soundbites rule. If you can't accept that, walk away;

e) always remember that every camera and microphone is potentially live, even when the little red light isn't on;

f) always check your facts beforehand - if you say something that's wrong, it's part of the record, you're stuck with it, and you have no-one to blame but yourself when you end up looking like an idiot;

g) ask to see a treatment, or at least a one-page synopsis, of the film in advance;

h) before the interview begins, ask to take a look in the camera viewfinder to see how you're being framed - tight close-up, mid shot, etc. If the producer or director won't let you, definitely walk away; and

g) remember that being "treated fairly" doesn't mean that the producer, director or the final film will end up endorsing or accepting your point of view.

Again, the above is not perfect, but it will help reduce the risk. Consider them the equivalent of interview condoms.

>This 'free press' society is nothing more than a smear campaign
>machine hiding under constitutional protections. It's been this
>way for centuries and used by politics the most.

>Opinion control nonsense to cover up crimes.

Now who's not being objective?

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 20:58:44 -1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:27:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Goldstein

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 14:28:05 -0400
>Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 17:36:46 -1000
>>Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

<snip>

>>One thing I observed that I had not seen in other photos is
>>that this picture shows the longest runway with X marks along
>>its length. That usually means a closed runway. I wonder why?

>More than likely they are either working on that runway [there's
>no evidence of that, however]or have closed it entirely. Most
>likely the latter.

>There are no "displaced" arrows in evidence. Traffic is being
>handled on RWY 14-32R. As for the reasons, they are handling
>heavier aircraft now than before of and/or the base below the
>original RWY 14-32 is insufficient to bear heavy loads and it's
>just too expensive [hah-what do they care ?] to rip it up and
>re-base it and then resurface.

>I see what looks like a "bump" marker [heavy white line across
>the rwy] at the nor' northwest end of the "closed" RWY 14-32.
>Subsidence?

>Business as usual.

>Refer to my Aurora email to you. How heavy is that?

Hi Don,

I also noticed that bump line but the odd thing is that this is the runway that they extended. I assumed that was to accomodate some form of heavier aircraft. I assumed that they would have been sure that the original stretch of runway was in good shape. Maybe they had some kind of unexpected sink in the base and it is closed for repair. This is just another Area 51 mystery and we'll have to see if the runway goes active again. Maybe they have completed whatever test program that required a longer runway.

Josh

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 03:35:33 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:30:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:35:25 -0800
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 13:18:44 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

<snip>

>Don, Dave:

>I think a better bet would be local #47 for Los Angeles. They
>were traveling up from that general area. There are other locals
>around there however.

Hi Larry,

I missed that bit. I thought they were from Nevada.

>If they are anything like local #6 (San Francisco) where I was
>a member, they won't have good records. Those get all messed up
>and eventually discarded as union officials dig thru the safe to
>rifle the general fund.

The universal problem. Same here at 571. But still an old union
membership book might survive.

Best,

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'

From: Michael Brownlee <michael.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 03:26:40 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:31:25 -0500
Subject: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'

The press release below briefly describes a very unusual book that may be of interest to readers here.

The Allies of Humanity material is certainly controversial, often disturbing in its implications and deeply challenging in its urgency, but should not be ignored. It offers a perspective that deserves careful consideration and thorough investigation.

While it is evident enough that humanity is being engaged by extraterrestrial forces, we have little verifiable information on their motivations and intentions, and thus we have no sound basis for appropriate response. I believe the Allies of Humanity material provides a powerful "Rosetta stone" that now makes it possible - taking into account all available research - to at last unravel the UFO/ET enigma and to begin to formulate strategies for dealing with this profound Encounter.

Respectfully,

Michael Brownlee
www.CosmicIntel.com

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE...

BOULDER, CO - Extraterrestrials not only account for mysterious UFO sightings and abductions, but may also be secretly exploiting human conflict and stimulating the rise of radical fundamentalism throughout the world.

A series of cosmic surveillance briefings, published as The Allies of Humanity, Book Two: Human Unity, Freedom and the Hidden Reality of Contact, by award-winning author Marshall Vian Summers, reveal a global "Intervention" by commercially-driven extraterrestrial forces determined to gradually gain control of planet Earth and its resources. The briefings demonstrate how ETs are influencing human affairs to advance their cause.

"We are all being marched to war by forces from beyond our world who seek to divide and weaken the human family for their own benefit," says Summers.

"Our fears, prejudices, self-doubts and desire for revenge are all being manipulated and used by the Intervention," he says. "Nothing could serve an extraterrestrial Intervention more than for humanity to maintain and to deepen its struggle with itself."

Summers was reluctantly thrust into the UFO controversy in 1997, when he began receiving a series of briefings from a small group of off-planet observers, agents of The Allies of Humanity, a network of individuals dedicated to the preservation of freedom and sovereignty among emerging worlds. They were dispatched to our solar system as cosmic spies, he explains, to investigate and report on the activities of the alien intruders. The first set of briefings was published in 2001, and is now completed with publication of Book Two (www.alliesofhumanity.org).

"This Intervention is occurring without our permission and largely without our awareness," says Summers. The Allies show how this "silent invasion is permeating our lives, influencing individuals in positions of power and religious authority, influencing our values and impulses, weakening any resistance that we might have to its presence."

The briefings in Book Two depict the extraterrestrial Intervention as the biggest event in human history, yet despite almost 60 years of mounting evidence from around the world, people are not seeing it clearly. Therefore, the Allies compiled their assessment and communicated it through Summers.

The Allies claim that their perspective is based not merely on observation, but upon experience across eons of time and in distant parts of the galaxy-for humanity is hardly the first emerging young race to face the challenge of premature Contact by uninvited extraterrestrial forces. "The Allies give us a window into the universe, the Greater Community of Intelligent Life," says Summers.

Summers is not a researcher but a spiritual contemplative who for twenty years has been "quietly receiving a body of teachings which constitutes the first real spirituality of contact," according to editor Darlene Mitchell at New Knowledge Library (www.greatercommunity.org), a non-profit reader-supported publishing company dedicated to making Summers' works available in print.

Book Two also includes commentaries by "the Unseen Ones," mysterious spiritual Teachers with whom Summers has collaborated on such titles as: Greater Community Spirituality: A New Revelation, Steps to Knowledge: The Book of Inner Knowing (winner of a national book award for Best Spiritual Book of the Year 2000), Wisdom from the Greater Community (vols. 1 and II), and The Allies of Humanity (Book One): An Urgent Message About the Extraterrestrial Presence in the World.

The Allies of Humanity, Book Two: Human Unity, Freedom and the Hidden Reality of Contact by Marshall Vian Summers Publication Date: January 30, 2005
Publisher: New Knowledge Library, P.O. Box 1724, Boulder CO 80306-1724
Paperback: 205 pages, ISBN 1-884238-35-1

Contact: Darlene Mitchell, New Knowledge Library
303-938-8401 or nkl.nul

<http://www.alliesofhumanity.org/Allies%2010-Point.pdf>

10-Point Summary Of The Allies Of Humanity Briefings Book One & Book Two

To assist you in sharing the Allies' Message and Briefings with others, we are including this ten-point summary of both sets of the Briefings. This summary represents only a general overview and does not include many of the important details that make a complete comprehension of the Allies Briefings possible. Visit www.alliesofhumanity.org for a downloadable version to share with others.

1. Humanity's destiny is to emerge into and to engage with a Greater Community of intelligent life in the Universe.
2. Contact with other forms of intelligent life represents the greatest threshold that humanity has ever faced. The results of this Contact will determine humanity's future for generations to come. This Contact is happening now.
3. Humanity is unprepared for Contact. Researchers are still unable to clearly see who is visiting our world and why. Governments are not revealing what they know, and most people are still in denial that this phenomenon is even occurring.
4. Because of this lack of preparation, humanity's true allies sent representatives to a location near Earth to observe the extraterrestrial presence and activities within our world. The Allies of Humanity Briefings represent their report.

5. The Briefings reveal that our world is undergoing an extraterrestrial Intervention by forces that, as demonstrated by their actions, are here to subvert human authority and to integrate into human societies for their own advantage. These forces represent non-military organizations that are here to seek human and biological resources. The Allies refer to these forces as the "Collectives". The Collectives do not value human freedom.

6. Because the Intervention is being carried out by small groups of intervening forces, it must rely primarily upon deception and persuasion to achieve its goals. The Allies Briefings describe in detail how this is being accomplished and what we must do to stop it. 7.

This extraterrestrial Intervention is being focused in four arenas:

- It is influencing individuals in positions of power and authority to cooperate with the Intervention through the promise of greater wealth, power & technology
- It is creating hidden establishments in the world from which the Intervention can exert its influence in the Mental Environment, seeking to make people everywhere open and compliant to its will through a "Pacification Program"
- It is manipulating our religious values and impulses in order to gain human allegiance to their cause
- It is taking people against their will, and often without their awareness, to support an interbreeding program designed to create a hybrid race and a new leadership who would be bonded to the "visitors".

8. Those extraterrestrial visitors who have been potentially beneficial to humanity have all retreated from the world in the face of the Intervention. Those remaining are alien races who are not here for our benefit. This leaves us in an unambiguous situation regarding the extraterrestrial presence. This enables us to clearly see what we are dealing with. Otherwise, it would be impossible for us to tell friend from foe.

9. The Allies Briefings emphasize the grave danger in our accepting and becoming reliant upon ET technology offered by the Intervention. This will only lead to our becoming dependent on the "visitors," resulting in our loss of freedom and self-sufficiency. No true ally of humanity would offer this to us. The Allies emphasize that we have earth-based solutions to all the problems that we face. What we lack as a race is unity, will and cooperation.

10. In spite of the great challenge we now face, humanity still has a great advantage if we can respond in time. The Allies Briefings reveal both the Intervention's strengths and its weaknesses. One of the Intervention's weaknesses is its reliance upon human acquiescence and cooperation to achieve its goals. According to Greater Community rules of conduct within the region in which our world exists, Intervention is not allowed unless it can be demonstrated that the native people welcome and approve of it. Here, our voices can have power in the Greater Community. At this moment the Intervention has few critics. But if enough people can become aware of it and speak out against it, the Intervention will be thwarted and must withdraw. This is the first step in humanity's preparation for dealing with the realities of life in the Universe. This step and all the steps that follow give humanity its one great chance to overcome its long-standing conflicts and to unite in its own defense for the preservation of the world. The Allies affirm that we as human beings have the spiritual and collective power to do this and that we must do this if we want to survive and advance as a free and independent race in the Greater Community.

"If humanity were well versed in Greater Community affairs, you would resist any visitation to your world unless a mutual agreement had been established previously. You would know enough not to allow your world to be so vulnerable."

- The Allies Of Humanity, Book One: The Fourth Briefing

The Society for The Greater Community Way of Knowledge
(303) 938-8401
www.alliesofhumanity.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 11:29:16 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:32:50 -0500
Subject: Re: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii - Shough

>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 19:43:27 +0200
>Subject: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii

>>From: Ralph Howard <rhjr.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 14:04:12 -0500
>>Subject: A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii

>>A Mysterious Streak Above Hawaii (NASA NSL Project)

>>Take a look at this:

>><http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap050208.html>

><snip>

>Let me ask: if this photo is taken looking up at the sky and the
>first photo shows a short dash, and then a series of long
>dashes, and then a shorter one - with the time between each jump
>(photo frame) assumed to be the same - does that mean the bright
>object was going up or down relative to the camera at the
>beginning and end of the streak? (hope that makes sense?!) it
>just seems that its a photo of something coming up from the
>ground or out from space and then going onto the ground or into
>space...

Hi Diana

The picture is not a flat field but a distorted all-sky view, so the scale changes from the centre (zenith) to the periphery (horizon). The relative lengths of exposed trail would have to be corrected for this before making such inferences. But in any case it seems that the trail has now been matched to the trajectory of specific AMC-16 rocket launch, and is explained as an "unexpectedly bright" fuel dump "one of the brightest yet recorded".

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Brazilian Air Force Spokesman Lies About UFOs

From: A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO <gevaerd.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:32:17 -0200
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:41:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Brazilian Air Force Spokesman Lies About UFOs

Dear Colleagues:

I made a commitment to myself and the readers of the Brazilian UFO Magazine to never let go of the issue about the lies we are getting from our military and authorities about UFOs in Brazil. The lies are simply outrageous and we cannot be silent.

So I decided to pursue this issue no matter what happens. I am loaded with info to contradict the liars and I now publish a recent message received from a reader of the magazine, who is also angry because of the coverup policy implemented by the military. There is more of this to come and I will spread it both in Brazil and overseas.

If readers want to check out the over 200 pages of official documents of Operation Saucer in the Amazon, 1977, go to:

<http://www.ufo.com.br/documentop.php>

and download as many as you want.

A. J. Gevaerd

Spokesman From The Brazilian Air Force Department For Social Communication Lies About UFOs

Letter to the Brazilian UFO Magazine:

The newspaper Correio Braziliense published a whole page about UFOs in its January 30th, 2005 issue under the title "Security" and subtitled as "ET Hunters". The report was signed by Ullisses Campbell. Among other subjects, the text describes the campaign carried out by Brazilian UFO Magazine [www.ufo.com.br], UFOs: Freedom of Information Now!, and reports the Brazilian ufologists' will to see the opening of their government secret archives about the Operation Saucer, the Varginha Case, and the Brazilian UFO researchers call "The Official Night of UFOs in Brazil". This request is included in the document called Manifesto of Brazilian Ufology, which is an integral part of the campaign, and is published by the magazine and its website.

In the aforementioned report, under the subtitle Archives in Brasilia, Campbell presents parts of his interview with the Air Force major Antonio Lorenzo, from the Brazilian Air Force Department for Social Communication. The text reads: "The Ministry of Air Force admits the existence of reports about unidentified flying objects in the archives of the Brazilian Command for Air Defense (Comdabra), a military body based in South Lake area". A statement of major Lorenzo follows: "But none of these has an investigative approach. We have never gone out looking for flying saucers in Brazilian skies".

The officer goes on by saying that ufologists do not need to gather 30,000 signatures, which is the intent of the above mentioned campaign - to make these documents disclosed. He finishes: "An order from the commander of the Air Force, Luiz Carlos da Silva Bueno, or from the minister of Defense, Jose

Alencar, is enough to open the archives".

The text continues by informing that the report from Operation Saucer, which is read by ufologists all over the world and is published on the website of Brazilian UFO Magazine [www.ufo.com.br], would have been released by the officer who headed the operation, Uyrange Hollanda, interviewed by the editor of the magazine, A. J. Gevaerd. In the documents, says the Correio Braziliense, there should be statements from people attacked by lights coming from the sky which burned their skins, the so-called chupa-chupa (*).

To finish, the report informs the reader that, according to major Lorenzo, there would be no evidence of UFOs sightings in any of the reports of the Air Force. The officer states: "As far as I know, there are only reports about people saying: I saw this, I saw that in the sky. Based on these reports, the Air Force has never established any operation in order to wait for lights from Mars or Jupiter".

The officer lies

I would like to inform Brazilian UFO Magazine that I received verified information saying that the statements made by Major Antonio Lorenzo, from the Brazilian Air Force Department for Social Communication, are false. He lacks the truth in his declarations to the journalist Ullisses Campbell and, therefore, in the position he occupies, he commits a serious fault towards the Brazilian society which needs to be repaired.

I state that in 1977 I was a member of the Brazilian Center for Ufology Studies (CNEU), founded and headed by General Alfredo Moacyr de Mendonca Uchoa, which was based in the Colégio Uniao Pioneira de Integracao Social (UPIS). I occupied a high position in the institution, which I am not going to reveal in order to keep my name in secret. One night, at 8:30 PM, I was in General Uchoa's office, sit at his table, when three men dressed in black suits and holding huge suitcases appeared. From the door they said: "General, we are here". "I'm going", was his response.

Then the three men left to wait at the corridor. General Uchoa told me in low voice: "These are security agents from the Air Force and bring good news from Colares, State of Para". He then asked me to follow him and the men, and we headed to the dead archives of UPIS. The first of the officers had a key in his hands, he opened the door and stand aside so that the others could pass. He was the last one, but when it was my turn to enter, I was stopped under the claim that the subject was secret and I was not allowed to go any further.

General Uchoa, who was already inside the room, turned back and said: "He is a man I highly trust. If he can not enter, than I can not either". Thus, the officers had no choice but to let me in. We sat all around a large table and they started by explaining in details all that should come to General Uchoa - and among other issues, there was the fact that the duty they carried out was assigned in Colares, a city at the coast of the State of Para. What they showed to us were images and documents concerning the Operation Saucer, which were impressive.

I was amazed with the quantity of films and more than 200 pictures they presented. That was an endless source of high quality material. Flying saucers were closely filmed and photographed by those officers - I figure a distance from 100m to 200m. In that great amount of evidence were shots of distant lights, which came towards them until getting very close. Everything was filmed and well photographed in high quality and contrast images. All facts occurred during several nights. There was a photo and film expert among the men, who explained to General Uchoa technical details of the images, the conditions in which they were made, the kind of film, and the exposure time.

There was another expert who explained physical aspects about the UFOs to General Uchoa, and we spent more than three hours watching all the material. However, during all this time, I did not say anything, since I was seen as an intruder and was not really invited. The men did not address me either. In the end, Uchoa's conclusion was: "No doubt these are interplanetary ships present in our planet. We should receive them in order to

understand their real intention".

Well, this is my report, which I hope to be useful for Brazilian UFO Magazine and the Brazilian Ufology Community in their campaign for the freedom of Ufology information. My intention is to contribute to show how important it is that the Government asks the Armed Forces to open their archives at once.

R (name and address in our archives)

(*) Chupa-chupa - Brazilian repeated words meaning to suck. Refers to the lights which sucked people's blood.

Translated by Eduard Rado, of the Brazilian UFO Magazine team.

Edited by A. J. Gevaerd, editor of the Brazilian UFO Magazine (gevaerd.nul)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

FO Reported Over Billerica

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 05:12:13 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:51:40 -0500
Subject: FO Reported Over Billerica

Source: The Wilmington Advocate - Concord, Massachusetts

<http://www2.townonline.com/wilmington/localRegional/view.bg?articleid=181743>

02-10-05

They Are Out There: UFO Reported Over Billerica

By Margaret Smith
Staff Writer

Whatever it was that appeared in the cold skies over Billerica on Dec. 12, at least one observer was concerned enough to seek answers.

That's according to Mark Petty, an investigator with the Massachusetts Mutual UFO Network, which said he is heading up a team to look into the reported sighting.

The volunteer-run network is part of a nationwide mutual UFO network, whose chapter members in several states track reports of all manner of peculiar lights and objects seen hovering or cruising through the heavens.

Petty, who is originally from Billerica, offered few details about the Dec. 12 incident in order to protect the privacy of the person who reported it. A press release describes the reporting sighting only as "a strange aerial phenomenon."

"One of the biggest concerns we have is for the person who reported the sight," Petty said. He added, "They might be traumatized, or just so curious they go crazy. A lot of people report them years later. They will say, 'Back in 1976, I saw this thing.'"

Petty did say that someone reported a similar sighting that same night, several miles away, on a southern stretch of Interstate 495 in the Worcester County vicinity.

He hopes others who may have witnessed something unusual will come forward in an effort to help the investigation and will e-mail him at MassMUFON.nul or visit the Web site, www.massmufon.com.

Billerica police said they did not receive any reports of an unusual sighting in the sky Dec. 12, but said from time to time, they, like all police departments, do get calls from concerned residents of a strange light or sound. Usually, it's easy to figure out what the person is seeing.

UFO network chapters are volunteer-driven, and members come from many walks of life, from astronomers to factory workers, Petty said. The network trains and certifies volunteers who wish to investigate UFO reports, teaching them skills that include interviewing witnesses and looking at data on celestial activity. The Massachusetts network has more than 120 members.

In a written statement, Greg Berghorn, the state director of the Massachusetts network, said he sent a team of four investigators, led by Petty, to conduct interviews and survey the area of the reported sighting.

According to Berghorn, the network has filed a Freedom of Information Act request to the Federal Aviation Administration to acquire radar tapes and phone reports. The network may also review police logs, newspaper articles and Internet findings in search of clues.

Petty said someone also reported seeing something peculiar in the sky over Billerica around 6:30 p.m. on Dec. 29 and reported the incident to the National UFO Reporting Center in Seattle, Wash.

That report describes "a very large, circular, bright-white light above the clouds going around and around in a very large circle" at high speeds. The report said the witness looked out again and saw the same light about an hour later and insisted it wasn't a search light or plane.

Without ruling out any possibilities, Petty said the light may have come from an area business, such as a gym in nearby Tewksbury.

By strictest definition, a UFO is, simply, an unidentified flying object. Petty said 95 percent of reported objects turn out to be ordinary things - a satellite or aircraft, or a planet or star that appears to waver because of atmospheric conditions.

"Lots of times, they are planes, meteors, something like that, or a reflection from the ground," Petty said, adding that the luminous planet Venus is the top-ranking culprit in UFO sightings.

Another factor in a possible area sighting is the presence of nearby Hanscom Air Force Base.

But among the annals of the Massachusetts Mutual UFO Network's cases remain about 5 percent whose origins have not yet been explained, said Petty.

Investigators will, from time to time, receive reports of aberrations such as a lighted object in the sky making several 90-degree turns, or blinking out and then reappearing in another part of the sky, Petty said.

There have also been reports of indentations in the soil that may or may not suggest an unusual craft landed there and even so-called crop circles - or unusual and seemingly deliberate patterns cut into the grass or ground.

"Then we have people who actually see what they describe as a craft," Petty said. "The ultimate goal is to try and find and answer as to what a UFO is."

To date, no smoking gun - a crashed vessel or vessel parts, or dead or wounded alien - exists to offer compelling evidence of interplanetary tourists.

Although the idea of a UFO sighting may conjure images of a spaceship landing in an open field in the Midwest, Petty said Massachusetts has its share of stories of unexplained occurrences.

Petty cited information from the National UFO Reporting Center indicating 412 reports of UFO sightings in the state. The earliest dates back to around 1638, when a strange light was reported flying back and forth over the Boston area.

Petty, who graduated from Billerica Memorial High School, now lives in Nashua, N.H. and works in marketing for a high-tech firm. Although he has no science degree, Petty said, "I've always been curious about it, ever since I was a child." He added, "I have always liked science, the sky and astronomy."

The Mutual UFO Network trains investigators on how to talk to people about what they may have seen and to collect information in an unbiased fashion, Petty said. Investigations may include questioning of those who say they witnessed something unusual,

as well as their neighbors; looking at police logs and consulting with astronomers' records of celestial activity.

In short, he said, volunteers strive to make their work reflect the scientific process, in which a hypothesis must be tested and skepticism is a must.

But so is an open mind. Petty said for his part, he remains neutral on the subject of extraterrestrial visitors because he has never found incontrovertible proof for or against their existence.

He does, however, believe in the possibility of life on other planets, perhaps in distant galaxies.

It's an idea he has in common with the late astronomer Carl Sagan. In his acclaimed television series, "Cosmos," Sagan pondered the possibility of civilizations, both advanced and primitive, from other worlds.

Sagan was a professor at Cornell University, which runs the world's largest single-dish radio telescope in Arecibo, Puerto Rico. There, astronomers are listening for possible communications from distant space travelers, although this work accounts for a small percentage of their research.

Despite his belief in the possibility of extraterrestrial life, Sagan lamented the speculation over tales of alien abductions by short, surly creatures with large heads and dour black eyes.

The public's fascination with these stories peaked in the 1990s, with the television series, "The X-Files," appearances on talk shows by alleged abduction victims and even a best-selling book, "Communion," by novelist Whitley Strieber.

Sagan complained that the public's fascination with such stories deflects attention from the many advances in science.

Here, Petty and Sagan part company. Petty said a curiosity about UFOs led him to study astronomy and take a greater interest in science.

"Anything that sparks curiosity in the sciences, whether it be a hobby such as UFOs, I think is a good thing," Petty said. "I think the schools do not teach enough hard sciences. Anything that sparks curiosity is a good thing."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 08:48:06 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:55:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Lehmberg

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 22:21:43 +0000
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 11:22:20 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 14:32:44 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

><snip>

>>>I give up trying to communicate with you. This is going nowhere,
>>>so I decline to participate any longer. You are playing word
>>>games, not thinking, reasoning, and communicating rationally.

>>I certainly agree that we disagree and this is going nowhere.
>>Try looking in the mirror Dick if you want to see why.

>Yes Stan, I know. You have said it over and over in various
>ways: you are brilliant and I am ignorant.

>'Mirror, mirror on the wall...'

Somebody knows...

UFOs are, by definition, change, and they point to worlds with much more breadth and scope - potential and expansiveness. It gets no easier to maintain a facade of normalcy for the smirking denial of a dwindling few... so fearlessly - we ask our own questions though the answers (or the suggestions of answers) offend us, shock us, or shame us. There is joy beyond the shame, satisfaction beyond the shock, and fellowship beyond the offense.

And it's real.

I would think, given the expansive wealth of this rather obvious potentiality, that we could cooperate and more efficiently graduate, especially when there is the offensiveness of skeptybunky glee to consider... likely precipitating as a result of a needless and less than constructive tempest.

Trifling Klasskurtzians beware in the interim as this plays out, verily. I'll be on any flame-fanning-programmed-divisiveness-from-the-sidelines... like white on bleached rice.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 07:42:59 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:56:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Smith

After reviewing some documents on lunar vehicle testing, I have come to the conclusion that Zamora's vehicle was not the result of these.

The Lunar Surveyor was drop tested from a tether attached to a balloon. (1,2,3) In (1), it states that such testing was to occur during the reporting period of (2). In (2), it was reported that the Surveyor test article was accidentally dropped (and destroyed) by the balloon due to electrostatic discharge causing the pyros to fire. The balloon testing was at the Air Force Missile Development Center. A test with engines was scheduled for no earlier than Sept, 1964.

Note that the Surveyor test article was only a three legged vehicle, unmanned, did not look at all like the Zamora object, and was a one way trip, from balloon to ground and an actual test occurred way past the Zamora sighting. It did test the propulsion system on the way down though.

Grumman was responsible for testing of the Lunar Excursion Module. (4, 5) They conducted a study of atmospheric free flight of the vehicle. The upshot of the study is that although they considered it technically feasible, they did not implement such a free flight vehicle for several reasons.

- 1) Pilot safety was hard to insure given the fact of carrying fuel and firing your engines right next to you. The extra ejection seat mass/complications were drawbacks.
- 2) Ground effects/interactions with the vehicle due to the presence of an atmosphere.
- 3) A great deal of LEM mass had to be removed including ascent engine.
- 4) Limited flight duration: with 7000lb thrust descent engine and LEM mass of 4400 lb the flight time was calced to be only 90 seconds.

They also considered the options of helicopter tethered carry and Langley tethered facility simulator. The helicopter method (e.g. Chinook HC-1B dangling it by a 300ft tether at White Sands Missile Range) was investigated for feasibility. I find no record of it being used. No balloon method was ever documented.

The tethered facility at Langley was the one that was eventually used/documented.

Although the free flight LEM tester has four legs, the conceptual diagrams show it looking a more like Zamora's object, it has a rocket engine, fairly heavy mass, it has the drawbacks of only have descent flight, very limited flight duration, 1 crew, and was not to be ready for testing until 1965

References: 1) SPACE PROGRAMS SUMMARY NO. 37-27, Volume VI, MARCH 1, 1964 TO APRIL 30 ,1964

2) SPACE PROGRAMS SUMMARY NO. 37-28, Volume VI, MAY 1, 1964 TO JUNE 30 ,1964

3) SPACE PROGRAMS SUMMARY NO. 37-29, Volume VI, JULY 1, 1964 TO AUGUST 31 ,1964

4) LTA-8 AND LTA- 9 PRELIMINARY DESIGN SUMMARY REPORT:
INTEGRATED SYSTEM DYNAMIC TEST AND EVALUATION VEHICLES, JAN 14,
1963

5)LTA-9 FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT, DEC 19, 1962.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 15:23:41 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 10:59:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 21:52:02 +0000
>Subject: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 22:41:11 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 17:07:03 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

><snip>

>>>Some versions of the ETH, such as _ufo reports are generated by
>>>fusion power spaceships from Mars_ would be finite and testable
>>>and fit into scientific naturalism, but unknown beings from
>>>unknown locations having unknown powers and motivations
>>>wouldn't.

>>Your objection to some variants of ETH appears now to be that
>>they would not be testable, whereas your fusion-powered Martians
>>supposedly are testable. Yet your original objection was not
>>about testability; it was an assertion that explanations
>>invoking "trans human intelligences" had no legitimate place in
>>modern scientific naturalism.

>That was transhuman intelligences with unknown powers if I
>remember rightly

If by "unknown powers" you meant "inconceivable powers" then you would be right, Peter. Because we can't conceive them, these powers are obviously not "natural" in terms of scientific naturalism. "Inconceivable beings from inconceivable locations having inconceivable powers and motivations" obviously can't be predicted or falsified and is an empty notion. But this is not at all the same thing as "unknown beings from unknown locations having unknown powers and motivations".

The idea that something may be unknown, yet implicated or foreshadowed by what is known, obviously underpins the possibility of progress and reveals science's "concept of nature" as dynamic. If you allow trans-human intelligences (as you do here by implication) then you have to allow "unknown powers" that may accompany a trans-human concept of nature. If such intelligences and powers are to be beyond the pale of scientific naturalism, then mankind itself has no future.

>>But exactly what is it that, from the point of view of
>>epistemological principle, makes your Martian-fusion theory
>>testable, whereas someone else's Zeta Reticuli space-ark theory
>>isn't? Or, if I am not drawing a valid distinction here, at
>>precisely what point on the spectrum of imaginable cosmic
>>intelligences is a proper distinction to be drawn?

>>If I understand the implication of your remark, it is that

>>intelligences capable of manipulating the nuclear 'strong' force
>>would be a valid hypothesis, whilst those capable of
>>manipulating, say, the quark-gluon colour force or perhaps the
>>gravitational force, would not be. I think this is a rather
>>esoteric sort of distinction that could only be defended on some
>>very esoteric theoretical grounds of your own, and I don't see
>>any connection to "testability".

>Well, if you can work out what the properties of a Zeta
>Reticullan space ark powered by the quark-gluon colour force
>would be, so that you could see if these properties were
>reflected in ufo reports, then it would presumably come through
>the barrier.

I can't, in practice, but that doesn't make it illegitimate to
frame hypotheses that allow for the possibility that someone
tomorrow will. I think you are confusing issues of principle and
issues of practice. It is your claim that "scientific
naturalism" excludes "unknown" beings, powers and motivations
that I take issue with. It doesn't, except insofar as you
circularly define the limits of "scientific naturalism" as the
limits of science at your particular epoch, reducing it from a
principle to a parochialism.

>>You said (rightly) that the successful advance of scientific
>>naturalism was achieved by the steady replacement of animistic
>>causal models with mechanistic ones. But this has nothing
>>directly to do with testability, everything to do with
>>broadening scientific imagination. And your acceptance in
>>principle of Martian non-human mental agency has nothing to do
>>with judiciously determining the limits of viable theory in
>>accordance with some philosophy of scientific method, everything
>>to do with the comfortable familiarity of a Buck Rogers-style
>>conception of extraterrestrial life that was, and still is,
>>another product of scientific imagination.

>You misunderstand, the fusion powered space ship was just meant
>as a hypothetical example of something whose properties we
>could
>work out on the basis of our current scientific knowledge.

You say this is testable and scientific; theories with more
unknowns are not testable and not scientific. Well, we can sort
of envisage in a general way that a Martian building a fusion
power plant is feasible in principle, but it is really a pretty
fuzzy extrapolation from current knowledge. It is unknown
engineering, with many unknown characteristics. Not, I agree,
inconceivable; but unknown. And can you define this hypothesis
carefully enough to work out how report data might falsify it?
You might find it trickier than you think.

Suppose you demonstrate evidence of fusion residuals in landing
traces. How would you exclude the alternative theory that the
fusion rocket was not from Mars, but from another star? Well,
survey Mars, of course, and photograph the Martian aerospace
production and launch areas. But because you are doing proper
science here you have to allow for the possibility that your
survey might prove negative, don't you? You've proved the ET
fusion drive, so if Mars comes up empty where next but to the
planets of nearby stars? A lot more unknowns now, but maybe
still conceivable using magnetic ram scoops or something. Then a
Prof Markowitz calculates that any long-lived organism would die
of boredom on the journey, so perhaps the fusion drive is only
used for shuttle flights and some other means provides rapid
acceleration to relativistic speeds on the long haul, or maybe
after all there could be wormhole transits to far-off regions of
the galaxy... whoa, stop there! This is already a fair distance
from your homely Martians, but we have got there by an
unremarkable extrapolation into the unknown and we remain deep
within the limits of "scientific naturalism". That's a big
place. We would have along way to go yet, in more than four
directions, before we threatened to fall off the edge.

>Surely you agree that there is no point in explaining something
>by invoking processes or phenomena we know nothing about.

I don't think it is logically possible to "explain" something in
terms of processes we know nothing about. (Although it's an
interesting philosophical point that at the end of all
explanations this is exactly the type of "explanation" that we
perversely yearn for, otherwise fundamental physics - as J W N

Sullivan said - finishes in the self-reference of a dictionary that defines a violin as a small cello and a cello as a large violin.) But the messy real-world situation is is this: It is neither logically impossible nor pointless - indeed it is essential - to "explain" by invoking processes that we know very little about. This is because it is not a one-way traffic: The processes that we know very little about are themselves illuminated and transfigured in the act of trying them out, and it is only because of this that science changes and advances. You can stand stiff on your paradigm; you walk to the next only by toppling inelegantly forwards.

>>Scientific naturalism, if it has any value at all as a
>>principle, restricts the spectrum of explanatory processes to
>>those processes which science finds operating in nature.
>>Obvious? But this principle obviously is not to be applied by
>>consulting a botanical list of ossified processes already
>>catalogued, else science would be immobilised and unable ever to
>>discover new processes. Science does discover new processes. It
>>does this both by identifying new particulars (facts) and by
>>creating new generalisations from these particulars (theories),
>>and the entire class of "scientific processes" containing both
>>types of entity inseparably is an evolving meta-process which
>>represents what science actively conceives as "nature".

>If by that there will be future scientific discoveries, then
>agreed. It may well be that in say 2105 someone will turn round
>and argue that the then newly discovered Chuan-Dangerfield
>bridgement process, or Gorbinsky's inverse hypercube hypothesis
>will explain some of those puzzling 20th century ufo reports.
>But as of 2005 we have no idea what these hypothetical or any
>other future hypotheses/discoveries might be. Until we discover
>(or invent) them they are of no use to us.

I think you're missing the point. Does that Chuan-Dangerfield
bridgement process, which will be discovered, lie beyond the
pale of scientific naturalism? Obviously not, even though it
lies beyond the bounds of current knowledge. It represents a
physics that is not realised, but exists as an unformed and
unarticulated implication of current knowledge. And only by
active conjecture will Chuan and Dangerfield elicit or invent
the future concept of nature that contains their amazing
bridgement process. The limits of scientific naturalism cannot
be rigidly defined by present ignorance.

>>The notion of "scientific naturalism" thus not only permits
>>nature to contain generalisations from particular facts
>>(theories) but demands it, logically and practically, and
>>among the spectrum of explanatory processes which science today
>>"finds" operating in nature are many such generalisations. Some
>>of these processes have strong claims to being "conventional" -
>>i.e., not in Occam's sense "new entities" - in natural science,
>>even though (like gluons, or gravitons) no particular example of
>>them has ever been directly observed, because they are knitted
>>into the theoretical fabric by intricate webs of implication.

<snip>

>Are we at least agreed that explanations in terms of unknown
>intelligences of unknown origin, possessing unknown powers and
>motivations actually explains nothing at all.

We are agreed that completely empty notions, having no point of
contact with science's present concept of nature, are of no use
at all. But the notion of a non-human intelligent being, with
uncertain abilities and motivations, is not empty and does
connect with our present theories of nature on many levels. In
fact there is a sizeable literature of science-based conjecture
on this, and not only is it a perfectly legitimate outgrowth of
centuries of scientific naturalism I'd almost go so far as to
say that it is in the realisation that life and mind are
scientifically accessible phenomena entailed by nature, not
occult black-box intrusions, that the process reaches maturity.

I think you are really wanting to use the yardstick of
scientific naturalism as a way of excluding from consideration,
as antiquated animism, a whole area of possibilities that you
"just don't believe in". That might be a perfectly justifiable
position on other grounds, but I don't think you can justify it
on the grounds of the way science works or is supposed to work.

Best

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: Socorro & Balloons - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 09:12:32 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:39:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons - Gehrman

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 13:52:11 -0800
>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 13:12:50 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Socorro & Balloons

>>As the crow (craft) flies, Six mile canyon is less than six
>>miles southwest of the sighting area. It would be difficult to
>>estimate a departing speed using six mile canyon mountain as
>>a reference point to determine distance and time.

>Estimates of departure speed depend primarily on the distance
>traveled and the elapsed time. Another important factor is
>whether the object accelerated smoothly or not. Lowest maximum
>speed is achieved with constant acceleration. Higher maximum
>speeds are calculated if the object accelerated more slowly at
>first and faster later on, as Zamora actually described.

David, EBK, List

Yes I agree

>This can lead to big variations in estimated maximum speed.
>_But_, here's the important point. Even with these
>uncertainties, are the estimated speeds at the _low_ end of the
>spectrum consistent with hypotheses such as a balloon

Yes I agree that what LZ saw was not a balloon or a tethered
device or any other such arrangement.

>or a
>"Lonnie and the Bean" scenario internal combustion engine? The
>answer is most definitely _not_.

Since you have no idea what the designers of the Bean had in
mind, then this is a rather sweeping generalization. The Bean
may be a figment of George Eastland's imagination but I figured
it would be worth the effort to look into it. I've ordered his
book and will write a review as soon as I read it. I just see
the Bean as a possibility, nothing more.

>Even with very conservative
>assumptions, the object achieved speeds at least that of a
>jetliner, plus the fact that it did this with a completely
>silent propulsion system.

I get to that below

>>Zamora's stated: "the object seemed to lift up slowly, and to
>>get small in the distance very fast. It seemed to just clear Box
>>Canyon or Six Mile Canyon Mt. It disappeared as it went over
>>the mountain."

>>Most of this observation was without prescription glasses.

>False. Maybe 10 seconds or so was without his glasses out of
>maybe a 30 second total departure time, from blastoff to
>disappearing in the distance. The important detail of him seeing
>the object disappear in the distance near Six Mile Canyon was
>definitely with his glasses on.

I disagree; you have underestimated the time and the way this event went together. Here's the way I see it:

LZ's statement:

"Stopped car, was still talking on radio, started to get out, mike fell down, reached back to put up mike, then replaced radio mike in slot, got out of car and started to go down to where I knew the object (car) was. (ten seconds)

Hardly turned around from car, when heard roar (was not exactly a blast), very loud roar - at that close was real loud. Not like a jet - knows what jets sound like. Started low frequency quickly, then roar rose in frequency (higher tone) and in loudness - from loud to very loud. At same time as roar saw flame. Flame was under the object. Object was starting to go straight up - slowly up. Object slowly rose straight up. Flame was light blue and at bottom was sort of orange color. From this angle, saw the side of object (not end, as first noted). Difficult to describe flame. Thought, from roar, it might blow up. Flame might have come from underside of object, at middle, possibly a four feet area - very rough guess. Cannot describe flame further except blue and orange. No smoke, except dust in immediate area. (3 seconds)

As soon as saw flame and heard roar, turned away, ran away from object but did turn head toward object. Bumped leg on car - back Fender area. Car facing southwest. Glasses fell to ground, left them there.

(seven seconds to fall and recover)

ran to north - car between him and object. Object was oval, in shape. It was smooth - no windows or doors. As roar started, it was still on or near ground. Noted red lettering of some type (see illustration). Insignia was about 2 1/2' high and about 2' wide I guess. Was in middle of object..... Object still like aluminum-white.

After fell by car and glasses fell off, kept running to north, with car between me and object. Glanced back couple of times. Noted object to rise to about level of car, about 20 to 25 feet guess - took I guess about six seconds when object started to rise and I glanced back. I ran I guess about halfway to where I ducked down - about fifty feet from the car is where I ducked down, just over edge of hill.

(I have recreated this scenario several times and it takes about twenty seconds to cover 100 feet. This is the Blue Book estimated distance, as drawn in their diagram of the scene, between the car and the spot where LZ took cover. I factored in the sand, street shoes and making sure where he was stepping. So that's twenty-seven seconds without glasses.)

I guess I had run about 25 feet when I glanced back and saw the object level with the car and it appeared about directly over the place where it rose from.

(without glasses)

I was still running and I jumped just over the hill - I stopped because I did not hear the roar. I was scared of the roar, and I had planned to continue running down the hill. I turned around toward the object and at same time put my head toward ground, covering my face with my arms. Being that there was no roar, I looked up, and I saw the object going away from me.

(To fall down, turn around toward the object and cover face takes about seven seconds)

It did not come any closer to me. It appeared to go in straight line and at same height - possibly 10 to 15 feet from ground, and it cleared the dynamite shack by about three feet. Shack about eight feet high.

(dynamite shack is 500 feet from where the object started its forward progress. It's not clear from LZ's statement whether he saw this part of the departure from his prone position just over the rise or on his way back to retrieve his glasses)

Object was travelling very fast. It seemed to rise up, and take off immediately across country. I ran back to my car and as I ran back, I kept an eye on the object.

(Twenty seconds)

I picked up my glasses (I left the sun glasses on ground),

(Six seconds to find and retrieve glasses)

got into the car, and radioed to Nep Lopez, radio operator, to "look out of the window, to see if you could see an object." He asked what is it? I answered "It looks like a balloon." I don't know if he saw it. If Nep looked out of his window, which faces north, he couldn't have seen it. I did not tell him at the moment which window to look out of.

(this conversation took six seconds)

As I was calling Nep, I could still see the object. The object seemed to lift up slowly, and to "get small" in the distance very fast. It seemed to just clear the Box Canyon or Six Mile Canyon Mountain. It disappeared as it went over the mountain.

(six Mile Canyon is a direction and not a distance estimate. It's just too vague a description for where something disappeared; it could mean anything. Have you been to the site? All it means is that the craft disappeared in the direction of six mile canyon mountain. Here is what LZ told Coral Lorenzen the next day:

"The thing was headed southwest making a high-pitched whining sound. It was ascending at a very shallow angle approximately 20 feet off the ground when it cleared the dynamite shack and disappeared into the distance.")

It had no flame whatsoever as it was traveling over the ground, and no smoke or noise. (I don't disagree with this) ...Can't tell how long [I] saw object second time (the "close" time), possibly 20 seconds - just a guess - from time got out of car, glanced at object, ran from object, jumped over edge of hill, then got back to car and radio as object disappeared.

(The way I figure it, this sequence of events took about 79 seconds from the time LZ stopped his car to the end of his conversation with Nep.)

>>The sun would also be a factor since this was a clear day and >>Zamora was looking directly into the setting sun.

>False. Zamora was not looking directly into the sun, and the >sun was not "setting" at the time. It was still a full 2 hours >before sunset. The sun was at azimuth 262 deg. (a little south >of west) and elevation 35 deg. The object departed on a course >of approximately 240 deg. azimuth, or to the WSW.

You have absolutely no idea of exactly where the object departed. All you know is that it was toward Box Canyon or Six Mile Canyon. These places are many degrees apart. So which one do you mean: Six mile canyon mountain or Box canyon?

>Thus the sun >was about 20 degrees to the right of Zamora as he observed the >object disappear in the distance and 35 degrees above him. >During earlier departure, the horizontal angle between the >object and the sun would have been even greater.

I don't think this matters much but the sun was in the west, about where LZ says the object departed. That was my only point.

>The sun may have been a nuisance factor and perhaps caused some >glare but Zamora was definitely not staring "directly" into >the sun. Sheesh!

OK he may not have been staring "directly" into the sun but we can agree that it might be a "nuisance factor" .

>>My review Zamora's testimony

>You apparently didn't review it very carefully, because many of
>the details you lay out as facts here contradict what Zamora
>said.

See above. That's the only LZ testimony I'm concerned with.

>>shows that the only thing we know
>>for sure is that the object and the small beings were not a
>>figment of his imagination and the object probably looked
>>like what he described. But there is definitely a question
>>regarding the speed of departure.

>I reiterate, even with very conservative assumptions, the speed
>was much higher than any biker-built "Lonnie and the Bean" type
>craft could possibly have achieved. And it did it silently too,
>and flew without wings.

Here's the way I figure. Using the Bean as an example: If it
traveled at forty MPH (about fifty-five feet a second) the craft
could fly between 2500 and 4000 feet in 75 seconds and easily
drop down in an arroyo or ravine or low depression and seem to
disappear. There are plenty of places where this would be
possible in the general direction LZ said the craft traveled.

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/zamora8.htm>

>>After Zamora lost his glasses, all his observations are
>>questionable.

>A sweeping statement. Which observations are you talking about?
>When he first lost his glasses, he was no more than 50-100 feet
>from the object.

He was one hundred feet from the object.

>He might not be able to see sharp detail, but
>it is absurd to claim that he couldn't see the object rise out
>of the gulley and then leave.

Yes I agree

>>First he ran 100 feet behind his car

>According to Zamora, he bumped his car running away and lost his
>glasses. Then he ran about 50 feet more behind his car, the car
>being about 50 feet from the object (hence Zamora being no more
>than 50-100 feet away after losing his glasses).

One hundred feet

>Even an overweight, 31-year-old traffic cop should be able to
>do that easily in 3-4 seconds, especially when scared and hyped
>on adrenalin.

Well you try it, in sand and street shoes and maybe up hill.
Time passes much faster than folks imagine. I was surprised
myself when I timed LZ's recollections.

>>and took his
>>eyes off the object while it lifted off.

>According to Zamora, he shot maybe 2 or 3 glances over his
>shoulder even while running. The reason he bumped into his car
>and lost his glasses to begin with was because he was looking
>over his shoulder at the time.

Yes I agree.

>>Then while the object
>>was in line with his car, he covered his eyes again.

>Except for maybe how long it took the craft to rise out of the
>gully, none of this has anything to do with the ultimate speed
>of departure. The speed has to do with how far the craft
>traveled before Zamora lost sight of it and how long it took
>to do this. In fact, the longer it took for the craft to lift
>off, the faster it would have had to travel to disappear in
>the distance in a given total departure time.

I'm not worried about lift-off time, just the time when LZ saw the craft depart.

>>As he watched the craft depart, he was walking back to his car >>(100 ft) and trying to keep the object in sight, but without >>glasses.

>"Walking back to his car?" According to Ray Stanford's account, >Zamora ran, not walked, back to his car (50 feet, not 100) to >call in.

Yes, I omitted "fast". He walked fast over the desert terrain but that still takes time and he was looking for his glasses. Maybe he ran but that also takes time, about seventeen seconds. Your and LZ's time estimates are way off base. Most folks don't run in the desert. It's just too dangerous to not look where you're going.

>Before getting in his car to call in, he stopped to >pick up his glasses and put them back on. Thus total time >without glasses approximately as follows:

>1. Time to run up hill 50 feet to get get away after losing >glasses: ~ 3-4 seconds

I say thirty four seconds from the time he fell to the time he dropped down and covered his face.

>2. Observing the craft even with his car going from roar to >silent mode: ~ 1-2 seconds

>3. Returning to car to pick up glasses: ~5-6 seconds

>Total time without glasses was maybe about 9-12 seconds.

I think that it was around fifty-five seconds that LZ was without glasses

>During >about half of this, the craft was still at location but rising. >About half of the remainder would be with the craft moving away >in silent mode, but still relatively close, probably within a >mile.

Yes I agree it probably disappeared about a mile from LZ but the process took much longer than you supposed.

>Even if you want to stretch the estimate a few seconds,

Many more than just a few seconds. Just go through LZ motions and activities yourself and see how long it takes. Be sure to measure off the 100 feet. It's much longer than it seems.

>this still doesn't change the fact that the rest of Zamora's >observations, approximately 2 minutes, were with his glasses >on, including when the object disappeared in the distance.

I don't understand this statement. I guess you must mean from the time LZ first heard and saw the object.

>Unless Zamora was severely nearsighted (which he doesn't appear >to have been, judging by the image of his eyes through his >glasses), he should have been able to observe the craft even >without glasses as it moved away initially. It may have been a >fuzzy blob instead of sharp, but he still would have seen it and >been able to make accurate judgments about its rate of departure >and trajectory.

Yes but when was the departure over the dynamite shack: before or after his glasses were in place.

>His eyesight also has nothing to do with his hearing. Zamora >heard no sound from the craft as it departed in a hurry, a >highly significant detail that those trying to debunk the >Socorro Socorro sighting are deliberately not discussing, since >it rules out any conventional propulsion system.

Yes I agree.

>>Then he recovered his glasses and put them back on. This all
>>took about 40 seconds, by my reckoning.

>A very long reckoning indeed based on an inaccurate rendering of
>Zamora's testimony plus some very questionable assumptions.
>According to Stanford's book, your distances are wrong (double
>of what Zamora said) and Zamora did not stroll back to his
>patrol car after the object left the scene. He raced back to
>call in.

I base my measurements on the map published in "Project
Bluebook" by Brad Steiger and I assumed part of the Blue Book
files. The map can be found here but the measurements are
missing:

<http://www.cufon.org/contributors/chrisl/roadmap.htm>

>Based on interviews with Zamora and on-site reenactment,
>Stanford placed the total time from blastoff to switch to
>silent propulsion and departure at only 11 seconds,

I have no argument with this.

>then maybe another 20 seconds for the object to disappear in
>the distance.

No I disagree. This took about one minute.

>Zamora probably would have had his glasses on for
>about 2/3rds of the 20 second departure time, including the
>important disappearance in the distance.

I disagree. See above

>If one assumes smooth acceleration during departure, a 20 second
>departure time, and a 6 mile distance to fadeout (consistent
>with what would be expected from human visual acuity), using a
>little high school Newtonian physics one ends up with a final
>speed of around 2200 mph! Even if one doubles the departure time
>and halves the fadeout distance, cutting the speed by a factor
>of four, one still ends up with a final speed of around 550 mph,
>i.e., jetliner speed.

I repeat:

Here's the way I figure. Using the Bean as an example: If it
traveled at forty MPH (about fifty-five feet a second) the craft
could fly between 2500 and 4000 feet in 75 seconds and easily
drop down in an arroyo or ravine or low depression and seem to
disappear. There are plenty of places where this would be
possible.

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/zamora8.htm>

>This is the point I was making at the beginning. Even using
>conservative assumptions of time and distance to lower the
>speed, the speed is still much too high for any sort of
>simplistic conventional craft.

Maybe.

>This is also from a craft making no noise and flying with no
>>wings. Since you are obviously trying to make a case for the
>"Lonnie and the Bean" scenario (some biker guys slapping
>together a craft propelled by some different internal combustion
>engine), you need to be able to explain these details. How could
>some biker guys build a completely _silent_ craft flying without
>>wings with vertical takeoff and landing capability and capable
>of jetliner if not supersonic speeds? Even NASA and Lockheed
>today can't do that.

>>(I reenacted the scene with my wife using a stop watch).
>>But most importantly, Zamora had to take his eyes off
>>the object while he found, picked up and replaced his
>>gasses(six seconds).

>He knew exactly where he had lost them. Six seconds seems a bit
>on the high side for him to locate and put his glasses on again
>once he returned to his car, but this is a minor point.

>You also don't seem to be taking into account that he didn't

>have to be staring at the ground the entire time. He could be
>alternating where he looked, looking for his glasses and then
>shooting quick glances in the sky to follow the departure. Even
>when Zamora was running away from the object at first, he still
>glanced several times over his shoulder to see what was going
>on. He would probably be doing the same as he rushed back to his
>car to call in and locate his glasses.

>>When he resumed looking for the craft, as he got in his car
>>to began transmitting, it

>Again you are assuming here that Zamora never looked back at
>the sky to follow where the object was going. But Zamora was
>a trained traffic cop and that obviously wasn't his MO.
>Whenever he had the opportunity, he was checking out what
>happened to the object, such as glancing over his shoulder as he
>was running away at the beginning. Again, it would take him but a
>fraction of a second to shift his gaze from the ground to sky
>to follow the object and then back again to the ground or his
>car.

>>may have already disappeared over the first rise (about 2500
>>feet from the car and over 100 feet higher than his vantage
>>point) and dropped down out of his sight.

>No, again this is you reinventing the situation instead of
>paying attention to Zamora's actual testimony. Zamora said he
>saw the object angle up steeply when it got about a mile away,
>not dip down or disappear behind a ridge, and saw it rapidly
>speed away and get small in the distance. To quote a
>section from Stanford's book (p. 30):

>"Zamora feels that the disappearance was due to distance, per
>se... 'It went away climbing up, fast into the distance.'
>...Shortly before disappearing into the distance, the object
>appeared as a bright, whitish oval getting smaller and smaller
>as it sped away, upward, and over the mountains."

Yes that's what he said later. Believe what you wish.

>This description is totally inconsistent with your scenario of
>the object disappearing behind a relatively close ridge.

His description doesn't sit well with me. His experience lasted
much longer than he estimated and that colored his story.

>>At that point Zamora
>>may have begun viewing some other object in the sky like a
>>bird or another airplane.

>Yeah right! More likely a pelican or flying pig.

I said "may have". I don't know what he was seeing but if the
Bean is the explanation for his sighting, he's not seeing an
object retreating at 1000 MPH.

>>If the "Lonnie and the Bean" account is correct,

>It isn't. It's obviously complete nonsense, a dime-a-dozen Net
>Shaggy Dog story. Nothing about it makes any sense or matches
>the facts of the case.

Everything in that story matches the facts of the case as far as
I can see. I wouldn't be so quick to judge. You haven't read the
book yet.

>>then the
>>trashed outer shell could still be in one of the arroyos
>>between the sighting site and box canyon. There are
>>roads in that region which are totally accessible and
>>mostly secluded where the "bean" could have landed again.

>Well, you are welcome to waste your time looking for the
>obviously nonexistent "Bean" craft built by those biker guys.

I doesn't cost much. And it wouldn't take more than a day. It
seems to me it beats pouring over old Reno entertainment pages.
I think it's worth a look but I had hope that maybe someone in
the Socorro area might be curious and take a look.

>>This might have given the

>>illusion that the craft had disappeared via 1000 MPH speed.

>Ah, the old "radical misperception" gambit. I knew it was only a
>matter of time before somebody tried that.

No, I was just trying to be kind; confabulation is what I was
thinking.

>>Ray Stanford relates that an Albuquerque resident called a
>>local TV station on that April afternoon, about 5:25 PM and
>>reported an egg shaped object traveling at low altitude and not
>>too fast, to the south (toward Socorro). About twenty minutes
>>later, a family driving north on Hwy 85 spotted an "ellipsoid"
>>craft that was very low to the ground, and as it crossed the
>>highway from the north east, almost hit their car antenna. They
>>saw it land to the west of them. They noticed a police car
>>heading in the direction of the object.

>Thank you for pointing out that there were indeed other
>witnesses to the egg-shaped craft and the landing besides
>Zamora.

>(In addition to noting other witnesses, Stanford also devotes a
>chapter to other sightings remarkably similar to Socorro, most
>of them from France from a decade earlier. No doubt the
>biker "bean" accounts for these as well.)

No, the sightings Ray includes don't match the LZ event
very well.
The Bean was probably a one-shot adventure.

>Stanford gives the time when Zamora first spotted the object as
>5:50, but I've seen 5:45 given elsewhere. Socorro is about 80
>miles south of Albuquerque. Thus the object probably traveled 80
>miles in 20-25 minutes from Albuquerque to Socorro, for an
>average speed of 190-240 mph.

No I can't explain or connect the two together unless the first
sighting was on the extreme south of Albuquerque and the time of
the sighting was off since the caller could have called quite
some time after the actual sighting. It may have taken some time
to get to a phone.

>Although this might be called a conventional speed that could be
>achieved by a propeller driven craft with wings or winglike
>airfoil, the Socorro craft had no wings and no external
>propeller. It was also a VTOL craft like a helicopter, which
>stays aloft by directing most of its thrust downward rather than
>sideways.

>Very fast military helicopters can achieve 200 mph speeds using
>very powerful and noisy engines, but the Socorro craft was
>described as completely silent once aloft and certainly with
>nothing like big helicopter blades. How do you reconcile a
>"Lonnie and the Bean" scenario with the silence of the craft and
>the absence of any obvious means of propulsion?

I can't. I don't know what the Bean sounded like or how it
worked. I'll know better when I read about it. As I stated
before, the Socorro event is not important to me and never has
been. I only revisited it because I trust Martin S's opinion and
the idea of a tethered device, and why we needed to study it,
intrigued me. It was only then that I went back over LZ's
testimony and realized that the timing was all wrong and that a
vehicle traveling less than 50 MPH could account for the
sighting. The Bean may not turn out to be the culprit, but your
time frames and calculations are questionable.

>>There are also two other witnesses who
>>observed the object landing and a cloud of dust, but it's
>>not clear from their testimony whether this was the first
>>landing that Zamora witnessed or the second landing that
>>might have happened if the craft crashed a second time.

>According to Stanford, the men were only 4000-4500 feet
>southwest of Zamora and the object and they were headed
>northeast on Highway 60, i.e. in the direction of Zamora and the
>object.

The men sighted the object while they were west of Socorro on
Hwy 60 but how far west is unknown. It was around six PM. One

witness saw it heading southwest and some dust, but the speed is unknown. I expect if it had been traveling at 1000 MPH, they would have noticed.

>There is no question that the landing they described was
>the same one described by Zamora. How you could think this would
>be linked to a second landing where the biker guys supposedly
>crashed is beyond me.

Show me the testimony that links their sighting with LZ's.

>Since you seem to have Stanford's book at hand, you should be
>paying attention to the actual details in the book instead of
>reinventing them in order to justify a "Lonnie and the Bean"
>scenario.

I have read Ray's book carefully and enjoyed it and have told him so several times. He's right about some things but wrong about others.

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

UFO Review issue 8 - February 2005

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 17:11:59 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:40:52 -0500
Subject: UFO Review issue 8 - February 2005

UFO Review, issue 8 February 2005 is now available at:

<http://www.uforeview.net>

Top left hand button on page marked "Current issue". As usual, a PDF download, this time at just over 3 mgs.

So what do we have? An interview with Lembit Opik, the Liberal/Democrat MP for Montgomery in the UK and the leading voice in Britain on NEOs. Lembit tells us what the government has done about the asteroid problem, what he's done, and what we can do. He also tells us he's convinced we're going to get whacked by something big sooner or later and we need to wake up! Wish the guy was my MP.

David Rudiak talks to us about Roswell, the Ramey memo, who's been "briefed", General Clark, NATO, and other topics. A wide ranging interview with an experienced, respected, intelligent researcher.

Writer Will Hart ("Genesis Race") gives us a well constructed argument against the sceptical cause and Sherryl Gottschall follows up her original piece on the problems facing ufologists with part 2, "Greater Challenges for the volunteer Ufologist". And we're extremely pleased to welcome Bill Hamilton to Review with the first installment of a series of articles entitled, "UFO Recognition."

We are also pleased to present Grant Cameron's Washington Presentation paper entitled "Glimpses of Disclosure".

We strip the mask off Kithra who has been writing for us since day one and we tell you a little bit about the lady who offers us her own thoughts on the S.E. Asian tsunami disaster.

"A reader" takes his courage in his hands and has sent us in a piece on "The Song of the Greys." We thank Robbie Jameson.

As we step over the edge into the world of unreality, "Dr. Bruce", who bares absolutely no similarity to any known living or deceased individual, joins our staff and answers letters from readers while Uncle Seth once again sits down with a group of people, in this instance very young children, and attempts to deal with what they throw at him. Indeed he does.

There's also a sensational revelation about who or what has been cleaning the solar panels on the Mars Opportunity Rover. Oh, there's something up there alright.

As usual, cartoons plus the usual silly madness.

Stuart

<http://www.uforeview.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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: UFO Reported Over Billerica - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 12:17:45 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:44:30 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Reported Over Billerica - Sandow

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers ->
>Date: Thursday, February 10, 2005 10:52 AM
>Subject: UFO Reported Over Billerica

>Source: The Wilmington Advocate - Concord, Massachusetts

><http://www2.townonline.com/wilmington/localRegional/view.bg?articleid=181743>

>02-10-05

>They Are Out There: UFO Reported Over Billerica

>By Margaret Smith
>Staff Writer

>Whatever it was that appeared in the cold skies over Billerica
>on Dec. 12, at least one observer was concerned enough to seek
>answers.

<snip>

This was an unusually intelligent news story. Congrats to Margaret Smith, who really took a lot of care to find out what investigating UFO reports is all 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 10](#)

Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 11:37:34 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:52:05 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -

>From: Michael Brownlee <michael.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 03:26:40 -0700
>Subject: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'

>The press release below briefly describes a very unusual book
>that may be of interest to readers here.

>The Allies of Humanity material is certainly controversial,
>often disturbing in its implications and deeply challenging in
>its urgency, but should not be ignored. It offers a perspective
>that deserves careful consideration and thorough investigation.

<snip>

Hi Michael,

Upon reading the cited press release, I have a question or two
or.....

How do you propose that we begin the "thorough investigation" of
the material?

It looks like a bunch of speculation, based on the "channeling"
experiences of one individual. What is there to investigate?

If this fellow is correct, how are we to avoid the inevitable?

If the problems of this world can now be explained as alien
intervention, does this not exonerate our leaders of any real
culpability? After all, you can barely describe a leaders
acquiescence to alien dominance as greed, when the alternative
is instant death by some ray or advanced technology. Why does
the current screwed-up-ness of the world have to be the fault of
aliens? Are we humans not capable enough of screwing things up?

When one asks the author how he knows the things he states are
true, what is his response...the aliens told me? How does he
know the ones he talks to aren't the liars with a hidden agenda,
trying to prevent us from allying with the "right" aliens?

This tome goes in my yellow file, right alongside Nancy and the
Zetas.

[[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: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 15:10:47 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:02:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51 - Ledger

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 20:58:44 -1000
>Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 14:28:05 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Large Colour Image Of Area 51

<snip>

>I also noticed that bump line but the odd thing is that this is
>the runway that they extended. I assumed that was to accomodate
>some form of heavier aircraft. I assumed that they would have
>been sure that the original stretch of runway was in good shape.
>Maybe they had some kind of unexpected sink in the base and it
>is closed for repair. This is just another Area 51 mystery and
>we'll have to see if the runway goes active again. Maybe they
>have completed whatever test program that required a longer
>runway.

Hi Josh,

I suspect that there is a flaw in that runway, which in general aviation would not amount to much - disregarding the bump - but might be dangerous to some sophisticated experimental aircraft with teething problems.

It looks as though the runway has not been in use for some time. Note the rubber tracks and scorch-marks on 34-14R. 32-14L is much cleaner, faded-weathered off.

And you make a good point, the newer aircraft designs have a shorter take-off run than the older birds. The F-22 - and possibly some other designs we don't know about - uses a slight downward deflection of its thrust-vectoring exhaust on takeoff, possibly accounting for some of the the heavy scorch-marks on the runway.

Best,

Don

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:17:48 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:04:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:14:18 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:44:00 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>>>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>>>with little contact with the outside world.

>>Stark irony _there_ when the truth seems to be that the air
>inside that little bubble seems to be of 'psychosocial'
>manufacture, too much nitrogen and not enough O2. In other
>words, you're hallucinating the high ground, Mr. Rimmer.

>Well, exactly. The notion that "most mainstream ufology exists
>in a small, insulated bubble, with little contact with the
>outside," is of course a witless ad hominem. It appears that
>since nobody else will congratulate them on their
>cosmopolitanism and wisdom, pelicanists are forced to do it for
>themselves.

Once again, Jerry, you leap to your keyboard without considering
what I said. "Most mainstream ufology" is rather different from
"Most mainstream ufologists". One thing that has become very
clear to me is that what people do, say or think in a ufological
context seems quite different to what they do, say or think in
other aspects of their lives. One example of this is the
question of abductions.

As an example: many ufologists believe that the abduction
phenomenon is caused by physical beings in physical craft
physically abducting humans and doing nasty things to them. It
also seems to be the opinion of some prominent abduction
researchers that there is nothing that anybody can do to stop
this from happening. Without challenging this opinion for the
moment, I must ask, how do these ufologists sleep at night if
they really believed this was happening?

The answer, I think, is because there is a disjunction between
their thinking as a ufologist and their thinking as a citizen. I
know Phil Klass (crosses self, waves garlic, etc.) was laughed
at for suggesting that Budd Hopkins should report abductions to
the FBI. Well, yes, I can see the problems, but, if ufology did
not exist in a "small, insulated bubble", what other option is
there? Just to go on reporting and recording these incidents,
and setting up therapy sessions so that it doesn't seem so bad
next time you're raped?

>We are to believe, one presumes, that by way of
>contrast with those uncool ufological Poindexters,

This is a word I have come across before in American usage. What exactly is a "Poindexter"?

>pelicanists
>are sophisticated, cosmopolitan men (and, far, far less often,
>women; the female of the species is rarely sighted within the
>flock) whose manifest brilliance only UFO nerds, our glasses
>held precariously together by masking tape while our pens leak
>ink into our wrinkled white shirts, would ever presume to
>question.

I'm sure I could never be as sophisticated as the Ivy League academics, important civil servants in Her Majesty's Government, and Upper-West-Side artists who comprise the UFO aristocracy.

>When pelicanists are reduced to squawking sentiments like the
>above, one can only infer that insults - and, depending as they
>do on the crudest and dopest of stereotypes, not even very
>interesting ones at that - are all they have left. It's really
>pretty sad when you think about it. It comes, I'm afraid, out of
>losing all those arguments on matters of actual substance.

Yes, I might well lose the arguments if anyone actually debated them on matters of substance, rather than emotional rants like the one above.

--
John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:36:38 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:06:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:48:37 -0400
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>><snip>

>>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>>with little contact with the outside world. One of the ways this
>>is manifested is in its inability to understand that some UFO
>>events - if they had in fact happened as described - would have
>>had a major impact on the outside world, and not be confined to
>>the 'paper trail' which many ufologists are so assiduous in
>>tracing.

>>Roswell, as generally accepted by many ufologists, represents a
>>major turning point in human history: an extraterrestrial
>>civilisation has come into contact with the major political,
>>scientific and industrial power on our planet. The earth's
>>greatest centre of scientific research suddenly found itself in
>>possession of a piece of advanced technology from another
>>planet.

>>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>>to believe.

>What colossal arrogance. Just how in the world do you or anyone
>else know what happened after Roswell? There is an enormous
>amount of material that is still classified from that era, but
>you can psychically determine that nothing relates to Roswell?
>Try reading my update on the Majestic 12 Documents at my website
>at:

>www.stanfriedman.com

>The Eisenhower Library still has 300,000 pages of classified
>material. The Truman Library has 45,000. The files of the USAF,
>CIA, NSC, DIA, NRO, NRL are still loaded with literally millions
>of classified pages, and you know John what isn't in them?
>Truly amazing.

I'm not talking about hundreds of thousands of files in archives
(and how many of that impressive number do actually have any
relevance to Roswell?) I'm talking about things that actually
happened in the outside world. Things affecting our everyday
life.

>>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>>the world is different today than it would have been it Roswell

>>hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>>was an event of negligible historical importance?

>>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

>The government realized there were new technologies to develop
>and to make sure their opponents didn't develop.

Such as? If the US Government was investigating alien technologies in the 1940s and 1950s there would be some evidence of this, not just a bundle of papers which might or might not mention Roswell. An enormous number of specialists in a dozen - a hundred - different disciplines would have been working flat out on the Roswell wreckage.

The US knew that the Soviets were developing the atom bomb because the output of research on related topics in technical journals, et., dried up. If the US was able to deduce that from observing such a closed and controlled society as the Stalinist Soviet Union, don't you think it might be possible to make similar deductions about US research into Roswell technology?

>Governments recognized that admitting the alien presence
>might well lead to an Earthling orientation, something no
>government wants.

I don't at all accept that presumption. Don't you also think that governments might be concerned where the next Roswell-style crash might take place, and might want to take some preparatory action to deal with such an event?

>The government realized that space is the place.

Are you saying that the space programmes of the USA and the USSR were only prompted by Roswell? Don't you think that security concerns, propaganda and prestige were the main motors on the space-race?

>The government
>realized it could lie through its teeth and get away with it

I think this was widely known long before 1947 and proven by events which had happened in the real world over many centuries, and more especially by events of the previous twenty years!

>by
>disinforming the press and the scientific community

Would this be the same scientific community as would be needed to perform the vast amount of research that the Roswell wreckage would generate?

>and ridiculing witnesses... gives confidence in manipulation.
>I am not saying the world is better for it.

>Maybe you should ask the beliefs of those who have studied the
>evidence... same goes for MJ-12.

>It is easier to say that there is no evidence than to examine
>that evidence. I, for one, vote 4 square for both and I have
>spent an enormous amount of effort studying both, researching
>both, dealing with the arguments of the negativists.

I love the way it's assumed that sceptical ufologists come to their conclusions by some random process. I don't suppose it could have occurred to you that we might have actually studied the evidence and then come to our conclusions as a result of what we have studied. Far easier to assume that we're just wierdos whose brains are wired wrongly, probably as a result of some genetic disability.

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:15:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:09:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - White

>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 19:03:13 EST
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased

<snip>

How would you receive a list of suggested talking points, and maybe one sentence each summarizing how the Subject will answer? Say, 3 pages maximum? Prepared by the Subject ahead of time?

I've done that for a number of talk radio hosts and generally, they seem to appreciate that. Would this reduce the likelihood of negative surprises?

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 13:40:15 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:12:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 03:35:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:35:25 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>I think a better bet would be local #47 for Los Angeles. They
>>were traveling up from that general area. There are other locals
>>around there however.

>I missed that bit. I thought they were from Nevada.

>>If they are anything like local #6 (San Francisco) where I was
>>a member, they won't have good records. Those get all messed up
>>and eventually discarded as union officials dig thru the safe to
>>rifle the general fund.

>The universal problem. Same here at 571.
>But still an old union membership book might survive.

Hi Don: I wish I could dredge up an old membership book too! I
would look up Anton LaVey for one thing and post that for
chuckles.

Anyhow, Dave Rudiak has nailed down the important fact that
there was Dick Drake trio, and that he did indeed come up and
play in Reno on the date(s) in question. Union membership is
assumed, but not really necessary.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:46:07 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:14:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:31:04 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:14:18 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>><snip>

>>>>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>>>>with little contact with the outside world.

>>Well, exactly. The notion that "most mainstream ufology exists
>>in a small, insulated bubble, with little contact with the
>>outside," is of course a witless ad hominem. It appears that
>>since nobody else will congratulate them on their
>>cosmopolitanism and wisdom, pelicanists are forced to do it for
>>themselves. We are to believe, one presumes, that by way of
>>contrast with those uncool ufological Poindexters, pelicanists
>>are sophisticated, cosmopolitan men (and, far, far less often,
>>women; the female of the species is rarely sighted within the
>>flock)

>Wow! You've noticed that, too, with regard to the general dearth
>of female pelicanists! Why do you think that is? I think it
>might have something to do with the better balance of their
>right and left brains due to the increased thickness of the
>female corpus collosum! [g]. In other words, just another easy
>demonstration of the aggregate superiority of your garden
>variety double X'er. <lol>

You want to be careful there, Mr Lehmborg. A mathematics
professor at Harvard (I think) got into a lot of hot water for
saying there was a difference between mens' and womens' brain.
One feminist academic complained that the claim made her
physically sick and she could hardly breath!

I don't notice a great number of female ufologists, either. Of
course there are some, but seriously outnumbered by the male
variety. Why do you think that is, Mr Lehmborg?

--
John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:52:55 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:15:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:22:48 -0800
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>>the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell
>>hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>>was an event of negligible historical importance?

>>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

>I hope you aren't suggesting that most mainstream ufologists
>consider Roswell the crash of an alien space craft.

>Sure some still do, but if I sense this correctly, they are
>_far_ from a majority unless you are counting all the internet
>pinheads as 'mainstream'.

>Maybe we should take a poll right on this list. I could be wrong
>too. Personally, I do not think Roswell 1947 was the crash of
>an alien space craft.

I would have thought that many ufologists take the view that a
piece of genuine extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell. I
have seen very few suggestions, on this list or elsewhere, that
anything else was involved. The only serious suggestion for
"not-an-alien-spaceship" that seems to have been considered is
the Mogul balloon explanation, and that has been the subject of
endless criticism here and elsewhere.

What do you think it might have been other than an
extraterrestrial craft? Be very careful when you answer that
question: you might find yourself being turned into a
skeptibunking klasskurtzian pelicanist!

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:57:49 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:16:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:05:04 EST
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>If "they" were "millions or hundreds of millions" of years ahead
>of us technologically there is simply no way any of their
>"spaceships" (if they even needed to use any) would crash and/or
>fail to be retrieved by them to keep us from getting our hands
>on their technology. Only a technology that is close to our
>level could be expected to "goof" up like that. And we would
>still have to answer the question why their stealth technology
>would allow us even to see them. A better explanation is that
>"they" are actually slightly behind us in technology and
>simply have extremely long life spans and thus can make long
>interstellar journeys in primitive spacecraft. So in that case
>they still would use spaceships that could crash once in a
>while.

An intriguing suggestion. It would certainly explain the propensity of UFOs to crash all over the place, and the way people keep coming across occupants trying to fix them by lonely roads late at night! I think it would make a great spoof SF film - the aliens arrive, to much ballyhoo, at the White House and it turns out they're rather dim. I suppose if I was being anti-America (pace, Jerry) it could turn out that they got along very well indeed with Dubya!

--
John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 22:03:04 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:17:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 18:07:24 -0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>>to believe.

>You may find it hard to believe, but I'm afraid I don't. I know
>there's a popular view that extraordinary events must always
>have extraordinary consequences, but actual human behavior often
>turns out to be much at variance with what one might expect.

>For example, if I were to ask people on this List how they think
>they might react if they were in a building which caught fire,
>I'm sure many people would say "I'd run like mad for the fire
>exit". But when the psychologist David Canter examined how
>people had behaved during a real life event - the King's Cross
>Underground fire - he discovered that many people were extremely
>reluctant to abandon their normal routine behavior, even when at
>one point smoke was clearly visible inside the station. It seems
>from this and from other examples that human beings can be very
>resistant to accepting that the proper order of things is being
>violated, and often very slow to react when it is.

I think I've already replied to enough comments on this, so I'll
be very brief: I'm not talking about individual reactions, I
totally agree with you about that, but the technical and
historical consequences of such a major event.

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

The Fortean Nailgun

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 14:07:08 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:19:35 -0500
Subject: The Fortean Nailgun

Alien Implants, Anachronistic Artifacts, and the Fortean Nailgun

by Mac Tonnies

From:

Man Finds Mystery Nail in His Neck

<http://abcnews.go.com/GMA/Health/story?id=480976&page=1>

"Yun said there is no way Villagomez could have swallowed the nail and also has no explanation for how it may have gotten in his neck. 'I hadn't seen anything like that before,' he said."

As the editor of The Anomalist notes, this case is reminiscent of the "alien implant" phenomenon, in which suspected "abductees" discover foreign objects embedded in their bodies. The few "implants" that have been removed - by a rather gullible podiatrist - share some interesting compositional similarities but have left the issue naggingly open to dismissal. (Of course, in theory, that could be an integral part of the alien plot. Villagomez's case suggests "they" might have decided to ramp up the absurdity that accompanies abductions by disguising their implants as common objects.)

"Implants" - whatever they are - are outnumbered by "scoop marks" and shallow craters similar to those left by punch biopsies. Pressed for an explanation, abductees recall - typically under hypnosis - alien beings taking tissue samples, apparently for a far-reaching genetic/tracking program.

Scoop marks and related blemishes are intriguing but don't fare well as evidence of anything in particular; almost anyone can find an anomalous scar on her body if she looks carefully enough. For example, I have a series of parallel grooves near my shoulder; they appeared suddenly, but I don't know how. Aliens? I can't prove ETs aren't the cause, but I strongly doubt it. In a similar vein, I once had a hard spherical object removed from my earlobe; the dermatologist who did the cutting didn't find it at all remarkable (although I do wish I'd thought to have him keep it for me).

But I'm genuinely puzzled about the nail in Villagomez's neck. Coincidentally, generations of archaeologists and miners have (unwittingly) found a plethora of tooled metal objects embedded in solid rock, forcefully implying the artifacts are millions of years old. Some researchers, notably Michael Cremo, have cited such anachronisms as evidence of a remarkably ancient civilization.

But the nail in Villagomez' neck suggests another (equally weird) explanation: Maybe, for unknown reasons, small metal objects are uniquely susceptible to random teleportation. Perhaps there's an ongoing, invisible traffic of nails, ball bearings and occasional jewelry (see Cremo and Thompson's "Forbidden Archaeology") that we notice only seldomly . . . if at all. Alternatively, "impossible" archaeological finds might

signal flaws in the universe's causal structure, indicating that our reality is in fact a simulation or some sort of consensual dream.

Humans are quite adept at ignoring the "impossible." Comically enough, we deign to acknowledge it only when it happens to manifest in a man's neck - metaphorically stuffed down our collective throat.

For more weirdness, see Posthuman Blues at:

<http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

=====

Mac Tonnies (machot.nul)

MTVI: <http://www.mactonnies.com>

Posthuman Blues: <http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

Now available!: "After the Martian Apocalypse"
<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/074348293X>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 17:49:37 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:22:11 -0500
Subject: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

Hi -

I listen to Austin, Texas broadcaster Alex Jones quite a bit. He makes video documentaries as one way to support his show. Recently he mentioned that his latest, which I believe is a couple of hours in length and is estimated at a production cost of \$22,000.

This List seems to have quite a few concerned and extremely well versed ufologists, who are not very happy with what is made for TV on this issue.

Is there enough interest to produce a 'Ufologist's own' video?

This could be sold to fund further work, and could serve as a template and maybe even a pilot for possible airing on TV. This keeps Alex Jones' busy activism operation and shows rolling. If not mainstream channels, then perhaps community cable channels.

There is quite a bit of interest reported in some video DVDs about the 9/11 attacks, for example. And these DVDs are finding special interest overseas, where versions in other languages are being produced.

Alex has many volunteers buying his videos and getting them aired on community cable channels, and even to gatherings of the interested public. He also keeps his production costs low by making use of volunteer producers from his local cable TV channel's facilities.

Instead of the costly flying of production crews to visit people to be interviewed, it's likely volunteer producers could be found at different community TV channels who could set up the actual interviews and either carry them out, or, have an established ufologist do the interviews by telephone.

Not quite as glitzy as Peter Jennings, but the content is the important thing.

And this would be one way to really put expolitics to the fore, without having to butt heads with mainstream producers.

These days, it's a lot easier to home brew your own documentary, and I wonder if the time is right for Ufology to have 'it's own brand' out there?

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 18:42:38 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:26:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Goldstein

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 12:37:23 -1000
>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 00:41:52 -0800
>>Subject: Salla & Bassett

><snip>

>Aloha Josh, thank you for expressing your desire for some clear
>thinking in Ufology. I welcome any effort to bring clarity to
>some of these critical topics under investigation and to clarify
>the different approaches to those doing research in the field of
>Ufology. It is not my intention at all to dilute Ufology by
>offering a wide range of unsubstantiated conjectures, but to
>instead offer analyses of testimonies and other evidence that
>point the field to some serious problems that are not
>sufficiently addressed by many UFO researchers using
>inappropriate research methodologies.

<snip>

>Finally you conclude, "Your efforts are a sham, pure garbage in
>my opinion." If one applies the same standards you apply to my
>research, to your own concluding statement, where is the
>objective evidence supporting your conjecture? Do you offer any
>hard empirical evidence that you laud as exemplary UFO research?
>No, you don't, what you instead offer are your opinions about my
>research which is purely conjecture on your part concerning an
>investigatory process for which you show little patience or
>regard. You also have shown little understanding for some
>important nuances in how a social scientist might investigate
>the testimonies of those offering 'soft data' on the UFO
>phenomenon.

>Let me say in conclusion that the investigation of 'soft data'
>in terms of whistleblower testimonies is a litmus test for
>Ufology. Will Ufology fully mature as a field by incorporating
>social science methodologies in investigating such testimonies,
>or will Ufology dig its head into the sand insisting on 'hard
>data' that can be measured and quantified, and thereby dismiss
>as inconclusive the testimonies of many whistleblowers? It's
>clear you have made your choice, my feeling is that many on the
>forum sincerely want Ufology to grow and are sympathetic to the
>approach I have to offer. I wouldn't be posting on this forum if
>I didn't believe many here are open to taking Ufology to a new
>level.

Dr. Salla,

In my opinion the above is just rationalization for faulty
methodology.

I am trained as a detective using standards of investigation
that are necessary to develop a case that will stand scrutiny in
a court of law. These methods are entirely different than social

sciences, political, and intelligence analysis. Soft evidence is only a tool in investigation to further the development of hard evidence that will withstand legal scrutiny.

In those terms your effort is a misguided failure. Your work does not even hold up to the standards of professional journalism.

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:22:19 -1000
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:29:01 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -

>From: Michael Brownlee <michael.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 03:26:40 -0700
>Subject: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'

>The press release below briefly describes a very unusual book
>that may be of interest to readers here.

>The Allies of Humanity material is certainly controversial,
>often disturbing in its implications and deeply challenging in
>its urgency, but should not be ignored. It offers a perspective
>that deserves careful consideration and thorough investigation.

>While it is evident enough that humanity is being engaged by
>extraterrestrial forces, we have little verifiable information
>on their motivations and intentions, and thus we have no sound
>basis for appropriate response. I believe the Allies of Humanity
>material provides a powerful "Rosetta stone" that now makes it
>possible - taking into account all available research - to at
>last unravel the UFO/ET enigma and to begin to formulate
>strategies for dealing with this profound Encounter.

>Respectfully,

>Michael Brownlee
>www.CosmicIntel.com

>-----

>FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE...

>BOULDER, CO - Extraterrestrials not only account for mysterious
>UFO sightings and abductions, but may also be secretly
>exploiting human conflict and stimulating the rise of radical
>fundamentalism throughout the world.

>A series of cosmic surveillance briefings, published as The
>Allies of Humanity, Book Two: Human Unity, Freedom and the
>Hidden Reality of Contact, by award-winning author Marshall Vian
>Summers, reveal a global "Intervention" by commercially-driven
>extraterrestrial forces determined to gradually gain control of
>planet Earth and its resources. The briefings demonstrate how
>ETs are influencing human affairs to advance their cause.

>"We are all being marched to war by forces from beyond our world
>who seek to divide and weaken the human family for their own
>benefit," says Summers.

<snip>

It sounds like this guy should be added to the upcoming 14th
annual International UFO Freak Show in Laughlin, Nevada. He
would also be a hit at the X-Conference.

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Johnson

From: Donald A. Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 23:18:43 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:33:18 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Johnson

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:48:25 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 08:02:38 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:27:14 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

><snip>

>>Somehow I don't think the problems facing the UFO field will be
>>solved by a software program.

>Agreed. The internet is not a solution to any problem. It is
>simply a tool to be used or not.

>There is no question that amassing a valuable database of vetted
>UFO cases is perhaps an impossibility. I feel confident however,
>that attempts to consolidate, categorize, and archive details of
>the cases from known archives, and current investigative efforts
>(not just the lists of anonymous UFO reports).

>Just as we have seen in trying to amalgamate the various
>intelligence agencies data sources, it is not easy. It may not
>even be possible if the most recent example is any indication
>(FBI).

>But these things aren't undertaken because they are easy. Jerome
>Clark did it. Project Blue Book did it. Many other on-the-ground
>researchers have their cases.

>What would be good would be simply a method for consolidating
>this data. Perhaps utilizing an existing method...like NUFORC,
>or HBCCUFO, and taking time to convert those other databases to
>the same format.

>At any rate, there are many out there building UFO databases.
>Why not try to get everyone using the same "language"?

<snip>

I have two comments to add to this dialogue:

1) as the archivist for UFOCAT, I want to make a pitch that UFO
researchers contribute cases to UFOCAT. The UFOCAT database is
now at 185,000 entries. I don't think there is anything else
comparable. Larry Hatch does an excellent job of vetting UFO
reports, and the U database is certainly worth having as a
resource, but it is only one-tenth the size of UFOCAT. Also,
from version to version Larry occasionally drops cases, and I am
not sure why - perhaps he could enlighten me?

2) NUFORC's archived monthly webpages are a good source for raw reports, but information content is, on average, pretty darned low. There isn't sufficient information to categorize most cases as as anymore than "insufficient information", although Peter Davenport at least attempts to flag and filter out the obvious cases of Venus or spacecraft debris re-entries. Nevertheless, with the latest version of Excel it has been much easier to download his archives and convert them to UFOCAT format in the Access database.

Donald A. Johnson
Khon Kaen, Thailand

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 11:23:55 +0100 (CET)
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:36:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
>Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>INEXPLICATA
>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
>02.08.05

>Source: Terra.cl
>Date: 02.08.05

><http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

>[Click 'Ir A Galeria' below thumbnail]

>At Iquique
>Incredible UFO Photo In Northern Chile

>This extraordinary chance photo was taken in the northern part
>of our country and shows the transit of an unidentified flying
>object (TERRA.cl)

<snip>

The photos in the link:

<http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

clicking on Galeria, were taken in Valparaiso (Chile) on October 10, 2004, by Manuel Aguirre, photographer of El Mercurio newspaper, and they show a kind of lens flare. See:

http://www.ovniaventura.cl/investigacion/ovni_valparaiso.htm

The object was not visually observed, it just appeared when the pictures were computer-downloaded.

These photos do not relate to the news report above.

Regards,

V-J

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:42:31 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:42:31 -0500
Subject: Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call

Source: The Australian - Sydney NSW

<http://tinyurl.com/7xkg2>

02-11-05

Scientists Are Willing To Wager That ET Will Call

February 11, 2005

Are we alone in the universe? Definitely not, say scientists such as Seth Shostak, senior astronomer with the SETI Institute in Mountain View, California.

For him the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI, of course) is likely to hit paydirt, just as the search for planets beyond our solar system did. Already more than 150 have been found.

The discovery of those extrasolar planets fuels Shostak's passion to find ET. "When I was a kid, planet formation was widely thought to be the consequence of a close 'fender bender' between the sun and another star. If so, then planets would be rarer than rhinos in Australia," he says.

Shostak isn't troubled by the fact that planet hunters haven't so far found a world that would support life as we know it: watery, cloaked by a protective atmosphere and nestled at just the right distance from a warming star such as our sun.

That will change, he says, as the technology improves: "I'm optimistic that we'll find that Earth-like worlds are as common as click beetles."

That means, Shostak confidently says, that the odds that something smart is out there are very good indeed. What's more, he believes the chances that SETI searchers will eventually pick up radio signals from the home world of our cosmic cousins are also good.

Given that astronomer Frank Drake launched the first SETI search about 40 years ago and nobody has thus far been heard from, when will Shostak and his colleagues make contact? "The answer is some time close to the year 2025," he says. "I'll bet you a flat white on that!"

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

UFO Sighting In Chatteris First Of The Year

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:45:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:45:35 -0500
Subject: UFO Sighting In Chatteris First Of The Year

Source: The Wisbech Standard - Wisbech, Cambridgeshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/69xyt>

02-10-05

UFO Sighting In Chatteris First Of The Year

Strange, bright lights seen from the sky in Chatteris were reported to the Ministry of Defence last month and was one of Britain's first reported UFO sightings this year.

This observation, which was reported by a member of the public on Saturday, January 15, was one of a number of cases revealed from records of unidentified flying objects released by the MoD's UFO unit.

Also, that night another similar sighting was submitted from Whitstable, Kent and a 'flying saucer' was spotted over Stoke-on-Trent.

What was seen in the sky at Chatteris is not described in thorough detail in the report, and where the lights came from still remains a mystery. But when the Cambs Times asked people in Chatteris about the sighting, some said they saw a number of bright lights in the sky at around the time the report was submitted.

Details of last year's unidentified flying objects were released to two national newspapers following a request to the MoD under the new Freedom of Information Act.

From the information released, it was revealed the MoD's UFO unit received 88 reports from military staff and members of the public concerned about strange objects in British skies.

Other reports in May last year include 'a bright, pulsing, spider-looking object', which was seen in King's Lynn and a UFO 'which had grooves and windows' but no room for humans in Surrey.

The MoD have said all UFO sightings are examined incase what was seen might have a defence significance, but only a handful of recent reports have needed further investigation, and none of which required further investigation.

Many of the reports were dismissed by experts as meteor showers and other astrological phenomena, but not all sightings are able to be fully explained.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 11](#)

What To Tell The Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:56:26 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:56:26 -0500
Subject: What To Tell The Aliens

Source: MSNBC - Cosmic Log

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/3217961/>

02-09-05

What To Tell The Aliens

For decades, researchers involved in the search for extraterrestrial intelligence have puzzled over how to code (and decode) messages meant for other civilizations. That goes for science-fiction tales such as "Contact" as well as a long list of real-life attempts to send messages, beginning with the Pioneer plaque and the Arecibo message in the early 1970s.

Such messages usually use intricate coding, including hieroglyphs that refer to the wavelength of the hydrogen transition and mathematical functions. But Seth Shostak, senior astronomer at the California-based SETI Institute, suggests that you needn't bother with all that cosmic cryptography. Streaming a cached copy of the Internet should do just fine, he says.

"What we should send is the content of the Google servers on a light beam," Shostak told me. "Don't worry about the coding. That's like the artists in the Lascaux cave worrying about how to paint an antelope so that anthropologists could figure it out 17,000 years later."

Shostak bases that strategy on the idea that any civilization receiving the message is likely to be far more advanced than ours =97 after all, we've been capable of transmitting signals to the stars for only a few decades. Thus, E.T. and company should be smart enough to figure out the digital encoding on their own.

"If there are truly sophisticated societies out there, that may not be a problem," Shostak said.

OK, so maybe the aliens would see our civilization's seamy side as well as the lofty images we'd like to convey =97 but at least we'd be providing a realistic representation of our society, without revealing the secrets or horrors that are too hot for the search engines.

But is it realistic to upload huge chunks of data to distant stars? That was the subject of a research paper Shostak presented a few months ago, titled "Limits on Interstellar Messages" (Here's the PDF version of the abstract). Shostak found that it all depends on how you transmit, and how much.

Some scenarios require more electrical power than the current demand for the entire state of California. Others require a transmitting antenna half as wide as Earth itself. On the other end of the scale, Shostak figures that a highly focused infrared laser signal could be sent out by a square mile's worth of transmitting surface and just 10 watts of power.

Shostak said that under the theoretically optimal conditions, it would take less than a tenth of a second to send out the equivalent of the Encyclopedia Britannica =97 a mere 5 billion bytes, far less than the quadrillions of bytes building up on the Internet. That would make it possible to "ping" a million stars capable of supporting life, delivering a digital encyclopedia for each star system to peruse.

Shostak sees that as the most efficient way to send out a beacon letting other civilizations know they're not alone. But this reasoning doesn't apply merely to transmitting signals. "It also suggests that SETI researchers should consider looking for stars whose infrared luminosity regularly spikes," Shostak observed.

He laid out yet another potential strategy for interstellar contact: The aliens might set up their transmitters so that they shoot out tightly focused signals, in a direction exactly opposite from that of an interesting cosmic object such as a pulsar. That way, another civilization studying the pulsar would pick up E.T.'s signal as well.

For that reason, pulsars could be among the first targets for observation when the initial group of antennas in the Allen Telescope Array begins operations later this year, Shostak said. "You know that the aliens will be studying pulsars, too," Shostak said.

Some researchers disagree with the whole idea of sending out signals, saying that the best way to contact other spacefaring civilizations is to send out cosmic messages in a bottle. What would you want to tell E.T., and how would you do it? We've addressed this subject before, but this is another opportunity to let me know what you think. I'll publish a selection of your suggestions on Friday.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 04:44:02 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 07:48:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:52:55 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:22:48 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>I would have thought that many ufologists take the view that a
>piece of genuine extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell.

Many? Yes, but that depends on your sample. The weenie websites
take Roswell as gospel. I was referring to the membership of
this list, and not all of them really.

>I have seen very few suggestions, on this list or elsewhere,
>that anything else was involved. The only serious suggestion
>for "not-an-alien-spaceship" that seems to have been
>considered is the Mogul balloon explanation, and that has
>been the subject of endless criticism here and elsewhere.

>What do you think it might have been other than an
>extraterrestrial craft? Be very careful when you answer that
>question: you might find yourself being turned into a
>skeptibunking klasskurtzian pelicanist!

I can only guess, and poorly at that.

I'm still willing to consider a (then) very secret Mogul
balloon, or something similar.

Another idea, admittedly half-baked, is some sort of atomic
apparatus, extremely top secret, which was mistakenly dropped
in the desert.

At least that might explain the secrecy, the "UFO crash" as a
very poorly chosen cover which immediately blew up in their
faces. It would also explain a seemingly flawed Mogul cover
story, if that's what it was.

Roswell AAF was our atomic airfield at the time. If this is far-
fetched, then so be it. I'm only tossing it out as one
possibility.

If someone wants to call me a skeptibunker after 20 years of
cataloging UFO sightings, some of which I find highly
interesting, they are welcome to do so. I'm not discussing the
pinheads here.

It remains my impression that a majority of serious ufologists,
Friedman excepted of course, no longer consider 'Roswell' the
crash of an alien spacecraft. Again, I would like a show
of hands, yea or nay, in case I'm wrong in this.

- Larry

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:17:54 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 07:50:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmberg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:17:48 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:14:18 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Alfred Lehmberg <alienview.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 13:44:00 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>><snip>

>>>>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>>>>with little contact with the outside world.

>>>>Stark irony there when the truth seems to be that the air
>>>>inside that little bubble seems to be of 'psychosocial'
>>manufacture, too much nitrogen and not enough O2. In other
>>words, you're hallucinating the high ground, Mr. Rimmer.

>>Well, exactly. The notion that "most mainstream ufology exists
>>in a small, insulated bubble, with little contact with the
>>outside," is of course a witless ad hominem. It appears that
>>since nobody else will congratulate them on their
>>cosmopolitanism and wisdom, pelicanists are forced to do it for
>>themselves.

>Once again, Jerry, you leap to your keyboard without considering
>what I said. "Most mainstream ufology" is rather different from
>"Most mainstream ufologists".

Oh, what terminal velocity monkey paffle! You're only splitting
this hair to sound reasonable to the fence-sitters. Moreover, if
Mr. Clark leaps to his keyboard that would still trump banging
on it with his forehead the way you do.

Back on leaping to the keyboard, I'm certain that nothing could
be further from the truth. I'm confident that Mr. Clark comes to
the keyboard out of a sense of duty compelling him to play your
tedious game of ufological "whack a mole" so your lot won't be
able to distract the fence sitter altogether!

>One thing that has become very
>clear to me is that what people do, say or think in a ufological
>context seems quite different to what they do, say or think in
>other aspects of their lives. One example of this is the
>question of abductions.

You only point out the obvious, Mr. Rimmer. No revelation here, by any means. Reasonable persons can still contemplate an infinity of space, time, and surface area implied by a night sky, and still engineer the contrived necessity of keeping food in the fridge and socks in the sock drawer. You would do well to remember that man won't be living by bread alone, Sir.

>As an example: many ufologists believe that the abduction
>phenomenon is caused by physical beings in physical craft
>physically abducting humans and doing nasty things to them. It
>also seems to be the opinion of some prominent abduction
>researchers that there is nothing that anybody can do to stop
>this from happening. Without challenging this opinion for the
>moment, I must ask, how do these ufologists sleep at night if
>they really believed this was happening?

Not very well, much of the time, I would suspect, given that they were still working out a way to adapt to reality. Consider the inmates at Auschwitz living in a reality of being taken in the night to perform as some kind of lab rat. They got their sleep, even if it wasn't good sleep.

>The answer, I think, is because there is a disjunction between
>their thinking as a ufologist and their thinking as a citizen. I
>know Phil Klass (crosses self, waves garlic, etc.)

...And throw some salt, Sir! The reality of this enemy of science and rationality is well known and not moved by your attempted obfuscation that he was just an honest skeptic valiantly combating thinking's humbuggery... He is not.

>was laughed
>at for suggesting that Budd Hopkins should report abductions to
>the FBI.

...And rightfully so... laughing as hard as the FBI when they get the report.

>Well, yes, i can see the problems,

No... I don't think you, remotely, do...

>but, if ufology did
>not exist in a "small, insulated bubble", what other option is
>there? Just to go on reporting and recording these incidents,
>and setting up therapy sessions so that it doesn't seem so bad
>next time you're raped?

Where do you get this stuff? This passes for thoughtfulness on your side of the pond? It remains that there are a lot of good persons who DO think they are being raped, so we can only hope they take your suggestion to heart, and actually DO feel better about it next time. Additionally the therapy, reporting, and recording on all aspects of ufology continues to invalidate your thoughtlessness, becomes more top-heavy with each passing day, and I'm sure contributes to your sweaty top lip, Sir, whether you admit it or not.

>>We are to believe, one presumes, that by way of
>>contrast with those uncool ufological Poindexters,

>This is a word I have come across before in American usage. What
>exactly is a "Poindexter"?

Substitute the word "Mootpooter," Mr. Rimmer, and then read it in context. It's quite plain, as you know, and you only use this feeble distraction to break the rhythm of your explication so you can appear more clever. Busted!

>>pelicanists
>>are sophisticated, cosmopolitan men (and, far, far less often,
>>women; the female of the species is rarely sighted within the
>>flock) whose manifest brilliance only UFO nerds, our glasses
>>held precariously together by masking tape while our pens leak
>>ink into our wrinkled white shirts, would ever presume to
>>question.

>I'm sure I could never be as sophisticated as the Ivy League
>academics, important civil servants in Her Majesty's Government,
>and Upper-West-Side artists who comprise the UFO aristocracy.

Still, you would pretend to try.

>>When pelicanists are reduced to squawking sentiments like the
>>above, one can only infer that insults - and, depending as they
>>do on the crudest and dopiest of stereotypes, not even very
>>interesting ones at that - are all they have left. It's really
>>pretty sad when you think about it. It comes, I'm afraid, out of
>>losing all those arguments on matters of actual substance.

>Yes, I might well lose the arguments if anyone actually debated
>them on matters of substance, rather than emotional rants like
>the one above.

You beg for substance you don't provide yourself Mr. Rimmer! You
troubleshoot confidence you don't have, obfuscate research
contrary to your world view, trivialize evidence that
invalidates your hubris, and then want to provide steam power in
an information age. You're the disease, Sir, not the cure. As I
said before, you hallucinate your rationality and the high
ground of same.

Oh - and sorry if this was a little too impassioned for your
genteel British sensibilities. I imagine Tom Paine was so far up
your founder's nose they felt his boot heels on their sweat
beaded top lips, too.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:46:02 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 07:52:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:46:07 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:31:04 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:14:18 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>><snip>

>>>>>Most mainstream ufology exists in a small, insulated bubble,
>>>>>with little contact with the outside world.

>>>>Well, exactly. The notion that "most mainstream ufology exists
>>>>in a small, insulated bubble, with little contact with the
>>>>outside," is of course a witless ad hominem. It appears that
>>>>since nobody else will congratulate them on their
>>>>cosmopolitanism and wisdom, pelicanists are forced to do it for
>>>>themselves. We are to believe, one presumes, that by way of
>>>>contrast with those uncool ufological Poindexters, pelicanists
>>>>are sophisticated, cosmopolitan men (and, far, far less often,
>>>>women; the female of the species is rarely sighted within the
>>>>flock)

>>>>>Wow! You've noticed that, too, with regard to the general dearth
>>>>>of female pelicanists! Why do you think that is? I think it
>>>>>might have something to do with the better balance of their
>>>>>right and left brains due to the increased thickness of the
>>>>>female corpus collosum! [g]. In other words, just another easy
>>>>>demonstration of the aggregate superiority of your garden
>>>>>variety double X'er. <lol>

>>>>>You want to be careful there, Mr Lehmborg. A mathematics
>>>>>professor at Harvard (I think) got into a lot of hot water for
>>>>>saying there was a difference between mens' and womens' brain.

And as it is with UFOs, ignoring a reality is not all that
effective at making it go away, Mr. Rimmer. Men and women have
different brains, the difference, I've read, may provide for
more communicational exchange between the brain hemispheres, and
this in turn provides for a balance, I understand, between the
hemispheres that men can't have. Smarter men and women than you
and I detect in things like this a real science, Sir, that goes
where the data goes and not where Mr. Rimmer would drive it...
on this subject and on the subject of UFOs.

>>>>>One feminist academic complained that the claim made her

>physically sick and she could hardly breath!

One can hardly account for the attitudes of individuals, Sir.
I, myself, wonder about you.

>I don't notice a great number of female ufologists, either. Of
>course there are some, but seriously outnumbered by the male
>variety. Why do you think that is, Mr Lehmborg?

I've not noticed that difference as much as you obviously have,
Mr. Rimmer. I've as high regard for as many female ufologists
as male ones, and essayed extensively on their work. In fact, I
find the more selfless approach they have preferable. They
don't "get in the way" like many males can. Be that as it may,
if there is a dearth I suspect it's for the same reasons that
put glass ceilings on career tracks for females, and pays them
75 cents on the dollar.

Why do you think that is, Mr. Rimmer?

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Salla

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 03:46:39 -1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 07:54:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Salla

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 18:42:38 -0800
>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

<snip>

>Dr. Salla,

>In my opinion the above is just rationalization for faulty
>methodology.

>I am trained as a detective using standards of investigation
>that are necessary to develop a case that will stand scrutiny in
>a court of law. These methods are entirely different than social
>sciences, political, and intelligence analysis. Soft evidence is
>only a tool in investigation to further the development of hard
>evidence that will withstand legal scrutiny.

>In those terms your effort is a misguided failure. Your work
>does not even hold up to the standards of professional
>journalism.

Aloha Josh, your response reveals your lack of familiarity with the full scope of social science methods which examine both hard and soft evidence. Examining soft evidence in the form of testimonies is a valid way of doing research and coming up with conclusions that are rigorous, and which form the basis of analyses that can inform policy makers. As a detective you know the importance of gaining witness testimony to support a case. I'm sure you have come across cases which consist primarily of witness testimonies and where there may be a lack of hard evidence. Doesn't a jury deliberate on both forms of evidence and sometimes give testimonies sufficient weight to reach a decision where hard evidence is lacking? I've investigated human rights violations in third world countries and extensively interviewed individuals who suffered violations in those countries. In my field work, I used the testimony of those I interviewed to build my conclusions and form my overall analysis. In one country I was prevented by the authorities from withdrawing hard evidence in the form of photos, letters, etc., and actually arrested and searched for hard evidence I may have had. Organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch regularly send individuals into such countries to gain evidence in the form of testimonies without necessarily being able to gain hard evidence which may be difficult to extract. Soft evidence or 'soft facts' are a valid way of doing research and forming an analysis so I'm puzzled why you and others do not wish to acknowledge this, and simply dismiss the work of myself and others as unsubstantiated conjecture.

An example more pertinent to this forum is the work of John Mack who examined 'soft evidence' in the form of the testimonies of 'abductees' and developed an overall methodology with which to draw his analyses. His work had very little hard evidence yet was quite rigorous in terms of the methodology he used. Others such as David Jacobs and Budd Hopkins do similar things in their analyses, is all the research of those investigating abductee testimonies unsubstantiated conjecture? In my very first Study

Paper and first chapter of my Exopolitics book I present my methodology. Basically, I identify seven sources of evidence (whistleblowers, sightings, contactees/abductees, remote viewers, independent archeologists, channelled information, etc.,) and rank these in terms of their persuasiveness, and then build my case. This is the basis of the analyses I build in later papers/chapters. You of course are free to challenge my methodology and identify weaknesses and express disagreements. This would help me strengthen my method which I have done over the last two years in response to critics. This makes for a better research methodology and I see my best work lies ahead as I develop my methodology to respond to criticisms of those such as yourself, Richard Hall and others. So in that sense, I can thank you despite the harshness of your criticisms.

Nevertheless, I feel the ultimate disagreement with you, Richard Hall, et al, lies in my use of whistleblower and contactee testimonies to build my analyses found in my website articles and book. You may feel that many of these whistleblower testimonies I cite are unsubstantiated and part of a 'faulty methodology'. You and others have expressed strong reservations over the usefulness of the whistleblower testimonies in the Disclosure Project. In fact, you Richard Hall and others have rejected Steven Greers and Steven Basset's efforts in this regard as some form of grandstanding and/or political posturing. I couldn't disagree with you more.

I have argued before that there are factors in the field that distort the data collection process when it comes to the UFO phenomenon. As a detective you may appreciate the difficulty of investigating cases of organized crime in developing countries where judges, parliamentarians, witnesses, investigators, etc., are routinely intimidated and/or where hard evidence is removed. This is an important methodological consideration in doing UFO research. Why is it that you, Hall and others don't acknowledge this? Why don't you refine the investigatory process to acknowledge this distorting factor in the field of UFO research. In not doing so, I believe I am justified in accusing you in advocating an inappropriate research methodology and doing 'bad science'. A competent scientist designs their research methodology to take into account all factors in investigating a hypothesis, especially any distorting factors.

The simple refrain that only hard evidence will do in UFO research is not only inappropriate but a major methodological flaw. Those who have worked in this field for decades as in the case of Mr Hall have committed a major methodological blunder and conducted shoddy science even according to their purported lofty scientific standards. Their and your research methods are in need in drastic methodological improvement given the true nature of the distorting factors in UFO research. To pontificate about the appropriateness of your research methodologies which focus on hard evidence in the UFO phenomenon is a major oversight and you and others bear a responsibility for the sorry state of UFO research which is largely ignored by the general public who are seeking rigorous analyses of the political implications of an undisclosed extraterrestrial presence.

You reject my earlier response to you as a rationalisation, I reject yours and Richard Hall's responses as a myopic focus on hard evidence where you adopt a parsimonious approach of systematically ignoring whistleblower testimonies and their political implications. In contrast, I fully support the whistleblower testimonies found in Steven Greer's Disclosure book as valid evidentiary material from which one can construct an exopolitical analysis. In fact, I contend that Greer's book is the single most important document to emerge in over five decades of UFO research and I'm appalled that UFO researchers continue to dismiss its relevance and refuse to consider the political implications. In that sense, you, Richard Hall, et al., have failed, and you will be made accountable by the court of public opinion. I am merely one voice identifying your methodological failure.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:56:02 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:17:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:17:48 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 09:14:18 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

Hi, John,

Actually, I'm a little surprised that you replied to this one. I thought you'd let this one be. Sigh. Well, in that case....

>Once again, Jerry, you leap to your keyboard without
>considering what I said. "Most mainstream ufology" is rather
>different from "Most mainstream ufologists". One thing that has
>become very clear to me is that what people do, say or think in
>a ufological context seems quite different to what they do, say
>or think in other aspects of their lives. One example of this is
>the question of abductions.

>As an example: many ufologists believe that the abduction
>phenomenon is caused by physical beings in physical craft
>physically abducting humans and doing nasty things to them. It
>also seems to be the opinion of some prominent abduction
>researchers that there is nothing that anybody can do to stop
>this from happening. Without challenging this opinion for the
>moment, I must ask, how do these ufologists sleep at night if
>they really believed this was happening?

Because, John, they are human beings, not the sorts of weirdos
pelicanist mythology must make them. During the Cold War human
beings all over the planet slept every night - and got married,
raised children, held jobs, went to movies, read books, listened
to music, had fun, took care of loved ones, maintained
friendships - even knowing that at any moment their lives,
indeed all life on earth, could end in a horrendous
thermonuclear holocaust.

In the America of today, despite an administration whose sole
function (besides protecting the interests of the wealthy) seems
to be to frighten citizens with fear of terror and terrorists,
people go about their lives just as they did when war between
the West and the Communist orbit seemed distinctly possible, at
moments even imminent.

I happen to know that persons to whom abduction research is a
part of daily life have been profoundly affected emotionally
by the conclusions they've drawn from their research. Beyond
that, among the more casually involved, abduction by aliens
seems (like so many disturbing potential occurrences even in
consensus reality) both real and abstract. Moreover, even those
who take a literalist reading of these experiences disagree on
their meaning. My impression is that only a relative few judge
that there is something purely horrendous happening; as you

know, some - for example, the late John Mack - thought abductions were, surface unpleasantness notwithstanding, are positive and life-enhancing. In any event, few ufologists lose sleep worrying that a frightening abduction experience is going to happen to them personally. In that sense, like any other normal citizens, if they're worried about their personal safety, the object of their concern is more likely to be criminal assault by a fellow human. Even for ufologists, aliens and abductions are an awful lot to comprehend.

>The answer, I think, is because there is a disjunction between their thinking as a ufologist and their thinking as a citizen.

Yeah, the same sort of disjunction that any citizen experiences when thinking about terrorism, nuclear attack, and the like. It is entirely normal for people to believe one thing that ought to disrupt quotidian life but, because people are ultimately sensible, they don't allow it to. Far from mass hysteria about terrorism, nuclear war, or nasty aliens, citizens exhibit - thank God - mass sanity.

>know Phil Klass (crosses self, waves garlic, etc.)

Are you implying that he's a vampire? I've heard all sorts of claims made about the man over the years, but this is a new one to me. I guess that would explain some things.

>was laughed at for suggesting that Budd Hopkins should report abductions to the FBI. Well, yes, i can see the problems,

Well, thank God for that moment of clarity.

>but, if ufology did not exist in a "small, insulated bubble", what other option is there? Just to go on reporting and recording these incidents, and setting up therapy sessions so that it doesn't seem so bad next time you're raped?

Since pelicanists have done all in their power to contribute to the climate of ridicule surrounding heterodox claims and to argue that it is illegitimate to heed such testimony except as evidence of some sort of diagnosable pathology, maybe you should be addressing questions like these to yourself. It's not as if ufologists haven't publicized abductions and reported many horror stories and tried (not entirely without success) to involve mainstream professionals in their effort to alert a larger public.

>I'm sure I could never be as sophisticated as the Ivy League academics, important civil servants in Her Majesty's Government, and Upper-West-Side artists who comprise the UFO aristocracy.

The "UFO aristocracy." That's a new one. Now, isn't the subtext of just about every pelicanist Updates posting - indeed, every issue of Magonia - that ufologists, far from being aristocrats, are sad nobodies who couldn't possibly match your sophistication and cosmopolitan wisdom? Now, which is it?

>>When pelicanists are reduced to squawking sentiments like the >>above, one can only infer that insults - and, depending as they >>do on the crudest and dopest of stereotypes, not even very >>interesting ones at that - are all they have left. It's really >>pretty sad when you think about it. It comes, I'm afraid, out of >>losing all those arguments on matters of actual substance.

>Yes, I might well lose the arguments if anyone actually debated >them on matters of substance, rather than emotional rants like >the one above.

It wasn't emotional, except in the sense that humor - an emotion possibly unrecognizable to the committed pelicanist - is emotional. And thank you, John, for providing so much amusement, even if unintentional. "UFO aristocracy" will have me chuckling the rest of the day.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Secrecy News -- 02/11/05 - Aftergood

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:25:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:58:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Secrecy News -- 02/11/05 - Aftergood

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 16
February 11, 2005

** COURT UPHOLDS SECRECY OF HISTORICAL CIA BUDGET DATA
** PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD MAY GO UNFUNDED
** NRC PROPOSES NEW RULE ON UNCLASSIFIED SAFEGUARDS INFO
** SOME RECENT DOD DIRECTIVES
** LINCOLN'S PATENT
** NEW FROM CRS

COURT UPHOLDS SECRECY OF HISTORICAL CIA BUDGET DATA

Although intelligence budget totals for 1997 and 1998 have been declassified, a federal court ruled this week that budget figures from thirty to fifty years earlier should not be disclosed because they "relate to intelligence sources and methods."

In a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit, the Federation of American Scientists had sought the release of aggregate and individual intelligence agency budgets from 1947 to 1970.

Judge Ricardo M. Urbina of the D.C. District Court accepted the CIA's argument that disclosure of such historical budget figures would compromise the "intelligence method" of transferring funds to the CIA. The CIA budget is not directly appropriated but is concealed within various budget line items in the Defense Department budget.

In the face of CIA denials, FAS showed that the 1963 CIA budget - \$550 million - was already in the public domain, and the court agreed that the CIA was not entitled to withhold the budget for this one year.

But "the fact that the CIA disclosed its intelligence budget for 1963 does not preclude it from claiming... protection for the rest of the information the plaintiff seeks," Judge Urbina wrote.

As a practical matter, CIA's argument for withholding seems untenable. It appears impossible, for example, to take the now-public 1963 CIA budget figure and use it to infer or deduce how funds were transferred that year through multiple budget line items to the Agency.

But that's just our opinion, the court said, and it doesn't count.

"The fact that the plaintiff subjectively believes that releasing the requested budget information would not compromise sources and methods of intelligence is of no moment," Judge Urbina wrote. "The DCI is statutorily entrusted with making that decision, not the plaintiff."

See Judge Urbina's February 9 ruling (with a February 10

technical amendment) here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/foia/1947/rmu020905.pdf>

It is a measure of the decline of American democracy in our time that the United States no longer sets the world standard for government accountability on this matter.

Numerous other countries, including the United Kingdom, Canada and the Netherlands, routinely publish their current intelligence spending levels. But here at home the CIA and the Justice Department Office of Information and Privacy deploy teams of attorneys to shield pre-Sputnik intelligence budgets from public knowledge.

"We overclassify very badly," said Porter Goss, now the Director of Central Intelligence, in testimony before the 9-11 Commission in May 2003.

PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD MAY GO UNFUNDED

The Public Interest Declassification Board, an advisory body created in the FY 2001 Intelligence Authorization Act to help set declassification priorities and mediate conflicts, suffered the ignominy of not having its members named for four years.

But now that six of its nine members have been named (SN, 02/02/05), the Board faces the further insult of being denied the budget it needs to commence its work.

No money was appropriated for the Board in the current fiscal year, and no money has been requested for the Board in the next fiscal year. That adds up to no money at all.

Even if the members were to forego the compensation to which they are entitled by statute, the Board requires a budget for various other purposes. It must pay for security clearance review for those members who do not hold active clearances, travel costs for members who reside outside of Washington, staff costs, and so on.

Since the Bush Administration made the effort last year to identify and appoint five members to the Board, it is hard to imagine that the Administration is now seeking to sabotage the Board by withholding funds. But no one approached by Secrecy News was able to explain how the Board could function without a budget.

The legislation that established the Public Interest Declassification Board, as amended in 2004, may be found here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/congress/2005/pida.html>

NRC PROPOSES NEW RULE ON UNCLASSIFIED SAFEGUARDS INFO

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission today proposed a new rule that elaborates controls on unclassified "Safeguards Information" (SGI) that is deemed too sensitive for public release.

SGI is yet another entrant in the long and growing list of government controls on unclassified information (SBU, FOUO, LOU, SSI, etc.).

"An individual's access to SGI requires both a valid 'need to know' such information and authorization based on an appropriate background investigation," according to the NRC.

In other words, SGI replicates in the unclassified world two of the defining characteristics of the classification system -- clearance and need-to-know. This is a problem.

Much of the information designated as SGI is undoubtedly withheld from disclosure for good reason. But the SGI system and other controls on unclassified information lack the definitional rigor of the classification system, as well as the orderly procedures for removing controls (declassification), and the oversight and appeal procedures for challenging excesses.

The expanding patchwork of controls on unclassified information

actually makes the classification system look good by comparison.

See the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposed rule on Safeguards Information from the February 11 Federal Register here:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/2005/02/fr021105.html>

SOME RECENT DOD DIRECTIVES

Following are some notable Defense Department directives published in the last few months.

"Data Sharing in a Net-Centric Department of Defense," DoD Directive 8320.2, 2 December 2004:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/d8320_2.pdf

"Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center," DoD Directive 6420.1, 9 October 2004:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/d6420_1.pdf

"DoD Electromagnetic Environmental Effects (E3) Program," DoD Directive 3222.3, September 7, 2004:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/d3222_3.pdf

"Designating and Naming Military Aerospace Vehicles," DoD Directive 4120.15E, 29 November 2004:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/d4120_15.pdf

LINCOLN'S PATENT

Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday falls on February 12, is the only American President to have held a patent on an invention of his own design.

"Be it known that I, Abraham Lincoln, of Springfield, in the county of Sangamon, in the State of Illinois, have invented a new and improved manner of combining adjustable buoyant air chambers with a steam boat or other vessel for the purpose of enabling their draught of water to be readily lessened to enable them to pass over bars, or through shallow water, without discharging their cargoes," Lincoln wrote in his patent application.

On May 22, 1849, Lincoln received Patent No. 6469 for his "adjustable buoyant air chamber" invention.

Although the Patent and Trademark Office (www.uspto.gov) maintains a very useful patent search engine, it does not include Lincoln's patent application, portions of which have been lost.

Lincoln's uniqueness as a presidential patent holder was noted by William Lee Miller in his valuable book "Lincoln's Virtues." The most extended published account of the device itself seems to be "Lincoln's Connections with the Illinois and Michigan Canal, His Return From Congress in '48 and His Invention" by Wayne C. Temple.

Much of the same information can also be found here:

<http://showcase.netins.net/web/creative/lincoln/education/patent.htm>

NEW FROM CRS

As may have been previously mentioned, the Congressional Research Service does not make its publications directly available to the public. The following new or newly updated CRS reports were obtained by Secrecy News.

"Al Qaeda: Statements and Evolving Ideology," February 4, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL32759.pdf>

"Nuclear Power Plants: Vulnerability to Terrorist Attack,"
updated February 4, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21131.pdf>

"Public Relations and Propaganda: Restrictions on Executive
Agency Activities," updated February 8, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/RL32750.pdf>

"Military Suppression of Enemy Air Defenses (SEAD): Assessing
Future Needs," updated January 24, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RS21141.pdf>

"The Economics of the Federal Budget Deficit," updated January
28, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/RL31235.pdf>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the
Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to
secrecy_news-request.nul
with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sgp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Is Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages? -

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 15:14:51 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:59:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Is Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages? -

Is Ufology Trapped In The Middle Ages?

Compare with astronomy/astrophys:- despite individual efforts of Babylonian, Arabic and later western observers, the data were not assembled or available in useful form and so sensible science wasn't possible.

So 'establishment' scientists, like the medical faculty of University of Paris when asked for the cause of the Black Death by King Philip VI of France, could pretend that "a triple conjunction in the constellation of Aquarius was the cause of the subsequent pestilence". And rulers of Church and State, then as now opposed to any popular knowledge of E.T. possibilities, were still burning people at the stake - like Bruno, an E.T. believer - as late as 1600.

Eventually Tycho Brahe assembled accurate data in useable form, but even then they weren't available to 'science' until Kepler finally grabbed them, not only for his own work on planetary theory but to publish them for wider use.

A scientific ufology needs those published big numbers - data and breakdowns, and accurate distributions in space and time. Real analysis isn't possible and 'true' patterns can't be observed without those data.

Some, Larry Hatch and others, are constantly working on geographical and time distributions, but, as Nikolay Subbotin recently posted, there are no agreed definitions yet.

Without a published assemblage of robust data (i.e. not nit-picking, just reasonably accurate) Ufology will be trapped in superstitious, heretic-burning Middle Ages imposed by gov'ts and media.

Cheers

Ray D

~~~~~  
"Perceptions" <http://www.perceptions.couk.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

Re: Is Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages? -

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Socorro and Balloons - McCoy

From: **GT McCoy** <gtmccoy.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:22:07 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:02:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro and Balloons - McCoy

Hello All,

This is one noisy unit. To all the old Helo drivers on the List
-The Bell 47 plus the LLRV! Zamora would've been rendered deaf.

<http://www1.dfrc.nasa.gov/Gallery/Photo/LLRV/index.html>

That URL is everything you want to know about the LLRV. "Ah'll
be bock!" -the Governor of California.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:34:03 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:03:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:57:49 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>turns out they're rather dim. I suppose if I was being anti-
>America (pace, Jerry) it could turn out that they got
>along very well indeed with Dubya!

Hi John,

Personally, I think Dubya may have more in common with "them" than one might at first suspect. His policies, decried by at least half of America and the rest of the world, certainly seem alien to many.

He seems not to know the language very well, he doesn't seem to grasp intellectual concepts, or even like them, and he often has a distant, vacant look about him that is troubling at least, and perhaps resulting from mothership separation anxiety.

How else to explain a Texas cowboy born a Connecticut Yankee?

A chimera, to boot!!

Yes, I imagine the conversations between Dubya and "them" are quite comforting for him, as contrasted by his obvious discomfort talking to "us".

Lest I be labeled yet again, this was a joke... well, mostly. <g>

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Advert For ABC TV Special In Newsweek

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:44:24 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:05:54 -0500
Subject: Advert For ABC TV Special In Newsweek

I've read on another List that there is a full page ad for the upcoming ABC tv special in Newsweek.

Unfortunately, the ads one sees in Newsweek vary depending upon what zip code you are in, what demographic your area is. In my area there's no ad for the special.

If anyone has it, please scan it and email it around - I'd love to see it. Maybe it has more info about who is in the show.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:49:35 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:07:21 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - King

>From: Donald A. Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 23:18:43 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

<snip>

>Nevertheless, with the latest version of Excel it
>has been much easier to download his archives and
>convert them to UFOCAT format in the Access database.

Hi Don,

Thanks for the information.

One question is why an Access database? I should think that an open-standards format would be more universally accepted. What about MySQL?

Access databases convert to MySQL rather easily, and the engine, front-end apps, and web interface apps for MySQL are all free. Using PHP in conjunction with MySQL is becoming the gold standard in web databases anyway.

Tying the case load to a proprietary and cumbersome relational database seems counter-intuitive.

Of course, I'm not an M\$ fan, but I think the validity of the PHP/MySQL model has been well-proven, particularly when combined with XML parsing and the comparatively simple SQL query format. User and propeller-head friendly. <g>

Not to mention that M\$' html rendering leaves much to be desired to be very kind.

Kudos for your work nonetheless. There should be a standard for categorization at any rate, and your catalog represents one vision realized.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:50:51 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:09:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:46:07 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:31:04 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>I don't notice a great number of female ufologists, either. Of
>course there are some, but seriously outnumbered by the male
>variety. Why do you think that is, Mr Lehmborg?

As is often the case, sadly, John Rimmer is paying little attention. The rest of us on this List will have noticed how many women participate. Anyone who attends UFO conferences, in the United States anyway, will also have noted how many women attend. And one might add the large historical role women such as Coral Lorenzen, Isabel Davis, Jennie Zeidman, and others played in the history of American ufology.

So the question remains, John:

Why are there so few - if any - female pelicanists?

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 11:53:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:12:05 -0500
Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 17:49:37 -0500
>Subject: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

>I listen to Austin, Texas broadcaster Alex Jones quite a bit. He
>makes video documentaries as one way to support his show.
>Recently he mentioned that his latest, which I believe is a
>couple of hours in length and is estimated at a production cost
>of \$22,000.

>This List seems to have quite a few concerned and extremely well
>versed ufologists, who are not very happy with what is made for
>TV on this issue.

>Is there enough interest to produce a 'Ufologist's own' video?

>This could be sold to fund further work, and could serve as a
>template and maybe even a pilot for possible airing on TV. This
>keeps Alex Jones' busy activism operation and shows rolling. If
>not mainstream channels, then perhaps community cable channels.

>There is quite a bit of interest reported in some video DVDs
>about the 9/11 attacks, for example. And these DVDs are finding
>special interest overseas, where versions in other languages are
>being produced.

>Alex has many volunteers buying his videos and getting them
>aired on community cable channels, and even to gatherings of the
>interested public. He also keeps his production costs low by
>making use of volunteer producers from his local cable TV
>channel's facilities.

>Instead of the costly flying of production crews to visit people
>to be interviewed, it's likely volunteer producers could be
>found at different community TV channels who could set up the
>actual interviews and either carry them out, or, have an
>established ufologist do the interviews by telephone.

>Not quite as glitzy as Peter Jennings, but the content is the
>important thing.

>And this would be one way to really put exopolitics to the fore,
>without having to butt heads with mainstream producers.

>These days, it's a lot easier to home brew your own documentary,
>and I wonder if the time is right for Ufology to have 'it's own
>brand' out there?

I should remind Listers that there are already some Videos out
by ufologists.

My Group 1 "UFOs ARE Real" has brought many good reviews. It
even won an award back in about 1980.

Included are Dr. Bruce Maccabee, Dr. James Harder, Dr. Richard
Haines, Major Jesse Marcel, Lt. Col. Larry Coyne, Ted Phillips,
Betty Hill, Marjorie Fish, Travis Walton, Mike Rogers, and

myself.

It was filmed on location in California, Louisiana, Ohio, New Hampshire, Arizona, Missouri. I was co-script writer, Technical Consultant and on location. and arranged all the interviews. It is about 90 minutes long, has been shown in theatres, and is only \$16. from me at POB 958, Houlton, ME 04730-0958.

Of more recent vintage is my two volume set "Flying Saucers ARE Real" available on DVD for only \$25. total time 168 Minutes. Some shot at Cape Kennedy.

Stan Friedman

www.v-j-enterprises.com/sfhome.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

UFO Sighting May Have Educational Explanation

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:14:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:14:58 -0500
Subject: UFO Sighting May Have Educational Explanation

Source: CBC News - Toronto

<http://north.cbc.ca/regional/servlet/View?filename=ufo-igaluit-20050211>

02-11-05

UFO Sighting May Have Educational Explanation

CBC News

IQALUIT - Several Iqaluit residents claimed they saw strange lights in the sky Wednesday night near the Road to Nowhere. Witnesses say they saw up to eight lights they claim were not airplane lights.

Jeremiah Veevee says his brother called him about the mysterious lights.

Veevee says he watched the show with binoculars from his home near the cemetery.

"I went to our backdoor area, started watching the lights come in, probably from the direction from the Road to Nowhere," he says.

"Something orange like light moving towards this area with one single light further back from the first one there were two of them flying side by side at about same speed."

Veevee says he called the air traffic control tower at the Iqaluit airport.

He says he was told that the strange objects were not showing up on the radar screen.

Other witnesses called the Iqaluit RCMP.

RCMP Sergeant Dale MacLeod says someone called about the lights just before 8 p.m., and police investigated.

He says the French school students were conducting experiments with balloons and candles at about the same time.

He believes that's what several people in Iqaluit witnessed, not UFOs.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:19:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:36:38 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:48:37 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>The Eisenhower Library still has 300,000 pages of classified
>>material. The Truman Library has 45,000. The files of the USAF,
>>CIA, NSC, DIA, NRO, NRL are still loaded with literally millions
>>of classified pages, and you know John what isn't in them?
>>Truly amazing.

>I'm not talking about hundreds of thousands of files in archives
>(and how many of that impressive number do actually have any
>relevance to Roswell?) I'm talking about things that actually
>happened in the outside world. Things affecting our everyday
>life.

The point is John, we don't know. Why would we be told about a
connection between Roswell and what happened in the outside
world? To do so would admit that Roswell represented the
recovery of an alien space craft. Clearly there was no intention,
then or now, to so admit. For example Samarium-Cobalt permanent
magnets were developed at Wright Air Development Center and were
widely used in ghetto blasters. If the idea came from
examination of a piece of a flying saucer, how would we know
that??

>>>I think anyone who really believes that a piece of
>>>extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell and was recovered
>>>by the United States government, is obliged to explain to us how
>>>the world is different today than it would have been if Roswell
>>>hadn't happened. Or do they say that Roswell changed nothing, it
>>>was an event of negligible historical importance?

Changes on the inside are not the same as changes on the
outside. Remember you can't tell your friends without telling
your enemies. Without access to the data, there is no way to
know (I don't approve of dart board physics) what the impact has
been. The public didn't hear about the NRL Corona Satellite
(Elint) until 1995. It was launched in 1960 and obtained more
elint data than all the U-2 flights.

Obviously the public was not told how important it was to the
inner circles.

>>>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

Recall that the UK broke the Enigma code and was reading
Hitler's mail. No public discussion for 25 or so years. Had a
huge impact on winning the war. We certainly weren't told that
at the time or for a long time afterwards.

>>The government realized there were new technologies to develop
>>and to make sure their opponents didn't develop.

>Such as? If the US Government was investigating alien
>technologies in the 1940s and 1950s there would be some evidence
>of this, not just a bundle of papers which might or might not
>mention Roswell. An enormous number of specialists in a dozen -
>a hundred - different disciplines would have been working flat
>out on the Roswell wreckage.

John, 3 nuclear weapons labs alone a few years ago each had an annual budget of over a billion dollars. and each employed about 8000 people of whom about 30% were engineers and scientists. Their total budget was greater than that of the National Science Foundation.

>The US knew that the Soviets were developing the atom bomb
>because the output of research on related topics in technical
>journals, et., dried up. If the US was able to deduce that from
>observing such a closed and controlled society as the Stalinist
>Soviet Union, don't you think it might be possible to make
>similar deductions about US research into Roswell technology?

According to a classified NSC document in 1951, the Soviets had made more progress in the development of nuclear weapons and methods for delivering them in the previous 18 months than had been expected for 5 years. There was no public announcement of that. A 1952 CIA document (also classified until 25 years later)worrying why there was so little about flying saucers in the Soviet press.

I certainly believe that the Soviets knew about Roswell because of their spies at Los Alamos. Burdakov talked about that based on comments .. many years later, from Space big shot Korolov. They certainly weren't going to make an announcement just as we and the Soviets didn't announce the shooting down of the other's reconnaissance planes until Gary Powers.

>>Governments recognized that admitting the alien presence
>>might well lead to an Earthling orientation, something no
>>government wants.

>I don't at all accept that presumption. Don't you also think
>that governments might be concerned where the next Roswell-style
>crash might take place, and might want to take some preparatory
>action to deal with such an event?

They set up recovery teams ready to go to the site of a nuclear incident or recovery of a crashed satellite, airplane or flying saucer. No these teams didn't put out press releases... except in the case of Cosmos 954.

>>The government realized that space is the place.

>Are you saying that the space programmes of the USA and the USSR
>were only prompted by Roswell? Don't you think that security
>concerns, propaganda and prestige were the main motors on the
>space-race?

I don't use the word "only". Considering how much work on rocketry was going on at White Sands, it is not unreasonable that a crashed flying saucer would provide a substantial incentive. Clearly it proved that intelligently controlled space traversing vehicles were feasible.

>>The government
>>realized it could lie through its teeth and get away with it

>I think this was widely known long before 1947 and proven by
>events which had happened in the real world over many centuries,
>and more especially by events of the previous twenty years!

>>by disinforming the press and the scientific community

>Would this be the same scientific community as would be needed
>to perform the vast amount of research that the Roswell wreckage
>would generate?

No it would be nasty noisy negativists in academia who would prattle on to the press an establish a laughter curtain.

There was a huge cadre readily available in industry and at lots of National Labs such as Oak Ridge, Hanford, MIT.. and Lockheed, GE, Westinghouse, McDonnell Douglas, Boeing etc. People with great talents and security clearances. Academia in general is not where the action is when it comes to advanced classified research and development activities. The U-2, SR-71, Stealth etc were not developed in academia.

>>and ridiculing witnesses... gives confidence in manipulation.
>>I am not saying the world is better for it.

>>Maybe you should ask the beliefs of those who have studied the
>>evidence... same goes for MJ-12.

>>It is easier to say that there is no evidence than to examine
>>that evidence. I, for one, vote 4 square for both and I have
>>spent an enormous amount of effort studying both, researching
>>both, dealing with the arguments of the negativists.

>I love the way it's assumed that sceptical ufologists come to
>their conclusions by some random process. I don't suppose it
>could have occurred to you that we might have actually studied
>the evidence and then come to our conclusions as a result of
>what we have studied. Far easier to assume that we're just
>wierdos whose brains are wired wrongly, probably as a result of
>some genetic disability.

I certainly do not assume that you are a wierdo whose brain is wired wrongly or that your processes are random.

You have given little indication of having done your homework just as the very bright SETI cultists prattle on about UFOs, interstellar travel, how aliens and governments would behave, without having done theirs.

Look at their references. Missing are the large scale scientific studies among many other things.....

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Kimball

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 12:20:09 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:21:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased - Kimball

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:15:08 -0500
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased

>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 19:03:13 EST
>>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Documentary Biased

<snip>

>How would you receive a list of suggested talking points, and
>maybe one sentence each summarizing how the Subject will answer?
>Say, 3 pages maximum? Prepared by the Subject ahead of time?

Eleanor:

I would have no problem with that, particularly if I really wanted to get the person on film, although it is technically a bit more like a press conference than an interview (I suspect that it would help establish a level of trust, however, that would lead to a more open interview as it progressed). Still, what I look for in the interview is the information, not to play "gotcha" so it would be fine. When I interviewed Karl Pflock for Do You Believe in Majic and Aztec 1948, he had "talking points" (ie. relevant information that he wanted to get across) on small cards, which I thought was a great idea, and expedited the process (he still got something wrong, however - calling Donald Menzel - and I used it in the film under the fair game rule, which is even more applicable if you actually use notes). Not everyone can fire away from the hip like Stan Friedman, after all!

>Would this reduce the likelihood of negative surprises?

Probably, but as I said previously, there is never an iron-clad guarantee.

Another rule that I would add to my earlier list is the insertion of a clause in a release form or contract to the effect of "the producer shall not alter the background against which I was filmed." It would prevent them from sticking CG pictures of aliens dancing, or something worse, behind you as you speak. In that vein, always try to be interviewed in natural surroundings. A black background is okay. Beware of green or blue!

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilms.com

BTW - Okay, I lied (just a bit). There are a couple of people in ufology that I would play "gotcha" with (names withheld to protect the guilty), but they deserve it. Fortunately for them, I haven't gotten around to making a documentary exposing the charlatanism, Stalinistic personality cultism, and hoodwinkery in ufology in which they engage (and no, I'm not talking about

the government here).

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 12:35:56 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:23:28 -0500
Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 17:49:37 -0500
>Subject: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

<snip>

>Is there enough interest to produce a 'Ufologist's own' video?

Argh!!! The peasants are revolting!! Call my MJ-12 troopers...

Seriously, though...

>This could be sold to fund further work, and could serve as a
>template and maybe even a pilot for possible airing on TV. This
>keeps Alex Jones' busy activism operation and shows rolling. If
>not mainstream channels, then perhaps community cable channels.

Your errors and omissions insurance alone is going to cost you a fair bit of money (no broadcaster, except perhaps community access, that I know of will air something without it).

Further, making good film and television isn't as easy as you might think.

Okay, I thought I could say that with a straight face, but couldn't:).

In truth, a monkey could do it.

I do (hmm... where did my banana wander off to??).

<snip>

>Instead of the costly flying of production crews to visit people
>to be interviewed, it's likely volunteer producers could be
>found at different community TV channels who could set up the
>actual interviews and either carry them out, or, have an
>established ufologist do the interviews by telephone.

Ick - volunteers!?

No costly travel for me and my crew?? What will we do without our annual trip to Vegas for "research".

<snip>

>These days, it's a lot easier to home brew your own documentary,
>and I wonder if the time is right for Ufology to have 'it's own
>brand' out there?

Okay, really serious this time...

The quality would be the problem, and if people go around peddling cheapo documentaries it could turn people off ("hey, I paid \$20 for this piece of ----!). You could well end up with myriad "UFO Crash at Aztec" malarkey (ahh... William Steinman). Still, amidst the dross, as Stan Friedman would say, there may be gold in them thar hills (note: Stan has never, to my

knowledge, used the word "thar" although I wish he would).

The music industry has been doing this for years. Can't get a record contract? Fine, then make your own album (er... CD, or I-Pod, or whatever the kids listen to these days), tour like heck to promote it (er... or use the Internet - whatever the kids do these days), and build up a following through non-traditional means. Try a ufologists Co-op so you can share the costs - a good mini-DV camera can cost as little as CAD 6,000, an edit system not much more. Once you have them, you never have to pay for those costs again.

There's a place for filmmaking like this, that is designed to appeal solely to a niche audience. I've even done it myself, when the networks won't pre-license a film (Aztec 1948, come on down).

There is a place for pros, and networks, but you're right - there is a place for the DIY types too.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call -

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 12:41:58 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:24:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call -

>Source: The Australian - Sydney NSW

><http://tinyurl.com/7xkg2>

<snip>

>Given that astronomer Frank Drake launched the first SETI search
>about 40 years ago and nobody has thus far been heard from, when
>will Shostak and his colleagues make contact? "The answer is
>some time close to the year 2025," he says. "I'll bet you a flat
>white on that!"

I always though the SETI guys were a bit goofy, but this is
pretty ridiculous.

He sounds like one of those old-time religion, pre-millennialists
- "Hey, the Second Coming is just around the corner." Snake-oil
salesmen, it seems, come in all shapes and sizes!

I do notice, however, that he conveniently placed the date two
decades from now, by which time hopefully Dr. Shostak and SETI
will be forgotten.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 11:44:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:26:41 -0500
Subject: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero

Listfolk,

Just now, while doing research into historical reports of UFO and UFO-like phenomena, I found this illuminating account of the work of a pelicanist hero, Prof. N. S. Shaler. The phenomenon he has so conclusively and effectively debunked is known as Ignis fatuus, explained by credulous physicists and chemists, according to a recent scientific reference work, as "spontaneously ignited gases escaping from swampy ground." Ufologists will recall that these nonexistent phenomena were used to explain UFO reports in Michigan in 1966.

It turns out that good pelicanist principles document that the stuff is just another delusion "sighted" by naive and hallucination-prone witnesses. Here's the story, from a science column in an Iowa newspaper, Nashua Reporter, for October 19, 1899:

"Notwithstanding the many traditions concerning mysterious lights seen hovering over swamps at night, and in spite of the attempted explanations of such phenomena in some popular books on science, Prof. N. S. Shaler says he is inclined to disbelieve in the existence of these luminous appearances. He has studied swamps for many years, but has never seen a will-o'-the-wisp, and he suggests that the reports about moving lights visible above swamps may be due to subjective impressions induced by gazing into darkness."

In a recent posting, prominent pelicanist Peter Rogerson points out that many imaginary phenomena, such as UFOs, are conjured up by people in remote locations (e.g., swamps) and gazing in isolation into darkness. Once again, pelicanism is there to save us from misguided, quasi-religious belief in pseudo-phenomena such as swamp gas.

Gratefully,

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 18:05:33 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:27:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Allan

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:48:37 -0400
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>And what happened? Nothing. A few teletypes were sent, a bit of
>>paperwork, and then presumably, like the Lost Ark at the end of
>>the Indiana Jones film, it was put in a crate and filed away and
>>everyone forgot about it until the mid 1980s. I find that hard
>>to believe.

>What colossal arrogance. Just how in the world do you or anyone
>else know what happened after Roswell? There is an enormous
>amount of material that is still classified from that era, but
>you can psychically determine that nothing relates to Roswell?
>Try reading my update on the Majestic 12 Documents at my website
>at:

>www.stanfriedman.com

>The Eisenhower Library still has 300,000 pages of classified
>material. The Truman Library has 45,000. The files of the USAF,
>CIA, NSC, DIA, NRO, NRL are still loaded with literally millions
>of classified pages, and you know John what isn't in them?
>Truly amazing.

Aren't these some of the very bodies that the GAO requested
'Roswell' documents from in 1995? Unlike you, most people,
including myself, accept their negative findings.

>The government realized there were new technologies to develop
>and to make sure their opponents didn't develop. Governments
>recognized that admitting the alien presence might well lead to
>an Earthling orientation, something no government wants. The
>government realized that space is the place. The government
>realized it could lie through its teeth and get away with it by
>disinforming the press and the scientific community and
>ridiculing witnesses. .. gives confidence in manipulation. I am
>not saying the world is better for it.

>Maybe you should ask the beliefs of those who have studied the
>evidence... same goes for MJ-12. It is easier to say that there
>is no evidence than to examine that evidence. I, for one, vote 4
>square for both and I have spent an enormous amount of effort
>studying both, researching both, dealing with the arguments of
>the negativists.

The zillions of still secret documents have absolutely nothing
to do with Roswell or MJ-12, except in your mind. The GAO dealt
with this ten years ago and you refuse to accept its findings.
You still won't accept the fact that the MJ-12 papers were faked
to fill a void, i.e. the lack of any genuine official papers on
Roswell. They were also produced to sort out the gullible souls
from the more rational ones. Whilst the great majority saw

through them pretty quickly, you and a few others did not.

And when we last discussed the MJ-12 matter on this forum, I recall that eventually you had to concede that perhaps none of the three original MJ-12 papers (the ones you love to promote as genuine) was actually written by its indicated author!

In addition you opined that the T-F memo was only a carbon copy and probably unsigned, and that therefore someone in the CIA had to search the archives for a Truman signature in 1952, lift it and append it to the copy of the T-F memo before it went to Ike, so as to give it more 'authority'. (i.e. some CIA guy actually purloined the president's signature, while he was still in office. A likely story!)

Yes, I have read your Majestic Update of last April.

You are certainly a first rate researcher, but your ideas and conclusions on Roswell and MJ-12 are way off base.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:47 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:31:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sandow

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:17:48 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

I'd been thinking that these repeated (and mostly repetitious) debates between Rimmer and others (including sometimes me) were really getting pointless.

And then comes this, which actually does deserve a reply:

>As an example: many ufologists believe that the abduction phenomenon is caused by physical beings in physical craft physically abducting humans and doing nasty things to them. It also seems to be the opinion of some prominent abduction researchers that there is nothing that anybody can do to stop this from happening. Without challenging this opinion for the moment, I must ask, how do these ufologists sleep at night if they really believed this was happening?

What makes John think that abduction researchers do sleep at all easily? I've known both Budd Hopkins and Dave Jacobs to be quite disturbed by what they feel their work has revealed.

>The answer, I think, is because there is a disjunction between their thinking as a ufologist and their thinking as a citizen. I know Phil Klass (crosses self, waves garlic, etc.) was laughed at for suggesting that Budd Hopkins should report abductions to the FBI. Well, yes, I can see the problems, but, if ufology did not exist in a "small, insulated bubble", what other option is there? Just to go on reporting and recording these incidents, and setting up therapy sessions so that it doesn't seem so bad next time you're raped?

Maybe, John, if you lived in New York, you'd have a more sympathetic understanding of these things.

You might remember a little event we call 9/11. I live in New York, and was there when that happened. The shock was very deep.

So now all New Yorkers, as far as I know -- certainly everyone I've ever talked about this with -- expects another major terrorist attack. Maybe sooner, maybe later, but certainly sometime. Or maybe not, but how can we know?

And what, John, do you imagine that we do about this? Basically nothing. What can we do? One couple I know moved to another city. That's certainly an option, though I'm not sure many people are taking it. My wife and I could opt to spend more time at our country place. But that poses problems of its own. My wife, for instance, is a music critic for the New York Times. She might review four concerts a week, of course in New York. Should she find another job? Should I plan fewer meetings in the city, in the course of my own freelance work (much more as a consultant these days than as a critic)? Should I give up my teaching position in New York?

Basically, like almost everyone we know, we're in New York as much as we ever were. We jump every time we hear something that

might be construed as an explosion. If we hear a lot of sirens, from emergency vehicles, we worry just a little. I remember one of our friends telling us that on 9/11 she first knew something was wrong when she heard far more sirens, for a much longer time, than she'd ever heard before. (They came, of course, from emergency vehicles passing within earshot of her apartment, on the way to the World Trade Center.)

And I've developed one small neurosis. I don't like driving through any of the many tunnels under our two rivers. Somehow the idea of being trapped there during an attack seems especially horrible. I should stress that I don't think about this when I'm not in the tunnels, and that I drive through them just as much as I ever did. But now I don't like it.

What does this have to do with abductions? Helplessness. I can't do anything to stop a terror attack, and I'm not willing, at this point, to change my life. So I endure the uncertainty. Abductees feel they can't do anything about their abductions, which they believe are real (and which, John, are not all intrusive enough to be called rapes).

So abductees, too, have to endure. And here they're actually in a better position than New Yorkers are, because they can console themselves with the understanding that abductions don't do permanent harm. In this situation, counseling and therapy can genuinely help. You learn to manage your anxiety. In just the same way, counseling and therapy helped countless New Yorkers after 9/11. My wife and I know someone who was in one of the buildings during the attack, and was lucky to survive. His company required him and others in his position to have counseling, and it did him enormous good. If my thoughts about tunnels escalated to the point that they seriously disturbed me, I'd seek therapy myself.

All of this, John, is to suggest that it's not uncommon to live with major uncertainty, and the ongoing threat of possible harm. (I could also talk about living in Los Angeles, and how absolutely everybody there takes for granted that there someday, maybe tomorrow, will be a major earthquake, and that the city will be destroyed.) It's not reasonable to say that this creates a disconnect between one aspect of life and another. Or at least you'd have to grant that disconnects of this kind aren't uncommon. Imagine someone who lives in Los Angeles, and learns that the hot water heater in their home is defective, and might explode. They'd fix it. But still they live with what they believe is a strong possibility that they could be killed in an earthquake. Abductees, if you think about it, are a lot more reasonable. At least they know they won't be permanently harmed.

Sheesh! Don't you skeptics know anything about people?

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:23:48 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:33:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 13:40:15 -0800
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

<snip>

>Anyhow, Dave Rudiak has nailed down the important fact that
>there was Dick Drake trio, and that he did indeed come up and
>play in Reno on the date(s) in question. Union membership is
>assumed, but not really necessary.

Hi Larry,

There's a point there as well. In most jurisdictions, the unions would have real clout with nightclubs by threatening to ban them if they refused to use union musicians. But in Vegas, where the "mob" ruled in those days, I don't think the union local would have had much say. They could have been a non-union group.

Though the Drake group existed it would be nice to make contact with one of them, particularly those other than Drake to confirm the sighting.

However these reports are a dime a dozen. As detailed as you could get it, some debunker would say, "Well musicians. Of course they saw something. How could they not in their perpetual state of drug induced experiences."

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:19:26 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:34:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Maccabee

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 18:19:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 12:20:35 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Infrasound UFO Detection

><snip>

>>The microphones used were sensitive to 1-16 Hz.

>Anyone know of reasonably priced 'something-phones' which can
>detect 1-16 Hz in air on the market today? (They could help in
>our efforts to detect the presence of signals.)

My guess is that the cheapest low frequency microphone is a
loudspeaker. Yes, a large one (10", 15" diameter, the bigger the
more sensitive to low freq.). Of course you will need sensitive
amplification devices which operate at very low frequencies...
such as operational amplifiers ("DC coupled" amplifiers).

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:29:55 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:37:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:17:01 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
>>Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>INEXPLICATA
>>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
>>02.08.05

>>Source: Terra.cl
>>Date: 02.08.05

>><http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

>>[Click 'Ir A Galeria' below thumbnail]

>>At Iquique>
>>Increible UFO Photo In Northern Chile

<snip>

>This is just another of many recent examples of a UFO which was
>not noticed by the witness until after he looked at the picture
>he took. Fortunately, this UFO can easily be explained. It is a
>lens flare! Just click on 'Anterior' to see the entire picture
>and you will see a very bright light source of the same angular
>size and appearance as the UFO just opposite the optical center
>of the photo which was the cause of this lens flare.

>For those of you who still have doubts about the lens flare
>explanation, if this was indeed a bright UFO almost as big as
>the Moon in the sky overlooking the harbour, why do we not see
>reflected lights of this UFO off the water's surface just like
>we would see with the light from the Moon, especially when we do
>see the much fainter city lights on the far shore reflecting off
>the water's surface?

My only doubt about the lens flare solution is the dark area. A
lens flare can add radiation to an area where there shouldn't be
radiation (by "taking radiation away" from some bright image of
a light source), but the flare cannot rob radiation from where
it should be. How do you explain the dark line that seems to
pass through the "flare?"

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 15:09:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:39:59 -0500
Subject: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
February 11, 2005

Source: Diario El Tribuno - Salta, Argentina
Date: February 6, 2005

Found by a teacher hiking through the hills

Strange Impressions Found On Cerro Parapente

A strange cylindrical impression measuring approximately 4.25 meters in diameter was found at the summit of one of the hills adjacent to the San Bernardo. This is the one known as Cerro Parapente ("Hanglider Hill") because it was customarily used by practitioners of the sport. It is also the western limit of the "Martin Miguel de Guemes" raceway.

The hill stands approximately 1200 meters high and lacks vehicular access, since the road constructed by an association of hang glider enthusiasts has fallen into disrepair.

The find was made by primary school instructor Omar Ruiz, 48, and his son Armando, 13, who had ascended the hill to practice sports.

Ruiz teaches at the "De La Patria" school in the distant community of Los Toldos and spent the last day of his vacation in Salta, since he is returning to work tomorrow.

"I was startled to see those strange prints, almost a perfect circle," he said. "But I was more startled by the curious drawings," stressed the educator after making his discovery known to El Tribuno. A team of reporters was immediately sent to the site.

A reporter and a photographer ascended the hill in the company of Ruiz elder and junior, attesting to the veracity of their report: the mark was on the hard, rocky summit of the hill, which is flat and chosen for that reason as a takeoff point for hang glider pilots: a perfect circle that left three types of grooves at different depths, a continuous inscription of notches equidistant to each other and in a diagonal position, similar to the drawings on certain types of special vehicles.

But that wasn't all. At the center of the shape was a rhomboidal form with a curious formation of straight lines, pressured into the rocky surface. Some salient rocks could be seen around the circumference, showing signs of having been polished by the effect of powerful friction.

A tourist from Santiago, vacationing with a large group of relatives who were engaged in rock climbing, reached the summit along with the El Tribuno team and the imprint's discoverers. They all expressed their amazement. "I don't know what could have made those marks. It's the weirdest thing I've ever seen," said businessman Marcelo Ruiz, absorbed in contemplation of the peculiar inscriptions.

Translation (c) 2005 Scott Corrales
Institute of Hispanic Ufology (IHU)
Special thanks to Mercedes Casas

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Strange Phenomena In Mar del Plata Argentina

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 15:41:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:42:31 -0500
Subject: Strange Phenomena In Mar del Plata Argentina

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
February 11, 2005

Source: Planeta UFO
Date: 02.11.05

Strange Phenomena In Mar del Plata

Christian Quintero writes: "In spite of the fact that the print media seems to have chose to ignore the case, several television channels have been reporting - for a number of days now - the strange events taking place in the city of Mar del Plata (Buenos Aires province). National stations like America 2 (La Plata) and Canal 9 (Buenos Aires) and some cable channels like Cronica TV are reporting on strange impressions that have appeared in the soil of this beach resort community.

The various reports suggest that the initial events took place in the early hours of Monday (02.07.05) at the "El Paraiso" sector of Sierra de los Padres, some 20 km away from downtown Mar del Plata (for those lacking firsthand knowledge of the site, it can be described as an undeveloped area filled with orchards and farms). Around midnight Sunday or early morning on Monday, some residents noticed that dogs and farm animals were exhibiting an unusually high state of nervousness, howling and braying as though aware of a strange presence.

Romelio Tapia, a local resident, reports hearing a strange noise around 2 a.m. "similar to that of a strong wind or turbine" and he raised the blinds in his bedroom to see what was going on. At that time he noticed a pair of yellowish lights - similar to mercury vapor lamps- floating above the top of a copse not far from his home. Tapia estimates that the lights were some 3-4 meters above the ground. The lights seemed diffused, as though surrounded by a mist, and rose into the air until they vanished. This information is corroborated by other local residents, like Mrs. Carmen Aranga.

Upon examining the terrain at first light, locals discovered that two strange circular marks of equal diameter (some meters) had appeared at the Tapia Farm. Upon closer examination, they ascertained that it was some kind of ash that leaved a greasy black residue upon contact with the skin.

After the corresponding report to the local authorities, elements of the forensic police arrived at the site to collect samples of the ash and the grass, but they subsequently decided to remove the entirety of the affected property, leaving it utterly bare.

It is interesting to note that in the days prior to the incident, the daughter of one of the residents suffered nightmares in which a luminous object "was after her". Upon awakening she would make drawings of the object, which showed a typical saucer-shape with a central dome and legs, in some cases. This story was shared with trustworthy individuals days before the imprints appeared.

After this case became public knowledge, it was learned that marks on the grass had also appeared elsewhere in the city. On this time it involved a business establishment located on Route 88, some 10 km from the Tapia Farm. No lights or sounds were reported in this case, since the facility is closed at night, but at least 10 marks were found the following day, featuring the same type of greyish ash. Unlike the event at Sierra de los Padres, the circles were only marked in their outline and several of them were not completely finished. For this reason they more closely resembled the phenomenon known as "fairy rings."

Translation (c) 2005. Scott Corrales IHU
Special thanks to Christian Quintero

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Mysterious Prints Found In Argentine Industrial

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 16:01:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:44:47 -0500
Subject: Mysterious Prints Found In Argentine Industrial

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
February 11, 2005

SOURCE: La Capital (Buenos Aires)
DATE: 02.11.05

Argentina: Mystery Prints Found At Industrial Park

More circles on grass wer found at a potato processing plant on Route 88. The circle is completely closed and is monitored. No explanation for this strange phenomenon has been found.

Mysterious circular marks were found yesterday on the grass in several local areas, similar to the ones found at "El Paraiso" at the 20 km marker of Route 226.

This time, one of the cases - linked by many with UFO sightings - took place at the Fernandez Hermanos potato processing plant, located on Rt. 88 and Hernandarias, some 6 km away from El Paraiso.

The discovery was made on Wednesday morning but was reported yesterday by company managers.

"While it did seem something strange to us we gave it little importance. When we read in the papers that something similar had happened on Rt. 226 we reported the case," explained a company employee to LA CAPITAL.

The circles at the Fernandez Hermanos plant were allegedly created between Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning, at the same time that an identical phenomenon took place on Rt. 226.

This time the marks - around 10 in number - appeared in a broad lot in the middle of the establishment, next to a greenhouse and a truck loading and unloading area.

The premises are fenced in and monitored, thus dismissing the possibility that a stranger could have broken in during the night.

One of the first to become aware of the situation was Hugo Giovannangelo, who performs maintenance duties at the company. "I arrived at 7 am and when I went out to the lot, I saw some very strange rings. I was accompanied by a co-worker, with whom I jested that UFOs might be involved."

According to management, no activity was carried out in that part of the premises which could account for the strange phenomenon. "We only mow the grass there. No chemical products are dumped there and trucks aren't allowed to park on it."

Giovannangelo was startled by another fact. He stated that the guard dog on the premises was "very nervous and aggressive" when he went to feed it.

Oddly enough, at El Paraiso, where a local resident claimed

having seen a light in the night, something similar happened to the animals. "We couldn't sleep all night because the dogs were restless and the pigs were squealing," said one woman.

There were no witnesses on hand to explain what happened Wednesday morning in the case recorded in the potato plant. All of the personnel left Tuesday at 22:30 after having eaten a meal. Only a watchman was left on site, who claims having seen nothing at all.

Company management was trying to locate a trucker who slept aboard his vehicle during the time at which the marks were created, but could not locate him. Should the driver have been awake at the time, he would have clearly seen what caused the impression, since his vehicle was parked only meters away. "But the man loaded up, went off to Rosario and we still haven't found him."

Phytopathologist Alberto Escande of the School of Agricultural Science and the INTA took photos of the grass to analyze them at his lab in Balcarce.

Escande, who has a broad knowledge of grass illnesses, did not conceal his astonishment. He explained that the grass "shows no signs of being burned" but rather shows some kind of dust on its surface, similar to a fungus. But what has intrigued the researcher was the way in which the marks were distributed - in the shape of rings - and the fact that the phenomenon has affected all grasses equally. "Generally funguses affect a single species, and in this case we can see that even clovers and weeds are affected. However, no explanation can be put forth until a lab analysis has been performed," he said.

Translation (c) 2005, Scott Corrales IHU
Special thanks to Christian Quintero

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 16:22:42 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:47:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Ledger

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 13:40:15 -0800
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

<snip>

>Hi Don: I wish I could dredge up an old membership book too! I
>would look up Anton LaVey for one thing and post that for
>chuckles.

>Anyhow, Dave Rudiak has nailed down the important fact that
>there was Dick Drake trio, and that he did indeed come up and
>play in Reno on the date(s) in question. Union membership is
>assumed, but not really necessary.

Hey, wait a minute.....

This case took place in 1960. and then there's this:

Frank Drake launched the first SETI search about 40 years ago.
Frank changed his first name [to get the stink of UFOs off his
back] got out of the music business and got his degree.

It all fits.

Call him, Dave, and confront him.

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 16:42:47 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:48:49 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom' -

>From: Michael Brownlee <michael.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 03:26:40 -0700
>Subject: 'Silent ET Invasion Threatens Human Freedom'

<snip>

>BOULDER, CO - Extraterrestrials not only account for mysterious
>UFO sightings and abductions, but may also be secretly
>exploiting human conflict and stimulating the rise of radical
>fundamentalism throughout the world.

Hmm... I wonder if they've been messing about with my cable
reception as well. Probably also responsible for the massive
amounts of snow that has been dumped on Nova Scotia in the past
two weeks.

It all makes so much sense now...

>A series of cosmic surveillance briefings, published as The
>Allies of Humanity, Book Two: Human Unity, Freedom and the
>Hidden Reality of Contact, by award-winning author Marshall Vian
>Summers, reveal a global "Intervention" by commercially-driven
>extraterrestrial forces determined to gradually gain control of
>planet Earth and its resources. The briefings demonstrate how
>ETs are influencing human affairs to advance their cause.

What awards has Marshall Vian Summers won, exactly? The "Hey -
five suckers wrote nice 'reviews' about the book on Amazon.com"
Award?

Perhaps the "Snake-Oil Salesman of the Year" Award?`

Beware of anyone who includes in his bio the statement "I am not
a guru, saint or avatar," and then goes on to pretty much claim
that he is a "guru, saint and avatar."

Sheesh...

>"We are all being marched to war by forces from beyond our world
>who seek to divide and weaken the human family for their own
>benefit," says Summers.

And here I thought that it was Halliburton! The things you learn.

Someone should send this to Michael Moore. He might want to re-
think Fahrenheit 9/11 in light of this startling new
information.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:20:47 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:50:54 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch

>From: Donald A. Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 23:18:43 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 16:48:25 -0600
>>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

<snip>

>>>Somehow I don't think the problems facing the UFO
>>>field will be solved by a software program.

>>There is no question that amassing a valuable database
>>of vetted UFO cases is perhaps an impossibility.

<snip>

>I have two comments to add to this dialogue:

>1) as the archivist for UFOCAT, I want to make a pitch that UFO
>researchers contribute cases to UFOCAT. The UFOCAT database is
>now at 185,000 entries. I don't think there is anything else
>comparable. Larry Hatch does an excellent job of vetting UFO
>reports, and the U database is certainly worth having as a
>resource, but it is only one-tenth the size of UFOCAT. Also,
>from version to version Larry occasionally drops cases, and I am
>not sure why - perhaps he could enlighten me?

<snip>

Hello Don: (always glad to enlighten)

If *U* is 1/10 the size of UFOCAT, its partly because I list
events rather than reports. That means a single event has one
listing, even if there were multiple witnesses.

Dropped cases: Lots of those over the decades. After re-
examining some of my earliest entries, I find a few that really
shouldn't have been there: Discovered hoaxes for example, but
more often likely mundane explanations or incomplete information
which makes it impossible to distinguish an anomaly from just
plain junk. The emphasis is on quality over quantity.

Some thoroughly discredited cases were tossed, and reappear in
this page of stinkeroos:

<http://www.larryhatch.net/DISCREd.html>

Here are two examples, copied on the fly:

(I'm late for work now ..)

1952/5/07 BARRA di TIJUCA, Brazil: Famous! FIVE photos taken
of a 60 meter (200 foot) silent Flying Saucer. Goes South to
sea. /FSR vol.17 #3 and APRO Bulletin Vol.1 #1, their first
issue! Shadows on an uncropped photo indicate the Sun about 45

degrees beneath the horizon (underwater) at 4:15 PM local time.
A most unlikely arrangement. Credit: Loren Gross (/r142#lp47)
and Brad Sparks.

1952/7/31 BERNINA ALPS, Italy : 6 FOTOS of LANDED SCR : OID in
DIVING SUIT EXITS.. /FSR Vol.4 #4 etc. Fotos of hoaxer Giampiero
Monguzzi holding his camera and small models trash this story.
These appeared in Reynolds News (UK, no date) which were saved
by Murray Bott, who kindly passed them to Loren Gross. (see
/r136 #11 pg 61-63) Case closed.

- -

I can't find an excuse NOT to toss cases like these.

Best wishes

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 19:56:27 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:52:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Shostak Willing To Wager That ET Will Call -

>Source: The Australian - Sydney NSW

><http://tinyurl.com/7xkg2>

>02-11-05

>Scientists Are Willing To Wager That ET Will Call

>February 11, 2005

>Are we alone in the universe? Definitely not, say scientists
>such as Seth Shostak, senior astronomer with the SETI Institute
>in Mountain View, California.

<snip>

>Given that astronomer Frank Drake launched the first SETI search
>about 40 years ago and nobody has thus far been heard from, when
>will Shostak and his colleagues make contact? "The answer is
>some time close to the year 2025," he says. "I'll bet you a flat
>white on that!"

Hi Everyone!

Below are some comments I made which were posted to UFO UpDates a while ago about Seth Shostak and his opinions on when he expected contact to be made with ETs. Since "contact" suggests two-way communication between us and the ETs such as talking to each other by radio or other means, I suggest that "discovery" of ETs is more what Seth meant. If we do not restrict our thinking only to ETs but to all advanced intelligences/civilizations currently unknown to science (John Keel's ultraterrestrials or UTs comes to mind and is more inclusive than just ETs), then I would argue that Seth's has already lost his bet since UTs have been known by various cultures throughout history!

At a recent Astronomy Journal Club meeting with colleagues at York University in Toronto we dealt with the fact that only a single spacefaring ET civilization at least 1 million year older than ours would be needed to, exponentially, occupied all the stellar neighbourhoods in our entire Milky Way galaxy. The other fact that Seth and his SETI colleagues have yet to discover their presence (Fermi's Paradox) suggests many things, one of them being that we are alone in the universe.

If just some of our past "mythology" and religious accounts, including present day mysterious encounters with aliens and unseen intelligences or forces, are true, then we are NOT alone (but still unique or special)! I proposed to my startled colleagues that if we think more as 21st rather than 20th century scientists, we would have to entertain the very real possibility that ETs (or UTs) are already present right here in this meeting room! It is only because of our inability as three dimensional beings that we cannot observe them. When our learned (and I think wiser) ancestors talked about concepts such as the 7 Heavens and the 12 Hierarchies or Orders of angels, I believe they were referring to the unseen reality of UT beings which

occupied these higher dimensions. To us, any dimensions beyond the three spatial dimensions and one dimension of time would seem to be collapsed to nothing - but not to the UTs who reside in these higher dimensions. These "collapsed" dimensions would be just as big and extensive as the universe we observe (very much like the two dimensional people in our home movies or videos who cannot observe us but we can observe them).

Nick Balaskas

Sometime back in 2001, two of my friends, Michael, a skeptical professional astronomer and Sue, a fellow member with MUFON Ontario stayed behind to speak with Seth Shostak (then with the SETI Institute) after his talk at York University to learn more about his beliefs regarding UFOs and ETs. As we expected, although Seth is a scientist, he was not well informed about important UFO incidents and other scientific evidence that strongly suggested ET contact had already been made and neither did he seem much interested in learning more - a cardinal sin for any true scientist, eminent or not.

Although I do not remember the exact things Seth mentioned, he was willing to bet that sometime in the coming few years we will make contact with an advanced ET civilization in our galaxy.

Seth's basis for believing this is the Drake Equation which, depending on the value of the numbers one guesses for each of the many variables, predicts the actual number of advanced ET civilizations in our galaxy. Using the Drake Equation, many astronomers including Seth suspect that there should be at least 100,000 advanced ET civilizations. Once SETI has had a chance to listened in on 100,000 stars or more which should happen by the time SETI's new Allen Telescope Array is completed in 2010 or soon afterwards, it is then Seth expects our first contact with an advanced ET civilization will be made.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: The Fortean Nailgun - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 21:15:11 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:53:44 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fortean Nailgun - Balaskas

>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 14:07:08 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: The Fortean Nailgun

>Alien Implants, Anachronistic Artifacts, and the Fortean Nailgun

>by Mac Tonnies

<snip>

>The few "implants" that have been removed - by a rather gullible
>podiatrist - share some interesting compositional similarities
>but have left the issue naggingly open to dismissal. (Of course,
>in theory, that could be an integral part of the alien plot.
>Villagomez's case suggests "they" might have decided to ramp up
>the absurdity that accompanies abductions by disguising their
>implants as common objects.)

Hi Mac!

A few of these implants which have been removed by this "rather gullible podiatrist", who I would more accurately describe as a very curious and open minded medical professional, do have some interesting compositional similarities but many also have some very interesting differences too which we have so far failed to identify or attribute to anything made here on Earth. Of course, simply because something is similar or different is not enough to conclude that these "implants" were from here or are evidence of their ET origin.

>But I'm genuinely puzzled about the nail in Villagomez's neck.
>Coincidentally, generations of archaeologists and miners have
>(unwittingly) found a plethora of tooled metal objects embedded
>in solid rock, forcefully implying the artifacts are millions of
>years old. Some researchers, notably Michael Cremo, have cited
>such anachronisms as evidence of a remarkably ancient
>civilization.

Check out this other related news story of a construction worker who had unknowingly fired a 4 inch nail into his skull with his nail gun!

http://www.usatoday.com/news/offbeat/2005-01-16-nail-skull_x.htm

It is not uncommon after some traumatic experience such as a car crash or intrusive alien abduction experience for the victim to discover some previously unknown lump. The majority of these which have subsequently been removed by other doctors have been of common objects (small stones, glass fragments, wood or metal slivers, bullet shrapnel, etc.) that the victims had unknowingly carried these in their bodies for many years. Although many of these lumps showed no signs of entrance wounds, this in itself is not unusual since embedded foreign objects, especially those in the connective tissues beneath the skin and just above the muscles, will easily migrate through the body! So the lack of an entrance wound alone is not evidence of that this object had somehow been inserted into the victim by aliens.

>But the nail in Villagomez' neck suggests another (equally
>weird) explanation: Maybe, for unknown reasons, small metal
>objects are uniquely susceptible to random teleportation.
>Perhaps there's an ongoing, invisible traffic of nails, ball
>bearings and occasional jewelry (see Cremo and Thompson's
>"Forbidden Archaeology") that we notice only seldomly . . . if
>at all. Alternatively, "impossible" archaeological finds might
>signal flaws in the universe's causal structure, indicating that
>our reality is in fact a simulation or some sort of consensual
>dream.

As I have said before, facts do not speak for themselves, they are interpreted in view of our current understanding. Very often erroneously. What one may argue is proof of teleportation of solid objects into other solid objects or proof that prehistoric man used ball bearings could in reality be present day objects that have been found in rapidly forming minerals or rocks, often observed since the time periods are a few years or less rather than the millions of years we associate with rock forming. A quick Google search will reveal many such examples which have been overlooked (and I suspect ignored) by some less than unbiased authors such as Cremo and Thompson who have their own hidden agendas or religious views to promote.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 07:50:55 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:56:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 04:44:02 -0800
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:52:55 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 04:22:48 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>>I would have thought that many ufologists take the view that a
>>piece of genuine extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell.

>Many? Yes, but that depends on your sample. The weenie websites
>take Roswell as gospel. I was referring to the membership of
>this List, and not all of them really.

But most? And excluding, of course, yourself, before your
morning beer? <burp!>

I'd suggest thinking about how alone you're going to feel, how
much crow you're going to have eat, how well you were really
served, and how constructive you really were for standing so far
from the cliff's edge. Did you think you were to survive your
interests and remain unchanged, Sir? Step up! Our betters, those
more diligently courageous, put up some guard rails, and you can
watch guys like me willing to jump thinking they might fly (It's
OK... I've got one hell of a bungee cord!)... Step up! Avoid the
rush! ...And there's going to be one...

>It remains my impression that a majority of serious ufologists,
>Friedman excepted of course, no longer consider 'Roswell' the
>crash of an alien spacecraft. Again, I would like a show >of
hands, yea or nay, in case I'm wrong in this.

Lost message traffic, Ramey memo, corroborating first-hand
testimony, we've lost nuclear weapons after Roswell (jeez...
about 12 I think), inconclusive archeology, CIA rewriting of the
history, 'official' versions change, concordance with an ongoing
flap, Dr. Marcel (forgetting his father), and the ardent
dismissal by Kal K. Korff et sig al... I believe you're wrong,
forgetting it won't matter one way or the other who was 'right.'

Consider... We're better off 'believing' we're not alone than
pretending that we are. Mr. Rimmer is going to go down hard...
he might even be one of the ones who opt 'out' at the presently
accelerating denouement... tsk.

Step up... if you're wrong you're wrong but that's a step up
too, upon discovery. At least you looked... be brave and mighty
forces will come to your aid. Moreover you're 'credibility' has
got to be self-defined so it's going to be what you think it is,

regardless..... But don't snipe from an imagined "high ground," Mr. Hatch. Forgetting it's predictable, as with Mr. Rimmer, its a distinction you only try to sell yourself to salve a sweaty top lip, and probably inaccurate for all that.

Now, I have to say that mine was the very reasonable response given your reflexive, unnecessary, and certainly less than constructive disrespect for a, very necessary, left half of the ufological Bell curve, Mr. Hatch.

Half a bell won't ring as well.

And thanks.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:26:44 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 09:58:14 -0500
Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 11:53:20 -0400
>Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 17:49:37 -0500
>>Subject: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

>>I listen to Austin, Texas broadcaster Alex Jones quite a bit. He
>>makes video documentaries as one way to support his show.
>>Recently he mentioned that his latest, which I believe is a
>>couple of hours in length and is estimated at a production cost
>>of \$22,000.

>>This List seems to have quite a few concerned and extremely well
>>versed ufologists, who are not very happy with what is made for
>>TV on this issue.

>>Is there enough interest to produce a 'Ufologist's own' video?

>>This could be sold to fund further work, and could serve as a
>>template and maybe even a pilot for possible airing on TV. This
>>keeps Alex Jones' busy activism operation and shows rolling. If
>>not mainstream channels, then perhaps community cable channels.

>>There is quite a bit of interest reported in some video DVDs
>>about the 9/11 attacks, for example. And these DVDs are finding
>>special interest overseas, where versions in other languages are
>>being produced.

>>Alex has many volunteers buying his videos and getting them
>>aired on community cable channels, and even to gatherings of the
>>interested public. He also keeps his production costs low by
>>making use of volunteer producers from his local cable TV
>>channel's facilities.

>>Instead of the costly flying of production crews to visit people
>>to be interviewed, it's likely volunteer producers could be
>>found at different community TV channels who could set up the
>>actual interviews and either carry them out, or, have an
>>established ufologist do the interviews by telephone.

>>Not quite as glitzy as Peter Jennings, but the content is the
>>important thing.

>>And this would be one way to really put expolitics to the fore,
>>without having to butt heads with mainstream producers.

>>These days, it's a lot easier to home brew your own documentary,
>>and I wonder if the time is right for Ufology to have 'it's own
>>brand' out there?

>I should remind Listers that there are already some Videos out
>by ufologists.

>My Group 1 "UFOs ARE Real" has brought many good reviews. It
>even won an award back in about 1980.

>Included are Dr. Bruce Maccabee, Dr. James Harder, Dr. Richard
>Haines, Major Jesse Marcel, Lt. Col. Larry Coyne,

Hey Mr. Friedman, do you have a line on Col. Coyne? I met Coyne around 1979 or thereabouts at Ft. Campbell, Kentucky when he'd flown in to Sabre Heliport see his buddy T.J. Ballantine, a platoon leader with the 2/17 Cavalry.

I wished I'd paid better attention then, and would like to talk to him now. I've another crew of active duty aviators who've recently had a sighting while on a training mission of a type similar to Coyne's (one of the crew actually wet themselves) and would like to compare notes...

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 12](#)

UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 13:12:43 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 13:12:43 -0500
Subject: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

Source: ProFindPages.Com

<http://www.profindpages.com/news/2005/02/12/MN752.htm>

02-12-05

UFO Sighted Over Washington DC, 10 Feb

UFO Pictured Over Washington DC

This latest UFO report was brought to our attention by
mediavillage.net.

Whilst doing some maintenance on another site, they came across
"something odd about the Washington image feed". Some screen
shots were taken and a UFO appears in the image. Click:

<http://tinyurl.com/6fzy5>

to go to their site and view the full details.

There are a number of screenshots taken at various times, in
one, the sky appears to darken considerably in just a few
minutes (following the appearance of the object).

The UFO sighting was reported to the National UFO Reporting
Center who seem to agree that it was unusual, but obviously
without further investigation it will be difficult to say
exactly what it was.

Perhaps if anyone else saw this strange object in the sky over
Washington DC at 03:15 EST Feb 10, 2005, they can contact the
site that supplied this information with further details?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 15:45:46 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 09:59:49 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Koi

>From: Nikolay Subbotin <paragloss.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
>Subject: UFO Research Software?

>Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any
>software for professional UFO research.

A lot depends upon what "UFO research software" you want.

When the topic of UFO databases and software arose a few weeks ago, I posted a list of references to discussions of some of the major existing databases (including UFOCAT and Larry Hatch's *U* database). Since the topic has recurred already, I'm giving in to the temptation to send a more comprehensive email.

However, as always, time is a bit limited right now so I've had to leave quite a bit of material until I return to this topic upon finishing my damn Chronology.

As a starting point, I find it useful to split up the various types of software/databases that ufologists use. In this email, I'll divide my comments into the following categories:

- A. Databases of UFO reports;
- B. Databases of other information;
- C. Expert systems to assist in identifying possible stimuli for a report;
- D. Other software to assist in investigations and research.

At the very minimum, I consider this exercise to be worthwhile because it may assist some of the various individuals that appear to be putting considerable time and effort into developing their own databases/software. Also, the usefulness of databases and other software merely as bibliographical tools should not be underestimated given the sheer mass of literature and documentation relating to UFO reports. However, before launching into these topics, I'll just note a few cautionary remarks in relation to the use of computers within ufology:

(1) "Computers are a powerful tool which properly used will give enormous assistance to ufologists the world over... but it should be recognised from the outset that they alone will not answer the questions. [T]he UFO enigma will not be answered by computers but by the talented and intuitive thinking of human minds" per Spencer, John and Vallee, Jacques and Verga, Maurizio in "UFO: 1947-1987" (1987) (edited by Hilary Evans with John Spencer) at page 245 of the Fortean Tomes softcover edition (in Chapter 3.6, entitled "Computers in Ufology").

(2) "Poor data will merely produce the wrong answer more quickly on a computer. No technology or technique will compensate for deficient data." per Peter Hill, quoted in Phenomenon (1988) (edited by John Spencer and Hilary Evans) at page 224.

(3) "The well-known phrase 'garbage in, garbage out' applies

equally well to ufology." per Gamble, Stephen and Wootten, Michael and Danby, J and Smith, Willy and Kuhlemann, Bertil in "Phenomenon" (1988) (edited by John Spencer and Hilary Evans) at pages 224-237 of the MacDonald hardback edition (in Part 3, in the unnumbered chapter entitled "Harnessing the Computer").

(4) See also the remarks by Brad Sparks on UpDates at the following link:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/jan/m09-010.shtml>

With these caveats firmly in mind, I turn to the categories I outlined above.

A. Databases of UFO reports

Given that many ufologists (and non-ufologists) in modern society appear to be almost compulsive list-makers, it is not surprising that there are already a wide variety of dabases of UFO Reports.

Heck, there are already a considerable number of lists of databases (in effect, databases of databases - or "databases squared").

What is more surprising is that these databases rarely seem to be referred to by other individuals that are considering developing their own databases.

If I were to attempt to prepare a comprehensive list of databases from scratch, I would attempt to divide existing databases into various categories (e.g. according to the method of storage or access (such as online, computerised and paper based), or according to the type of data stored (e.g. worldwide reports, regional reports, or specialised (e.g. pilot sightings, EM reports) and gradually build up a comprehensive list of databases within each catagory.

However, given the existence of some attempts to list databases already, I think a more efficient and systematic approach would be to begin by starting by producing a list of references to lists of databases (in effect, a database of databases of databases, or a list of databases squared, or a "database cubed").

I'll begin with a list of online lists of databases (most of which are useful as guides to databases available online, but are rather weak in relation to databases supplied on CD or on paper):

(a) Mark Cashman's list of catalogues at the following link, which is clearly presented and useful (but rather limited):

<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/catalog/index.htm>

(b) Potentially more comprehensive, but a bit hit and miss in its coverage, is the following page on Francis Ridge's "NICAP" website. That page refers to various categories or "groups" of sightings. Clicking on a "group" displays a page relating to that category of sighting that generally begins with a list of databases or analyses relevant to that category.

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/special.htm>

(c) Project 1947 provides a list of catalogues (which appears to be generally limited to those by contributors to the Project) at:

<http://www.project1947.com/47cats.htm>

(d) A slightly bare list of databases (which includes several regional databases rarely mentioned elsewhere) is provided by SUFOI at the following link:

<http://www.sufoi.dk/artik-sn/new12-08.htm>

(e) Few of the many computer software projects currently in development give any indication that existing databases/software were reviewed before launching into the new project. One of the few exceptions is the RRO project being run by Jerome Beau, which not only includes a limited list of "alternatives and

competition" but also (extremely briefly and not entirely clearly (possibly because of the somewhat stilted English/jargon)) attempts to define what is different about the proposed project. See the "alternatives and competition" table and the remarks below it at the following link:

https://sourceforge.net/docman/display_doc.php?docid=17408&group_id=70060#AlternativesAndCompetition

(f) A very brief list of databases is given by Terry Groff on his UFO Tools website at the following link:

<http://www.terrygroff.com/ufotools/statistics.html>

The most striking thing about these lists, to me at least, is that there is very limited overlap in the lists of databases. It seems to me that merely combining these lists would generate a more comprehensive list of UFO databases than is currently available on the Internet.

Even more striking is the fact that the lists of databases and catalogues that appear in print also have extremely limited overlap with the above lists. For example, UFO databases are listed and/or discussed in the following:

Evans, Hilary in "UFO: 1947-1987" (1987) (edited by Hilary Evans with John Spencer) at page 46 of the Fortean Tomes softcover edition (Chapter 2.3.1, entitled "UFOs as Global Phenomenon").

Hall, Richard in "The UFO Evidence: Volume 2 - A Thirty Year Report" (2001) (edited by Richard Hall) at pages 646-647 (in Section 16) of the Scarecrow Press hardback edition.

Hynek, J Allen and Vallee, Jacques in their "The Edge of Reality" (1975) at pages 76, 78-82 (in Chapter 3) of the Henry Regnery hardback edition.

Gamble, Stephen and Wootten, Michael and Danby, J and Smith, Willy and Kuhlemann, Bertil in "Phenomenon" (1988) (edited by John Spencer and Hilary Evans) at pages 224-237 of the MacDonald hardback edition (Part 3, in the unnumbered chapter entitled "Harnessing the Computer").

Randles, Jenny and Warrington, Peter in their "UFOs : A British Viewpoint" (1979) at pages 180-181 (in Chapter 11) of the Book Club Associates hardback edition.

Randles, Jenny and Warrington, Peter in their "Science and the UFOs" (1985) at page 60 (in Chapter 4) of the Blackwell hardback edition.

Spencer, John and Vallee, Jacques and Verga, Maurizio in "UFO: 1947-1987" (1987) (edited by Hilary Evans with John Spencer) at pages 238-245 of the Fortean Tomes softcover edition (in Chapter 3.6, entitled "Computers in Ufology").

Sturrock, Peter in his "The UFO Enigma" (1999) at pages 166-167 (in Chapter 24) of the Warner Aspect hardback edition.

Westrum, Ronald M in "UFO Phenomena and the Behavioral Scientist" (1979) (edited by Richard F Haines) at pages 104-106 (in Chapter 5) of the Scarecrow Press hardback edition.

The above lists are an attempt at a database cubed. I've started to generate my own database squared (i.e. a list of computer databases), by listing the databases listed in the webpages/discussions and other databases I've read about elsewhere (or have obtained).

Before I spend much more time on this project, I'd invite anyone that knows of other lists of databases to add to the above database cubed to do so.

Of the above list of existing lists of databases, I would heavily highlight in particular the article by Spencer, John and Vallee, Jacques and Verga, Maurizio in "UFO: 1947-1987" (1987) (edited by Hilary Evans with John Spencer) at pages 238-245 of the Fortean Tomes softcover edition (in Chapter 3.6, entitled "Computers in Ufology").

That article discusses a considerable number of existing

databases. Interestingly, I don't think I've read about most of those databases since that article was printed in 1987. It would be interesting to follow up on the status and availability of those databases. A few hours of effort in following up the availability of programs or databases that took week or months to produce could be very rewarding.

I note in particular the following from that article (at the top of page 242): " This is the only publication in the world exclusively devoted to the use and application of computers in ufology. A lot of international researchers contribute to the [Computer UFO Newsletter] edited by Maurizio Verga. with articles on research projects, ready programs, proposals of common works and new software. There is a column, 'Offers of software', where there is an offer at cost price of all UFO programs available at the moment (about 30) for different kinds of computers."

Presumably, if the authors of the relevant programs were prepared to make the programs available at cost price, some or all of them would be prepared to make them available on a website (such as Terry's "UFO Tools" website).

I note that the Newsletter is referred to on Maurizio Verga's website at the following link, but I don't know whether the newsletters that were produced (or the relevant programs) are already available online or how useful they would be.

<http://www.ufo.it/verga.htm>

Another previous effort that I would be interested in knowing more about (and may be worth noting by those that are working on, or thinking about, generating their own database) is the International Committee for UFO Research ("ICUR"). That organisation made an effort to consider how more comprehensive international databases of UFO reports could be generated and how (if at all) the data in various databases could be standardised. See the links below:

<http://members.rogers.com/vlourenco/mufon/hais02.htm>

<http://dSPACE.dial.pipex.com/town/square/el82/icur.htm>

That Committee boasted an impressive list of members, including BUFORA, CUFOSS, Project UNICAT, Project URD, SUFOI and others. I'm aware of some background on the Committee (see the short list of references below), but am quite out of date. I'd like to know far more about this interesting endeavour. Can anyone point me to more up to date information? Are any of the members of the executive of that Committee on this List? How active was/is the Committee? Did it issue any reports or substantial minutes of its deliberations?

Some references for the International Committee for UFO Research (in addition to the 2 hyperlinks given above):

Blevins, Dave in his "UFO Directory International" (2003) at pages 89-90 (in Part 2) of the McF softcover edition.

Gamble, Stephen and Wootten, Michael and Danby, J. and Smith, Willy and Kuhlmann, Bertil in "Phenomenon" (1988) (edited by John Spencer and Hilary Evans) at page 224 of the MacDonald hardback edition (Part 3, in the unnumbered chapter entitled "Harnessing the Computer").

Randles, Jenny in her "UFO Reality" (1983) at page 52 (in Chapter 3) of the Hale hardback edition.

West, Arnold in "Phenomenon" (1988) (edited by John Spencer and Hilary Evans) at page 12 of the MacDonald hardback edition (in the unnumbered chapter entitled "About BUFORA and ICUR").

In this part of this email I'm merely seeking to outline how a comprehensive list of existing computer databases could be produced, not to give a list of them. (A draft list I'm working on is probably too long to include in this email). However, it would be remiss of me to fail to give a couple of comments on the two offline giants of the UFO database world: UFOCAT and Larry Hatch's *U* database.

UFOCAT: I don't think that there's any real doubt that UFOCAT is the most famous and largest offline UFO database.

I gave a list of references to discussion of UFOCAT cut and paste from an incomplete draft of my Chronology in my email at the following link:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/jan/m10-017.shtml>

See also the CUFOS and UFOCAT webpages:

<http://www.cufos.org/UFOCAT.html>

<http://www.ufocat.com/>

As I remarked in that email, I think it would be in the interests of ufology and CUFOS for the manual for UFOCAT to be made available on the internet. The manual hints at the wealth of data and bibliographical references on various topics that can be extracted from UFOCAT. Also, the UFOCAT database (which runs on Microsoft's Access) comes with various pre-prepared lists relating to particularly types of sightings etc. I would have thought it would be good advertising for UFOCAT for one or more of those lists to be made freely available on the CUFOS website.

I'd also note the following comment from page 5 of the UFOCAT 2002 Manual: "We would first caution potential users not to expect to be able to begin and end their research using only UFOCAT 2002--there are too many gaps in the data and, just like the Internet, not every source of information is as reliable and accurate as the next. The results obtained from UFOCAT 2002 are best thought of as a reference guide to the original sources for the crucial details. Otherwise, the distinction between poorly investigated reports and exhaustively studied sightings will be lost. However, you will substantially improve your search for information by accessing UFOCAT 2002. What was true when Allan Hendry wrote his critique of UFOCAT in 1979 is even truer today: UFOCAT 2002 is without peer as a reference source. Thousands of hours went into creating it, and months have gone into revising it to improve its ease of use. It exists today as the most comprehensive reference tool and bibliographic source on UFO reports in existence."

Larry Hatch's *U* Database - Given Larry's frequent posts to Updates, his database probably does not require any introduction or any reference to his website at the following link:

<http://www.larryhatch.net/>

As far as I've seen, this database has not been discussed in many books so far. However, Larry's objective appears to be very similar to that of Dr Willy Smith's Project UNICAT (i.e. a filtered catalogue of higher quality UFO reports). Project UNICAT's database has been discussed in several of the references given above, and elsewhere (e.g. in the entry entitled "UNICAT Project" at pages 943-944 of Jerome Clark's "UFO Encyclopedia 2nd Edition : Volume 2 L-Z:" (1998).

Larry's database is currently only available as a Microsoft DOS program and its appearance is a rather basic. The sound effects may have been cutting edge for DOS software but are now simply a bit irritating. However, these rather superficial issues should not cause the database itself to be underestimated. The database is a useful tool and I look forward to seeing Larry release a new version of his database once it's been given a new, glossy, Windows user interface. (Again, I find it interesting that the references given by Larry's database rarely seem to overlap with the references given for the same sightings by UFOCAT).

B. Databases of other information

Ah, well, this is a rather wide category of a mass of (generally) smaller databases.....

For example, there are lists/databases of different types of IFOs (e.g. Menzel's list, which is now online at:

http://www.cufon.org/cufon/ifo_list.htm

or lists relating to a particular type of IFO (e.g. the list of

clouds (with photos) for which a link is given on Terry's UFO Tools website).

More significant are the various bibliographies (by Catoe etc). I won't attempt to list the existing bibliographies in this email, but will simply note that several of the existing bibliographies contain sections which are devoted to listing bibliographies - see, in particular, the following:

(1) Codes LB and LBA in the excellent online database produced by the AFU, at the following link:

<http://www.afu.info/booksbycodeL.htm>

(2) US Library of Congress, Tracer Bullet 91-1 "Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOs)" containing section entitled "Bibliographies", available online at:

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/scitech/tracer-bullets/ufostb.html>

Surprising limited, unless I'm missing something, are existing indexes/databases of government documents. Of course, there are some lists (e.g. Brad Sparks' list of Project Blue Book "Unknowns"), but I've seen far fewer such indexes than would be useful. If someone has already compiled a list of such indexes/databases, I'd be grateful if they could let me know as it would produce a short cut for the database squared I'm producing.

The range of other existing lists/databases that might be of interest to ufologists is almost unlimited, for example:

(1) lists of SETI projects (such as those presented by Darling, David in his "The Extraterrestrial Encyclopedia" (2000) at pages 378-383 (in the table entitled "SETI Observing Programs: 1960 to the Present") of the Three Rivers softcover edition and Jill Tarter's list in "Extraterrestrials: Science and alien intelligence" (1985) (edited by Edward Regis) as her tabular Appendix entitled "Archive of SETI observing programs 1959-84" at page 192 of the Cambridge University Press softcover edition.

(2) various lists of movies involving UFOS/aliens, including:

a. The list entitled "A Checklist of ETs in the Cinema" presented by Chris Boyce in in his "Extraterrestrial Encounter" (1979) at page 164 (in Appendix 1) of the David & Charles hardback edition, at page 152 of the 1980 revised NEL paperback edition.

b. The list of science fiction films with themes of either visitors from space, or travelling to space or both presented by Armando Simon in "UFO Phenomena and the Behavioral Scientist" (1979) (edited by Richard F Haines) at page 53 (in Chapter 3) of the Scarecrow Press hardback edition.

c. The list entitled "Alien Inspired Movies" presented by Kurland, Michael in his "The Complete Idiot's Guide to Extraterrestrial Intelligence" (1999) at page 290 (in Chapter 28) of the Alpha Books softcover edition, and included in Appendix E at pages 315-316.

(3) List of names of supposed extraterrestrials relating to UFO sightings/contactees presented by Paul Christopher in his "Alien Intervention" (1998) at pages 81-82 (in Chapter 5) of the Huntington House softcover edition.

etc., etc., etc.

C. Expert systems to assist in identifying possible stimuli for a report

Jacques Vallee has written about an expert system called OVNIBASE that he developed using NEXPERT SYSTEM (developed by Neuron Data, Inc) to implement a screening system which could be operated by clerical personnel with the objective of eliminating most misidentifications and to enable a skilled scientific analyst to spend his or her time on those few cases genuinely worthy of full investigation.

This system was discussed by Jacques Vallee in his

"Confrontations" (1990) at pages 212-213 (in the Appendix) of the Ballantine Books paperback edition. It is also discussed in the article by Spencer, Vallee and Verga highlighted above.

I've heard very little about this system in recent years. I understand that it was being developed further by a French group, but am not sure of its current status or availability.

D. Other software to assist in investigations and research.

This appears to be the primary focus of Terry Groff's "UFO Tools" website at:

<http://www.terrygroff.com/ufotools/>

Again, I won't attempt to list specific examples in this email (given its already considerable length), but will merely note some categories for which lists could be developed:

1. Software for checking specific IFOs, the most obvious example being astronomical sources;

2. Software relevant to particular types of evidence, e.g. Photographic evidence : image analysis software; Witness evidence: software/databases to assist in locating witnesses and calculation tools to assist in evaluating witness evidence. (In relation to calculation tools, in addition to noting the tools on Terry Groff's UFO website referred to above, I note that the article by Spencer, Vallee, and Verga highlighted above appears to briefly refer to other such calculation tools, including an Italian program called "Elaborazione Dati Avvistamento" ("Sighting Data Processing"), which, at least according to that article, "allows the processing of many different parameters coming from the witness' tale. Probable sizes, altitude, distance and speed are some of the parameters you can obtain...".

3. Software for digitising information, e.g. Documents: Scanning software, OCR (Optical Character Recognition) software; Sound (e.g. lectures, radio interviews) : software such as Magix's Audio Cleaning Lab.

Also, it is important not to forget the full range of activities that may be encompassed by the term ufology, including political lobbying FOIA requests. There are various interactive tools online (and other software) that can be useful in relation to these areas. For example, there are websites that allow the user to send a fax elected representatives in a particular country, or to help generate the text of a FOIA request letter.

Furthermore, there are of course the fundamental software program (word processors, spreadsheets, databases, desktop publishing software, virus software, zipping software etc etc).

Perhaps the most obvious observations from reviewing the discussions referred to above are that many, many catalogues/databases have (a) been planned but not finished, or (b) finished but are not readily available. I dread to think how much time and effort has been wasted on such projects. I urge the various individuals on Updates that are involved in the development of further databases to:

(1) consider what, if anything, their project adds to existing databases;

(2) adopt realistic goals; and

(3) consider how their project can be designed in stages or modules,

so that others can build upon your work if you decide to abandon it.

To help me (or anyone else) track down databases that have been developed but almost forgotten about, I repeat the invitation given above to let me (or Updates generally) know of references to lists of databases (other than those given in Section A of this email) so that a comprehensive list of databases can be generated and then followed up.

Kind Regards,

Isaac Koi

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 07:49:21 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 10:02:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good - Hatch

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:23:48 -0400
>Subject: Re: Report Is Almost Too Good

>>Anyhow, Dave Rudiak has nailed down the important fact that
>>there was Dick Drake trio, and that he did indeed come up and
>>play in Reno on the date(s) in question. Union membership is
>>assumed, but not really necessary.

>There's a point there as well. In most jurisdictions, the
>unions would have real clout with nightclubs by threatening to
>ban them if they refused to use union musicians. But in Vegas,
>where the "mob" ruled in those days, I don't think the union
>local would have had much say. They could have been a non-union
>group.

This was Reno, not Las Vegas. Even in mob "influenced" Vegas
back then, and if I have this right, the major clubs were
unionized. The "mob" would promote this or that union in order
to corrupt it!

>Though the Drake goup existed it would be nice to make
>contact with one of them, particularly those other than
>Drake to confirm the sighting.

Agreed! That's the main thing. Anyone who heard a second hand
account from anyone in the small band would be highly valuable.
So far, there is just Dick Drake's account to FATE magazine.

>However these reports are a dime a dozen. As detailed
>as you could get it, some debunker would say,
>"Well musicians. Of course they saw something. How could
>they not in their perpetual state of drug induced
>experiences."

The musicians I knew in the 1960s were more into booze (many
were tee-totalers). I have lots of great memories of those days.

Joe Dodge (drummer) took me on the "100 yard dash" on a break
once .. out some well tracked but obscure exit from the St.
Francis Hotel if memory serves [burp!] and across the street
into Lefty O'Douls! One fast drink and right back up to the set.

The Cuban bartender at the top of the Sir Francis Drake had a
different setup. Any musician could slide a dollar next to the
fruit tray (lime slices, olives etc.) in a special little hidden
place. Some sniveling hotel manager out of a 1930s movie was
watching the whole time but never caught on.

A \$4 scotch would appeared like magic, almost right in your
hand. Amazing. I never left either hotel entirely sober. I
could go on forever.

My point is that the people into dope either didn't last long,
or never got far. (Notable exceptions excepted.)

The fact that the Dick Drake trio were musicians doesn't detract
from the report, not to me. In a curious way it almost

strengthens it.

What is needed is independent confirmation that one of those guys stood by the story, enough to tell somebody else, who might hopefully be found.

Thanks BTW for your interest in the matter. I find the year, location and apparent trajectory interesting for multiple reasons. I hope it either proves out or goes flat bust.

Dave Rudiak has done a wonderful job so far, some real field work. All I'm doing is tracking this and cataloging and mapping things as usual. I hope he can find more. If not, its not for lack of effort!

Best wishes

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages? - Friedman

From: **Stanton Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 11:55:25 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 10:04:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages? - Friedman

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 15:14:51 +0000
>Subject: Is Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages?

<snip>

>A scientific ufology needs those published big numbers - data
>and breakdowns, and accurate distributions in space and time.
>Real analysis isn't possible and 'true' patterns can't be
>observed without those data.

>Some, Larry Hatch and others, are constantly working on
>geographical and time distributions, but, as Nikolay Subbotin
>recently posted, there are no agreed definitions yet.

>Without a published assemblage of robust data (i.e. not nit-
>picking, just reasonably accurate) Ufology will be trapped in
>superstitious, heretic-burning Middle Ages imposed by gov'ts
>and media.

Might I suggest "Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14"?

It is about 260 pages long, has 240 charts, tables, graphs and maps. It has categorizations of 3201 UFO sightings, quality evaluations, statistical cross comparisons between knowns and UNKNOWNs, info on duration, color, apparent size, shape etc. The work was done by Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, OHIO, under contract to USAF Project Blue Book., though their name isn't on it.

A totally misleading press release was given very wide distribution in October, 1955, and the report itself was not publicly distributed. I believe that FUFOR has some copies available with Bruce Maccabee's comments, though not with all the tables. I have available a full copy including the press release and tables constructed from the data demonstrating wilful misrepresentation by the Secretary of the Air Force. It is available from me for \$25.00 including priority mail at POB 958, Houlton, ME 04730-0958.

By the way, I am preparing a new paper "Government UFO Lies" and will include some from BBSR 14. Any suggestions for inclusion would be appreciated. I already have a long list. But comments from government officials in any country would be appreciated.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Underlying Threat Fears [was: Magonia]

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:00:45 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 13:12:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Underlying Threat Fears [was: Magonia]

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:47 -0500
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:17:48 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>I'd been thinking that these repeated (and mostly repetitious)
>debates between Rimmer and others (including sometimes me) were
>really getting pointless.

>And then comes this, which actually does deserve a reply:

>>As an example: many ufologists believe that the abduction
>>phenomenon is caused by physical beings in physical craft
>>physically abducting humans and doing nasty things to them. It
>>also seems to be the opinion of some prominent abduction
>>researchers that there is nothing that anybody can do to stop
>>this from happening. Without challenging this opinion for the
>>moment, I must ask, how do these ufologists sleep at night if
>>they really believed this was happening?

>What makes John think that abduction researchers do sleep at all
>easily? I've known both Budd Hopkins and Dave Jacobs to be quite
>disturbed by what they feel their work has revealed.

>>The answer, I think, is because there is a disjunction between
>>their thinking as a ufologist and their thinking as a citizen. I
>>know Phil Klass (crosses self, waves garlic, etc.) was laughed
>>at for suggesting that Budd Hopkins should report abductions to
>>the FBI. Well, yes, I can see the problems, but, if ufology did
>>not exist in a "small, insulated bubble", what other option is
>>there? Just to go on reporting and recording these incidents,
>>and setting up therapy sessions so that it doesn't seem so bad
>>next time you're raped?

>Maybe, John, if you lived in New York, you'd have a more
>sympathetic understanding of these things.

>You might remember a little event we call 9/11. I live in New
>York, and was there when that happened. The shock was very deep.

>So now all New Yorkers, as far as I know -- certainly everyone
>I've ever talked about this with -- expects another major
>terrorist attack. Maybe sooner, maybe later, but certainly
>sometime. Or maybe not, but how can we know?

>And what, John, do you imagine that we do about this? Basically
>nothing. What can we do? One couple I know moved to another
>city. That's certainly an option, though I'm not sure many
>people are taking it. My wife and I could opt to spend more time
>at our country place. But that poses problems of its own. My
>wife, for instance, is a music critic for the New York Times.
>She might review four concerts a week, of course in New York.
>Should she find another job? Should I plan fewer meetings in the
>city, in the course of my own freelance work (much more as a

>consultant these days than as a critic)? Should I give up my
>teaching position in New York?

I'd like to use this response to Greg Sandow's post to also respond to similar points made by Jerome Clark. It is true that we all live with a variety of fears in our background - some years ago it was the threat of nuclear war, today we are surrounded by threats of ecological disaster. And there is, as Greg explains from his and his friends immediate and terrifying experience, the ongoing threat of terrorism. Although not on the scale of 9/11, in Britain we have also lived - for over thirty years - with terrorist threats and deaths in our streets. There are many people in London who would never take the Underground for fear that it would become a target of IRA bombers.

But I think this is a slightly different thing from the way in which individual people are targeted by the abductors - whatever they are - rather than a generalised threat to a whole population. It is probably more analogous to western aid and construction workers in Iraq being kidnapped and murdered by terrorists - the threat is personal.

I'm sure Hopkins and the other abduction researchers are disturbed by what they hear, they'd be less than human if they weren't, and not even I am suggesting that! But do they really believe there is nothing that they can do for the people they deal with, rather than just listen to them sympathetically and help them cope with more of the same?

If they really, really, really believed that what is happening is a real physical event wouldn't they try to stop it? To her credit, Ann Druffel has suggested ways in which abductees can fight back against their attackers, rather than just devise a 'coping' strategy.

This suggests that the abduction researchers who adopt a therapeutic approach do not really believe that the abduction event is something that happens in consensus reality, and there is no point in involving the police or the FBI, not just because those agencies won't believe them (has anybody actually tried this, incidentally?) but because they realise that these events do not take place in the world of daylight reality that you and I inhabit. You mention John Mack, but it seems to me that Mack did accept that the abduction experience was something other than a physical contact with physical aliens; however this does not appear to be the stance taken by Hopkins and Jacobs, amongst others.

My life in London is not greatly affected by thirty years of sporadic IRA bombings, or threats of future terrorist outrages - we have several times been warned that Canary Wharf - our equivalent of the WTC - is a target for bombers or hijackers. I do use the Underground, I do visit high buildings, I do get furious when Tony Blair tries to use these threats in order to assault our civil liberties, but I do not spend my life in fear that someone is out to get *me*, as I'm I would if I were an engineer working in Baghdad.

>What does this have to do with abductions? Helplessness. I can't
>do anything to stop a terror attack, and I'm not willing, at
>this point, to change my life. So I endure the uncertainty.
>Abductees feel they can't do anything about their abductions,
>which they believe are real (and which, John, are not all
>intrusive enough to be called rapes).

Well, certainly some of them are, literally and figuratively, rapes, and I wonder how you can be so sanguine as to say that "abductions don't cause permanent harm" unless you also accept they do not have an event-level reality.

>So abductees, too, have to endure. And here they're actually in
>a better position than New Yorkers are, because they can console
>themselves with the understanding that abductions don't do
>permanent harm. In this situation, counseling and therapy can
>genuinely help. You learn to manage your anxiety. In just the
>same way, counseling and therapy helped countless New Yorkers
>after 9/11. My wife and I know someone who was in one of the
>buildings during the attack, and was lucky to survive. His
>company required him and others in his position to have
>counseling, and it did him enormous good. If my thoughts about
>tunnels escalated to the point that they seriously disturbed me,

>I'd seek therapy myself.

>All of this, John, is to suggest that it's not uncommon to live
>with major uncertainty, and the ongoing threat of possible harm.
>(I could also talk about living in Los Angeles, and how
>absolutely everybody there takes for granted that there someday,
>maybe tomorrow, will be a major earthquake, and that the city
>will be destroyed.) It's not reasonable to say that this creates
>a disconnect between one aspect of life and another. Or at least
>you'd have to grant that disconnects of this kind aren't
>uncommon. Imagine someone who lives in Los Angeles, and learns
>that the hot water heater in their home is defective, and might
>explode. They'd fix it. But still they live with what they
>believe is a strong possibility that they could be killed in an
>earthquake. Abductees, if you think about it, are a lot more
>reasonable. At least they know they won't be permanently harmed.

I think you make my point here. Yes, therapy can help after any traumatic experience, and I appreciate its value from the example of people I know, although I think nowadays it does get offered a little too readily. But that is after the event. No-one can prevent an earthquake (although buildings can be designed to lessen its impact, so that a quake in Iran killed thousands, whereas a similar size quake in LA might not result in any deaths), it would be very difficult to prevent another 9/11, so yes, we do have to just get on with our lives. But for a threat we can do something about, that faulty gas water heater, we can take preventative action, and that would be the sort of thing that keeps us awake at night just because we could do something about it.

I guess the fundamental question is: is an abduction more like a faulty water heater, or more like an earthquake?

>Sheesh! Don't you skeptics know anything about people?

I've been one for quite a long time, and I still can't work them out!

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:08:39 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 13:14:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 04:44:02 -0800
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:52:55 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>>I would have thought that many ufologists take the view that a
>>piece of genuine extraterrestrial hardware crashed at Roswell.

>Many? Yes, but that depends on your sample. The weenie websites
>take Roswell as gospel. I was referring to the membership of
>this list, and not all of them really.

I was really looking at the people who write the books and the
magazine articles.

<snip>

>>What do you think it might have been other than an
>>extraterrestrial craft? Be very careful when you answer that
>>question: you might find yourself being turned into a
>>skeptibunking klasskurtzian pelicanist!

>I can only guess, and poorly at that.

>I'm still willing to consider a (then) very secret Mogul
>balloon, or something similar.

Sounds reasonable to me.

>Another idea, admittedly half-baked, is some sort of atomic
>apparatus, extremely top secret, which was mistakenly dropped
>in the desert.

>At least that might explain the secrecy, the "UFO crash" as a
>very poorly chosen cover which immediately blew up in their
>faces. It would also explain a seemingly flawed Mogul cover
>story, if that's what it was.

>Roswell AAF was our atomic airfield at the time. If this is far-
>fetched, then so be it. I'm only tossing it out as one
>possibility.

Certainly not half-baked. Quite plausible to me.

>If someone wants to call me a skeptibunker after 20 years of
>cataloging UFO sightings, some of which I find highly
>interesting, they are welcome to do so. I'm not discussing the
>pinheads here.

Same for me, after nearly forty years of being involved in
publishing UFO-related magazines.

>It remains my impression that a majority of serious ufologists,
>Friedman excepted of course, no longer consider 'Roswell' the
>crash of an alien spacecraft. Again, I would like a show
>of hands, yea or nay, in case I'm wrong in this.

My impression is to the contrary, or at least that those who
don't think it's a UFO crash are content to keep their heads
(and hands) down. at!

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:12:54 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 13:15:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:17:54 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Oh - and sorry if this was a little too impassioned for your
>genteel British sensibilities. I imagine Tom Paine was so far up
>your founder's nose they felt his boot heels on their sweat
>beaded top lips, too.

Eh?

--
John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:20:52 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:32:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:50:51 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:46:07 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>I don't notice a great number of female ufologists, either. Of
>>course there are some, but seriously outnumbered by the male
>>variety. Why do you think that is, Mr Lehmberg?

>As is often the case, sadly, John Rimmer is paying little
>attention. The rest of us on this List will have noticed how
>many women participate. Anyone who attends UFO conferences, in
>the United States anyway, will also have noted how many women
>attend. And one might add the large historical role women such
>as Coral Lorenzen, Isabel Davis, Jennie Zeidman, and others
>played in the history of American ufology.

>So the question remains, John:

>Why are there so few - if any - female pelicanists?

If Jerry, on his next visit to the land of decent beer, were to
come along to a meeting of a splendid organisation known as
"Sceptics in the Pub" he would find a fair sprinkling of females
present. Fewer than the number of men, certainly, but then I
think, despite the names he mentions, the number of women active
in the UFO world is also significantly fewer than the men.

Mr Lehmberg, in another posting, suggests it's something to do
with the 'glass ceiling' that holds women back in many fields.
Some truth in that argument, but personally I think, for
sceptics and ufologists, it's because they've got better things
to do.

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:22:42 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:33:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:34:03 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 21:57:49 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>>turns out they're rather dim. I suppose if I was being anti-
>>America (pace, Jerry) it could turn out that they got
>>along very well indeed with Dubya!

>Hi John,

>Personally, I think Dubya may have more in common with "them"
>than one might at first suspect. His policies, decried by at
>least half of America and the rest of the world, certainly seem
>alien to many.

>He seems not to know the language very well, he doesn't seem to
>grasp intellectual concepts, or even like them, and he often has
>a distant, vacant look about him that is troubling at least, and
>perhaps resulting from mothership separation anxiety.

Which solves the question of why he seems to get along so well
with Tony Blair!

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:23:57 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:34:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Hatch

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:19:26 -0500
>Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection

>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 18:19:06 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection

<snip>

>>Anyone know of reasonably priced 'something-phones' which can
>>detect 1-16 Hz in air on the market today? (They could help in
>>our efforts to detect the presence of signals.)

>My guess is that the cheapest low frequency microphone is a
>loudspeaker. Yes, a large one (10", 15" diameter, the bigger the
>more sensitive to low freq.). Of course you will need sensitive
>amplification devices which operate at very low frequencies...
>such as operational amplifiers ("DC coupled" amplifiers).

Hello Bruce:

Of course! And why didn't I think of this? Probably because I
was distracted with the technology of foiling mind control
operations.

In some dusty closet here, I have a 15-inch JBL musicians bass
speaker, one which could (if need be) peel plaster off of the
walls without self-destructing.

Used in reverse mode, it would make a wonderful transducer
(pickup). True DC coupling is ideal in one sense, but
troublesome due to voltage drift.

Capacitive coupling might work, provided the coupling
capacitor is of high value, say 100 or 1000 microfarads .. maybe
more .. as long as charges can slowly dissipate without losing
low frequency response.

Getting back to Eleanor White's mind control troubles, I forgot
to add that a leather helmet should be wet leather, moist at
least. Wet leather would more closely resemble human tissues. If
mind control waves are electronic in nature, wet leather might
attenuate their evil waves.

One cannot presume that mind-control waves are electronic,
however easy it is to do so. They might represent some
technology not publicly known.

For this, I have a (yet untested) idea. Suppose the m-c tech is
partially optical, and or looks at physical shapes and
geometries?

One way to foil this might be with a fake brain! The cheapest
and easiest test would be to put a 3-liter jar of salt water
next to the bed of suspected m-c victims, but don't stop there.

Go to the grocer. Select the largest head of cauliflower you can find. Put THAT into the jar of salt water.

NOW you have a close approximation to the brain of a mind-control victim: proper salinity of liquids (about 6%, similar to sea water), roughly the same shape, texture and consistency, and no big bucks for scientific gear.

Just imagine the mind control types trying to influence a head of cauliflower! (I'd like to see their faces when things don't go just right..)

The downside is that the water and veg will rot and stink up the room after a few days. Water salt and vegetable will need to be changed regularly. That is still way better than a wet leather helmet.

If somebody asks why you have a jar of cauliflower by your bed, you could just say "It's been lonely around here lately."

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:24:53 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:36:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:36:38 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:48:37 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

><snip>

>>>The Eisenhower Library still has 300,000 pages of classified
>>>material. The Truman Library has 45,000. The files of the USAF,
>>>CIA, NSC, DIA, NRO, NRL are still loaded with literally millions
>>>of classified pages, and you know John what isn't in them?
>>>Truly amazing.

>>I'm not talking about hundreds of thousands of files in archives
>>(and how many of that impressive number do actually have any
>>relevance to Roswell?) I'm talking about things that actually
>>happened in the outside world. Things affecting our everyday
>>life.

>The point is John, we don't know. Why would we be told about a
>connection between Roswell and what happened in the outside
>world? To do so would admit that Roswell represented the
>recovery of an alien space craft. Clearly there was no intention,
>then or now, to so admit. For example Samarium-Cobalt permanent
>magnets were developed at Wright Air Development Center and were
>widely used in ghetto blasters.

Blimey! Not only are they abducting us, but they inflicted those
accursed gadgets on us. I don't know which is the greater crime
to humanity.

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:39:28 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 17:00:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
>to: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 15:09:53 -0500
>Subject: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

>INEXPLICATA
>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology February 11, 2005

>Source: Diario El Tribuno - Salta, Argentina
>Date: February 6, 2005

>Found by a teacher hiking through the hills

>Strange Impressions Found On Cerro Parapente

>A strange cylindrical impression measuring approximately 4.25
>meters in diameter was found at the summit of one of the hills
>adjacent to the San Bernardo. This is the one known as Cerro
>Parapente ("Hanglider Hill") because it was customarily used by
>practitioners of the sport. It is also the western limit of the
>"Martin Miguel de Guemes" raceway.

Oh Pshaw, salamanders and Humbug Scott!

I saw the photo you kindly provided, and the "cylindrical
impression": is just some traces on a hilltop. They show no
real depth.

The two concentric tracks could be easily explained as the
frenzied traces of a chupacabras, one tied to a stick with a
rope.

Running in circles, as a chupacabras is likely to do, they will
inevitably leave a circular trail with a rope of constant
length.

My question is why the chupa was released instead of being
turned over to Jaime Maussan for proper scientific examination.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 12:52:15 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 17:02:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:29:55 -0500
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 23:17:01 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 11:17:31 -0500
>>>Subject: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>INEXPLICATA
>>>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
>>>02.08.05

>>>Source: Terra.cl
>>>Date: 02.08.05

>>><http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

>>>[Click 'Ir A Galeria' below thumbnail]

>>>At Iquique>
>>>Increible UFO Photo In Northern Chile

<snip>

>My only doubt about the lens flare solution is the dark area. A
>lens flare can add radiation to an area where there shouldn't be
>radiation (by "taking radiation away" from some bright image of
>a light source), but the flare cannot rob radiation from where
>it should be. How do you explain the dark line that seems to
>pass through the "flare?"

Hi Bruce,

The "dark areas" are the spaces between the light bulbs on the
light pole.

The image of the light standards themselves are oversaturated
due
to a lengthy exposure. The reflected one which causes the flare
is not as bright as the real light source, so you see the detail
that is otherwise washed out. Note the lights on the far side of
the harbor, and how they are grossly large due to the
oversaturation of a long exposure. Reflections so not produce
the same amount of light as the source of the light itself.
They are semi-transparent as opposed to the opaque light source
itself. The flare produced by a strong light source cannot be as
bright as the light source itself. In this case, the flare is a
more accurate representation of what the camera is seeing (the
reflected light standard) than the actual lightpost image. This
is not unusual at all, and other than the convenient location of
this flare in the image (in the sky), not remarkable in the
least.

Another point is that the reflection magnifies the light source, so the separations between the elements are more noticeable.

I again suggest that this very image was presented on this List some time ago, or one very similar.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Starchild Research Funded

From: Lloyd Pye <mailing_list.nul-uk.com>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 14:00:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 17:06:37 -0500
Subject: Starchild Research Funded

Hi Everyone!

With the profoundest possible joy and relief, today I can announce to all supporters and fans of the Starchild Project that the remainder of the testing procedures on the bone have been fully funded! Hoorraayy! And a second big Hoorrrraayyyy to all of you who contributed along the way, at any level, to help get us to this magical splendiferous moment!

Excuse my exuberance, but in one week, on Feb. 18th, it will be six grinding years since I first laid eyes on the Starchild skull. On many occasions I despaired of ever getting to the end of the testing process, but we are definitely within sight of the end now, thanks to an out-of-the-blue pair of contributors from Liverpool, England. (NOT the Beatles, I promise!)

From this point the testing will proceed with official supervision by a scientist here in London, with the remaining test bills paid by the pair in Liverpool. It is all arranged. We think it can all be finished within six to ten months, with a target date of six months starting in March, so we're talking about the fall of this year, 2005, being able to announce one way or another what the skull is with no equivocation. What a relief that will be!!!

In addition, we've updated the www.Starchild-uk.com website with a new set of slides (the link is "Initial Findings") that tell the early story of the skull as we tried to figure out what it was. Those 40 slides give several different comparisons from the link at "2004 Findings" by showing a half-dozen artist conceptions of how the skull might have looked in life, providing evidence to support alien-UFO connections to the skull, and ending with a humorous side-story. Not a bad way to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to read the few sentences of text under each slide.

For the duration of the testing I will be relegated to the sidelines, so my life has to change. As I previously explained, the financial support given to me for two years by Belinda McKenzie and Cognoscence has ended. Therefore, I'm returning to the States on Feb. 20th to try to pick up the pieces and find a way to move forward through the next six months or so, after which I have to find my way back to London to deal with the final results of the testing, whatever they are.

Lastly, I want to say that within the next few weeks my personal website, www.lloydpye.com, will undergo a complete overhaul, top to bottom. It is seven years old, leaving it clearly in need of major changes. I've already created the bulk of the new material, which will explain in a series of 15 small slide shows (about 10 slides per show) my views on Intervention Theory, the origin of life, human origins, and Hominoids (Bigfoot, Yeti, etc.). I know you'll find it immeasurably more engaging and enlightening than what I have now. More on that when it's ready for viewing....

Enough. In some ways I regret seeing the Starchild saga coming to an end, but those regrets are miniscule compared to the elation I feel about seeing it nearly finished. You can be sure

I'll continue keeping everyone on the mailing list informed about developments via these periodic updates.

Until the next one....whew!!!!

Lloyd Pye
lloydpye.nul
www.starchild-uk.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 13:06:01 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:18:43 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC - King

>Source: ProFindPages.Com

><http://www.profindpages.com/news/2005/02/12/MN752.htm>

>02-12-05

>UFO Sighted Over Washington DC, 10 Feb

>UFO Pictured Over Washington DC

>This latest UFO report was brought to our attention by
>mediavillage.net.

>Whilst doing some maintenance on another site, they
>came across
>"something odd about the Washington image feed". Some screen
>shots were taken and a UFO appears in the image. Click:

><http://tinyurl.com/6fzy5>

>to go to their site and view the full details.

>There are a number of screenshots taken at various times, in
>one, the sky appears to darken considerably in just a few
>minutes (following the appearance of the object).

>The UFO sighting was reported to the National UFO Reporting
>Center who seem to agree that it was unusual, but obviously
>without further investigation it will be difficult to say
>exactly what it was.

>Perhaps if anyone else saw this strange object in the sky over
>Washington DC at 03:15 EST Feb 10, 2005, they can contact the
>site that supplied this information with further details?

Hi List,

Taking photos late at night in my neighborhood, which is on the
flight path to both our major airports (Hobby and George Bush
Intercontinental), I have imaged very similar things.

Obviously, in mine the cause is obvious, as I can watch the
planes come over while the camera shutter is open, and see the
results instantly (digital SLR).

What is most odd about this webcam shot is that DC is supposed
to be a no-fly zone. Are airliners coming in to Dulles or Wash.
National steered around DC itself?

I recognize the what of this image, but the where seems to be
somewhat disturbing if planes are not supposed to be there, and
no one noticed this one except someone checking out the DC
webcam.

In the words (or letters) of my son...WTF!???

Best to all,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 13:14:45 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:19:39 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC - Groff

>Source: ProFindPages.Com

><http://www.profindpages.com/news/2005/02/12/MN752.htm>

>02-12-05

>UFO Sighted Over Washington DC, 10 Feb

>UFO Pictured Over Washington DC

>This latest UFO report was brought to our attention by
>mediavillage.net.

>Whilst doing some maintenance on another site, they came across
>"something odd about the Washington image feed". Some screen
>shots were taken and a UFO appears in the image. Click:

><http://tinyurl.com/6fzy5>

>to go to their site and view the full details.

I went to the source at:

<http://www2.nature.nps.gov/air/Webcams/parks/nacccam/washcam.htm>

and I noticed that these views are only updated on the quarter
hour.

It was mighty obliging of this object to just happen to be
passing at the time of one of the updates.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 19:16:55 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:20:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Allan

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 03:46:39 -1000
>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 18:42:38 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

>The simple refrain that only hard evidence will do in UFO
>research is not only inappropriate but a major methodological
>flaw. Those who have worked in this field for decades as in the
>case of Mr Hall have committed a major methodological blunder
>and conducted shoddy science even according to their purported
>lofty scientific standards. Their and your research methods are
>in need in drastic methodological improvement given the true
>nature of the distorting factors in UFO research. To pontificate
>about the appropriateness of your research methodologies which
>focus on hard evidence in the UFO phenomenon is a major
>oversight and you and others bear a responsibility for the sorry
>state of UFO research which is largely ignored by the general
>public who are seeking rigorous analyses of the political
>implications of an undisclosed extraterrestrial presence.

Those last three words remind me of someone else who said the same thing in the 1950s. See below.

>You reject my earlier response to you as a rationalisation, I
>reject yours and Richard Hall's responses as a myopic focus on
>hard evidence where you adopt a parsimonious approach of
>systematically ignoring whistleblower testimonies and their
>political implications. In contrast, I fully support the
>whistleblower testimonies found in Steven Greer's Disclosure
>book as valid evidentiary material from which one can construct
>an exopolitical analysis. In fact, I contend that Greer's book
>is the single most important document to emerge in over five
>decades of UFO research and I'm appalled that UFO researchers
>continue to dismiss its relevance and refuse to consider the
>political implications. In that sense, you, Richard Hall, et
>al., have failed, and you will be made accountable by the court
>of public opinion. I am merely one voice identifying your
>methodological failure.

The "court of public opinion" , i.e. the general public at large, is not, I think, the least interested in the anecdotal testimony supplied by Steven Greer's witnesses. One reason for this is that it is nothing new.

A certain George Adamski was a whistle-blower 50 years ago. He claimed the US government knew the truth and was preparing to inform the public. He also told us that two government scientists had witnessed one of his meetings with ETs.

I suggest your whistle-blowers have no more credibility than Adamski had, five decades ago.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: The Fortean Nailgun - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 12:34:15 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:24:51 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fortean Nailgun - Tonnies

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 21:15:11 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: The Fortean Nailgun

Hi Nick,

>A few of these implants which have been removed by this "rather
>gullible podiatrist", who I would more accurately describe as a
>very curious and open minded medical professional,

I've read Leir's book and, while I applaud his efforts to take a scientific look at alleged implants, I find his approach to the UFO subject pretty blinkered. I don't think he's a kook, but I think he's made a heavy psychological investment in a "literal" interpretation of the abduction phenomenon.

>very interesting differences too which we have so far failed to
>identify or attribute to anything made here on Earth. Of course,
>simply because something is similar or different is not enough
>to conclude that these "implants" were from here or are evidence
>of their ET origin.

I suppose what I'm really after is a central, non-ufological database where interested parties can get the scoop on any anomalous properties without wading through Leir's personal outlook. (Not that his perspective is in any way irrelevant.)

>It is not uncommon after some traumatic experience such as a car
>crash or intrusive alien abduction experience for the victim to
>discover some previously unknown lump. The majority of these
>which have subsequently been removed by other doctors have been
>of common objects (small stones, glass fragments, wood or metal
>slivers, bullet sharpnel, etc.) that the victims had unknowingly
>carried these in their bodies for many years.

>Although many of these lumps showed no signs of entrance
>>wounds, this in itself is not unusual since embedded foreign
>objects, especially those in the connective tissues beneath
>the skin and just above the muscles, will easily migrate
>through the body! So the lack of an entrance wound alone is
>not evidence of that this object had somehow been inserted
>into the victim by aliens.

Very good points.

>As I have said before, facts do not speak for themselves, they
>are interpreted in view of our current understanding. Very
>often erroneously. What one may argue is proof of
>teleportation of solid objects into other solid objects or
>proof that prehistoric man used ball bearings could in reality
>be present day objects that have been found in rapidly forming
>minerals or rocks, often observed since the time periods are a
>few years or less rather than the millions of years we
>associate with rock forming. A quick Google search will reveal
>many such examples which have been overlooked (and I suspect
>ignored) by some less than unbiased authors such as Cremo and
>Thompson who have their own hidden agendas or religious views
>to promote.

I read "Human Devolution" and can vouch for Cremo's religious agenda. I don't consider him the final word on the matter of out-of-place, "impossible" artifacts, but it seems to me he's documented some genuine enigmas. Whether they're due to teleportation (as proposed in my essay) or ancient civilizations is another matter.

=====

Mac Tonnies (machot.nul)

MTVI: <http://www.mactonnies.com>

Posthuman Blues: <http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

Now available!: "After the Martian Apocalypse"
<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/074348293X>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:47:57 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:31:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 18:05:33 -0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:48:37 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 21:49:13 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>What colossal arrogance. Just how in the world do you or anyone
>>else know what happened after Roswell? There is an enormous
>>amount of material that is still classified from that era, but
>>you can psychically determine that nothing relates to Roswell?
>>Try reading my update on the Majestic 12 Documents at my >website at:

>>www.v-j-enterprises.com/sfhome.html

>>The Eisenhower Library still has 300,000 pages of classified
>>material. The Truman Library has 45,000. The files of the USAF,
>>CIA, NSC, DIA, NRO, NRL are still loaded with literally millions
>>of classified pages, and you know John what isn't in them?
>>Truly amazing.

>Aren't these some of the very bodies that the GAO requested
>'Roswell' documents from in 1995? Unlike you, most people,
>including myself, accept their negative findings.

I have had several conversations with the GAO guys and they
definitely didn't have access to everything. It was so bad that
at one time the CIA only wanted to give up what they had already
released under FOIA..Read the instructions from the CIA and FBI
and others and you will note the limitations. Though, to their
credit, the GAO did take note of the fact that in one of their
visits they noted several instances of the use of TOP SECRET
RESTRICTED in the same time frame as the Cutler Twining memo
even though they had been told it was not in use at that time.

>>The government realized there were new technologies to develop
>>and to make sure their opponents didn't develop. Governments
>>recognized that admitting the alien presence might well lead to
>>an Earthling orientation, something no government wants. The
>>government realized that space is the place. The government
>>realized it could lie through its teeth and get away with it by
>>disinforming the press and the scientific community and
>>ridiculing witnesses. .. gives confidence in manipulation. I am
>>not saying the world is better for it.

>>Maybe you should ask the beliefs of those who have studied the
>>evidence... same goes for MJ-12. It is easier to say that there
>>is no evidence than to examine that evidence. I, for one, vote 4
>>square for both and I have spent an enormous amount of effort

>>studying both, researching both, dealing with the arguments of
>>the negativists.

>The zillions of still secret documents have absolutely nothing
>to do with Roswell or MJ-12, except in your mind.

How is it you know that? Psychic powers?

>The GAO dealt
>with this ten years ago and you refuse to accept its findings.

They never said they reviewed all documents.. especially TS Code
word documents.

>You still won't accept the fact that the MJ-12 papers were faked
>to fill a void, i.e. the lack of any genuine official papers on
>Roswell. They were also produced to sort out the gullible souls
>from the more rational ones. Whilst the great majority saw
>through them pretty quickly, you and a few others did not.

If you didn't produce them, how do you know why they were
produced, and by whom and when? If Roswell didn't happen, then
why all the government lies about it?

You have provided no evidence the papers were fraudulent. I have
provided a great deal indicating they were not. You made a claim.
You did not establish a fact at all. I did show that a number of
the Tim Cooper documents were fraudulent, with evidence not by
proclamation.

>And when we last discussed the MJ-12 matter on this forum, I
>recall that eventually you had to concede that perhaps none of
>the three original MJ-12 papers (the ones you love to promote
>as genuine) was actually written by its indicated author!

That is not an accurate representation.

A. I did conclude that the CT memo was almost certainly prepared
by James Lay, Exec. Sec. of the National Security Council:

1. Cutler, who was out of the US on July 14, 1954, left
instructions to Lay to keep things moving out of his in-box. Lay
wrote Cutler while Cutler was over seas saying he was doing just
that. Note the memo isn't signed and doesn't have an /s/ next to
the name. Nobody knew Cutler was gone at the time until after the
memo was found.

2. Lay met with Ike early on July 14 and had a brief phone
conversation later. Easy to say please notify Nate to change his
schedule.

3. Lay and Cutler sat next to each other at NSC meetings and
generally copied each other on documents.

4. George Elsey who worked for Truman all the time he was at the
White House told me that of course Lay would have sent such a
straightforward notice of change of timing of a meeting in
Cutler's name..

5. The Pica type face perfectly matches that used in other items
from Lay, according to Phil Klass, who paid me \$1000. for
providing more than ten samples of that type face on other
memos. He claimed it should have been elite.

6. The TOP SECRET RESTRICTED as noted above checks out even
though the government had casually said it wasn't in use.

7. The Fox Paper watermark (Dictation Onionskin) is from the
right time frame for this paper, which was not distributed in
stores but sold in bid lots only.

8. The paper is aged . It can't be removed from the archives nor
destructively tested. If it could, I would pay for dating it.

9. Contrary to loud proclamations about the necessity of TOP
SECRET registry numbers (not on the documents) it has been
established that there are many TS documents without such
numbers.

B. TFM

1. The type face on the Truman-Forrestal memo checked out according to a professional questioned document examiner, despite earlier off hand comments that it did not..
2. According to a former CIA employe, the agency had the capability of adding a signature. Since the memo was addressed to Forrestal in 1947, and he died in 1949, his files were not exactly readily available especially considering all the fuss about his suicide.
3. The off set in the numerical portion of the date 24,1947. and the presence of the period strongly suggested it was prepared in Van Bush's office which always put a period after the date. Again Elsey indicated that more than 80% of the documents signed by the president were prepared by somebody else. and that Truman certainly trusted Bush and Forrestal. He also indicated that it was not unusual to type the date later as appropriate. It was a very busy time for Truman. Remember that the date was the only one in a several month period when HST, JF, and VB were all together. Bush is the only other person named in the TF memo... though the DCI is named by title. That was Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter.

C. The EBE. I have certainly expressed my conviction that it indeed was prepared by Hillenkoetter, the briefing officer, as, for example, concluded by Roger Wescott an internationally recognized linguist who looked at 27 other items prepared by Hillenkoetter.

My April, 2004, Update goes into a host of other criticisms and demolishes them, fact by fact, including, for example, the false claim that Hillenkoetter would never have listed himself generically as Admiral since he was only a rear admiral. I also noted the use of the date as part of a filing system as in Special Classified Executive Order 092447...

>In addition you opined that the T-F memo was only a carbon copy
>and probably unsigned, and that therefore someone in the CIA had
>to search the archives for a Truman signature in 1952, lift it
>and append it to the copy of the T-F memo before it went to Ike,
>so as to give it more 'authority'. (i.e. some CIA guy actually
>purloined the president's signature, while he was still in
>office. A likely story!)

Who said anything about purloined? I said transferred and did note that WB Smith who succeeded RHH had worked very closely with Ike during WW 2 and prepared security briefings for Ike during the presidential campaign of 1952 and after the election. There were plenty of Truman signatures around at the CIA, with Bush etc. Bush was alive, Forrestal was not, on Nov. 18, 1952.

>Yes, I have read your Majestic Update of last April.
>You are certainly a first rate researcher, but your ideas and
>conclusions on Roswell and MJ-12 are way off base.

Thank you. This first rate researcher concludes that your conclusions about Roswell and MJ-12 are way off base.

By the way the publisher of TOP SECRET/MAJIC has decided to bring out a new edition this year in which I will update the discussion.

STF

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Magazine Article Help Please!

From: Ray Boeche <rayboeche.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 15:29:11 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:34:54 -0500
Subject: Magazine Article Help Please!

Greetings, all!

I'd like to request assistance from anyone able and willing to help.

I'm beginning a project (web site: definitely, book: quite possibly) tracing the impact of unexplained phenomena on society as a whole.

This will encompass a broad range of areas including popular culture, academic and scientific attitudes towards the unexplained, religion and faith-based issues, political issues, and so on.

For those who don't remember, (or are just not as long in the tooth as I) SAGA Magazine during the 1960's and 1970's primarily, carried articles on some aspect of the unexplained almost monthly.

I'm in the process of assembling a chronological collection of articles on UFOs, Bigfoot, sea serpents, other cryptozoological oddities, the paranormal, etc., the purpose of which will be to track the development and shifting focus of the phenomenon and public perceptions of it.

In short, I am looking for text files of articles along these lines from SAGA, True, Argosy, Popular Science and Popular Mechanics, LIFE, LOOK, etc.

If anyone has, or would be willing to help prepare text files of appropriate articles, would you please contact me?

Feel free to contact me off-list, if you'd like:
rayboeche.nul

Thanks in advance,

Ray Boeche

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:39:13 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:36:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 20:36:38 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 17:48:37 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>
>The public didn't hear about the NRL Corona Satellite
>(Elint) until 1995. It was launched in 1960 and obtained more
>elint data than all the U-2 flights.
<snip>

>>>If 'Roswell' happened, the world changed. How?

>Recall that the UK broke the Enigma code and was reading
>Hitler's mail. No public discussion for 25 or so years. Had a
>huge impact on winning the war. We certainly weren't told that
>at the time or for a long time afterwards.
<snip>

Stan,

Rimmer has a point and it would be best to acknowledge it instead of fighting everything tooth and nail. The point has nothing to do with official announcements. It has to do with real-world impacts. Specifics of spy satellites may not have been known but people especially interested observers knew there were spy satellites in orbit, just didn't know their exact code names and data returned. Aerospace observers noticed that the spy satellite photos seemed to have an impact on US foreign policy in terms of toughening the US stance to the USSR because apparently the spy sat photos revealed that the Soviets didn't have as many ICBM's as they wanted everyone to believe. All this was discerned from observing the policy impacts of the spy sat photo revolution in intelligence without anyone seeing a single one of the spy sat photos themselves or knowing the classified CORONA codename or the TALENT-KEYHOLE SCI security system or that Eisenhower ordered the T-K system on Feb 5, 1958, etc. etc.

No coverup can perfectly cover up 100%, especially at the inception of a coverup of something that is unplanned and unprecedented in history that is suddenly forced on you. There will be leaks and there will be visible policy impacts on the national policymakers - two different things. How visible the policy impacts and how big the leaks are a matter of degree and a matter of sufficient access to "all source" information and sufficient interest and intellect to connect the "dots" after finding them, and avoiding the connection of imaginary and fabricated "dots" which the UFO community so dearly loves to do because of its incipient poor judgment (e.g., Greer, MJ-12).

The Chicago Tribune leaked the existence of the US's breaking of the Japanese codes in 1944. The Chicago Tribune is a huge international paper. Yet the Japanese (and the Germans) missed the article and the massive potentially deadly leak! They just didn't "read the papers."

The breaking of the Enigma code was public knowledge by at least 1958 if not earlier, so no more than 13 years secret, and possibly much less (I have not researched it in a while). Some WWII historians were able to figure it out by carefully studying the policy effects of what seemed to be secret advance knowledge of enemy plans and moves, without anyone on the "inside" leaking anything to them. The same principle applies to Roswell.

I told you and Bill Moore in 1979 to look for real-world policy impacts of Roswell on Washington, DC, because the coverup if there was one would be most easily seen in the earliest days before the security lid came down tight and better methods of maintaining secrecy were instituted. Policy changes are not the same things as people and personalities and paper shuffling, and those were the things you investigated rather than what I had urged, interesting though some of that might be, it's just not the same, it's apples and oranges.

Without resources to pursue such an investigation I did nevertheless accidentally stumble upon a TOP SECRET policy response to Roswell in some non-UFO research I was doing in Dec 2000, and have pursued it off and on since then, again with very little resources. I am not happy about this development as I would prefer to think Roswell is a non-event, or at the very least some bizarre Cold War anomaly. However facts are facts and I cannot get around them. I also see that no one else has even the slightest inkling of what this is and is not even close to being on the trail. There is a whole history of reaction and planning that ensues from this initial Roswell policy plan, and again no one else has stumbled onto any of it.

>A 1952 CIA document (also classified until 25 years
>later)worried why there was so little about flying saucers in
>the Soviet press.

I'm the one who obtained the declassification of the multiple 1952 CIA documents in 1974-5 that revealed the concern about lack of Soviet press mention as indicating an official Soviet policy to generally not discuss UFO's. (I didn't use FOIA either. I used MDR and my own "sources and methods" that shall remain confidential.) Notice that the CIA was trying to analyze a _policy_ pattern for evidence of what the Soviets might be up to.

The CIA would repeatedly "declassify" different copies of the same document, so my 1975 set of declassified docs has several repeated again and stamped "declassified" in 1978. The CIA could not keep track of what it was releasing and often would release something one time that it would not release another time. Only by compiling all sets of document releases can one find out the most complete picture. But again, it is demonstrative of the fact that no coverup can be 100% perfect and leak-proof. Many of the NSA's breaks of codes were not due to brute-force cryptanalysis but by noticing and quickly taking advantage of slipups in the target country's code system, mistakes in sending messages in the clear then repeating them in code, code clerks accidentally repeating a "one-time pad" twice, misprints in physical printings of codebooks, electrical glitches in cipher machines, EM radiation ghosting that is picked up at a distance, etc.

Again, the same applies to Roswell. As I have said there does seem to be some evidence of a top secret policy response to Roswell. I'm still working out the full dimensions of it all. I still think it should just resolve into a big MOGUL balloon but it has absolutely no apparent connection, the policy response is quite obviously not to "one of ours" as such a defense policy would be unnecessary by definition.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:46:23 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:37:18 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>Source: ProFindPages.Com

><http://www.profindpages.com/news/2005/02/12/MN752.htm>

>02-12-05

>UFO Sighted Over Washington DC, 10 Feb

>UFO Pictured Over Washington DC

>This latest UFO report was brought to our attention by
>mediavillage.net.

>Whilst doing some maintenance on another site, they came across
>"something odd about the Washington image feed". Some screen
>shots were taken and a UFO appears in the image. Click:

><http://tinyurl.com/6fzy5>

>to go to their site and view the full details.

>There are a number of screenshots taken at various times, in
>one, the sky appears to darken considerably in just a few
>minutes (following the appearance of the object).

>The UFO sighting was reported to the National UFO Reporting
>Center who seem to agree that it was unusual, but obviously
>without further investigation it will be difficult to say
>exactly what it was.

>Perhaps if anyone else saw this strange object in the sky over
>Washington DC at 03:15 EST Feb 10, 2005, they can contact the
>site that supplied this information with further details?

Hi everyone!

The strange object in this picture is not a UFO but very likely an U.S. passenger airliner on its final approach to or departure from Ronald Reagan National Airport. Actually, this is really an international airport but because it is located a little more than a "stone's throw" from the Capitol and the Pentagon, the only foreign airline allowed to fly in is Air Canada - which could have produced this UFO if the picture was taken about 3/4 of an hour later.

My conclusion is based on the fact that this is a long exposure picture and that there are frequent passenger aircraft flying over the Potomac River in the middle ground of this picture with the UFO. Since the moving cars produced streaks in this long exposure picture and do not even appear as cars, then a faster moving airplane on its final approach to the airport just a few miles away would have produced a similar streak too, just like the one in the picture. Of course, flashing navigation lights on this moving airplane would appear as points of light just like we see in the picture. With so much air traffic over this part of Washington, D.C., especially at the time of day the picture was taken, I would be surprised if anyone would even notice this illuminated moving UFO that's larger than the Moon.

Having visited Washington, D.C. a few months ago for my godson's wedding and to follow-up on important UFO leads (including the alleged alien bodies and flying saucer that were once stored in the Capitol's sub-basement during President FDR's term of office - and may still be there to this day), I took many pictures with very similar views. Some of these pictures were taken from President JFK's grave site in Arlington National Cemetery and from nearby Columbia Island (the lights of the cars in the foreground of this picture are on this same island). I also tried to take a few pictures of these airliners from the nearby Arlington Memorial Bridge (seen to the right of this picture) as they flew along the river on their approach to D.C.'s National Airport but by the time my digital camera had powered up and was ready to take a picture, the airplanes had already zoomed by.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 13](#)

UFO In Phoenix Sky?

From: **Stig Agermose** <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 20:39:10 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:45:57 -0500
Subject: UFO In Phoenix Sky?

Source: KTVK-TV - Phoenix, Arizona

<http://www.azfamily.com/news/local/stories/KTVKLNews20050209.904e4ba7.html>

02-09-05

UFO In Phoenix Sky?

By 3TV Staff

Watch the video <link>

South Phoenix resident Jeff Woolwine took home video of something odd in the sky last week.

Woolwine said a black object appeared around 8 a.m. one day last week then swooped and moved over his apartment complex near 40th Street and Baseline Road.

"At first we thought it was a black plastic bag," Woolwine said.

But Woolwine claims it was the size of a Volkswagen and said the object held its shape the entire time it was on camera.

Woolwine said the object was "absolutely silent."

"I think the reason people might not have noticed it was because it didn't make any sound," Woolwine said. "It was very silent and it was cruisin'."

c. Belo Interactive 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Recent Iran UFOs US Drones?

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 21:03:13 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 07:58:18 -0500
Subject: Recent Iran UFOs US Drones?

Source: The Washington Post,

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A19820-2005Feb12.html>

U.S. Uses Drones to Probe Iran For Arms

Surveillance Flights Are Sent From Iraq

By Dafna Linzer
Washington Post Staff Writer

Sunday, February 13, 2005; Page A01

The Bush administration has been flying surveillance drones over Iran for nearly a year to seek evidence of nuclear weapons programs and detect weaknesses in air defenses, according to three U.S. officials with detailed knowledge of the secret effort.

The small, pilotless planes, penetrating Iranian airspace from U.S. military facilities in Iraq, use radar, video, still photography and air filters designed to pick up traces of nuclear activity to gather information that is not accessible by satellites, the officials said. The aerial espionage is standard in military preparations for an eventual air attack and is also employed as a tool for intimidation.

The Iranian government, using Swiss channels in the absence of diplomatic relations with Washington, formally protested the incursions as illegal, according to Iranian, European and U.S. officials, all speaking on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the matter.

A U.S. official acknowledged that drones were being used but said the Iranian complaint focused on aircraft overflights by the Pentagon. The United States, the official said, replied with a denial that manned U.S. aircraft had crossed Iran's borders. The drones were first spotted by dozens of Iranian civilians and set off a national newspaper frenzy in late December over whether the country was being visited by UFOs.

The surveillance has been conducted as the Bush administration sharpens its anti-Iran rhetoric and the U.S. intelligence community searches for information to support President Bush's assertion that Tehran is trying to build nuclear weapons.

<snip>

The spring 2004 flyovers led Iran's military to step up its defenses around nuclear facilities in the southern cities of Isfahan and Bushehr, where locals first reported the UFO sighting. Defenses were added around those sites and others last month, Iranian officials said, after it became clear they were being observed by the drones.

A Dec. 25 article in the Etemaad newspaper, translated from Farsi by the CIA, reported on "the presence of unidentified

flying objects in the Bushehr sky on a number of occasions, particularly in recent weeks." After Moscow experts were called in, the Russian daily Pravda reported on "UFO mania" sweeping Iran.

<snip>

Staff writer Glenn Kessler contributed to this report.

c. 2005 The Washington Post Company

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Hicks

From: **Simon Hicks** <slh.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:30:09 +0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:01:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Hicks

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 03:46:39 -1000
>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 18:42:38 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

<snip>

>I am merely one voice identifying your methodological failure.

Amen

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

'Mysterious Streak' Over Hawaii Generates Wide Buzz

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 23:12:45 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:03:03 -0500
Subject: 'Mysterious Streak' Over Hawaii Generates Wide Buzz

Source: Honolulu Star-Bulletin - Hawaii

<http://starbulletin.com/2005/02/10/news/story4.html>

02-10-05

Isle Skies' Light Show Generates Wide Buzz

Cameras capture a "mysterious streak" over Hawaii Dec. 17

By Ignacio Lobos
ilobos.nul

"When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth."

Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes was not an astronomer, but his maxim could have come in handy during a lively Internet discussion about a "mysterious streak" of light captured by cameras on Haleakala and Mauna Kea last Dec. 17.

A photograph of the object was featured on the Night Sky Live Web site Tuesday with a call for a possible explanation. The responses came by the dozens, including those from conspiracy buffs.

But this is a serious discussion site, and some of its members were perturbed by the UFO explanations that crowded their discussions after they were profiled by a well-known Internet site.

The Night Sky Live team said it might have disregarded the streak as unconfirmed if it had not been recorded on two islands. The streak was captured by continuous cameras with fisheye lenses on Maui and the Big Island.

Night Sky Live is a collaborative project that operates 10 fisheye cameras around the world to watch the entire sky every night.

University of Hawaii astronomer Robert Jedicke said it possibly was a satellite that has not been recorded in the heavens-above Web site. "I'm pretty sure that there are military satellites that are not recorded in that Web site."

And so, as Holmes did in his adventures, Night Sky members did their homework, including the analysis of critical information posted by a South Kona resident who saw the "white blob."

"Being a frequent stargazer, my initial response was, 'What ... is that?' I have never seen an object like it before. Its size was approximately twice, maybe a little more, than the full moon diameter," he wrote.

The most probable answer: fuel dumped by an AMC-16 Atlas 5 rocket hauling a TV satellite into orbit from Cape Canaveral, Fla.

"This fuel dump was unexpectedly bright -- one of the brightest yet recorded," the site's moderator said before closing the topic.

Star-Bulletin reporter Helen Altonn contributed to this report.

See photo at:

antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap050208.html.

c. Honolulu Star-Bulletin -- <http://starbulletin.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero - Morton

From: Dave Morton <Marspyrs.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 02:39:44 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:04:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero - Morton

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 11:44:13 -0600
>Subject: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero

>Just now, while doing research into historical reports of UFO
>and UFO-like phenomena, I found this illuminating account of the
>work of a pelicanist hero, Prof. N. S. Shaler. The phenomenon he
>has so conclusively and effectively debunked is known as Ignis
>fatuus, explained by credulous physicists and chemists,
>according to a recent scientific reference work, as
>"spontaneously ignited gases escaping from swampy ground."
>Ufologists will recall that these nonexistent phenomena were
>used to explain UFO reports in Michigan in 1966.

>It turns out that good pelicanist principles document that the
>stuff is just another delusion "sighted" by naive and
>hallucination-prone witnesses. Here's the story, from a science
>column in an Iowa newspaper, Nashua Reporter, for October 19,
>1899:

>"Notwithstanding the many traditions concerning mysterious
>lights seen hovering over swamps at night, and in spite of the
>attempted explanations of such phenomena in some popular books
>on science, Prof. N. S. Shaler says he is inclined to disbelieve
>in the existence of these luminous appearances. He has studied
>swamps for many years, but has never seen a will-o'-the-wisp,
>and he suggests that the reports about moving lights visible
>above swamps may be due to subjective impressions induced by
>gazing into darkness."

>In a recent post, prominent pelicanist Peter Rogerson points
>out that many imaginary phenomena, such as UFOs, are conjured up
>by people in remote locations (e.g., swamps) and gazing in
>isolation into darkness. Once again, pelicanism is there to save
>us from misguided, quasi-religious belief in pseudo-phenomena
>such as swamp gas.

Jerry -

It's interesting that the same or similar swampy arguments have
been advanced for so long.....

Pelicanism itself is a religion - a religion of "safety". That
is, "personal physical and psychological safety".

Since the 100th anniversary of that article occurred just a few
years ago, you would have thought that the Pelicanists might
have noted the event with some kind of event, such as:
"Celebrating 100 years of Pelicanism - the religion of safety -
especially when you're all alone in the dark".

Dave Morton

(drinking hot cocoa and browsing Reader's Digest, in front of
the warm, crackling fire, with the doors barred and locked)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Popular Mechanics On UFO Detector

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 00:02:09 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:08:40 -0500
Subject: Popular Mechanics On UFO Detector

Source: Popular Mechanics,

<http://www.popularmechanics.com/outdoors/outdoors/1277516.html?page=1&c=y>

02-11-05

UFOs And The Great Outdoors

By Cliff Gromer

Forget bear attacks, avalanches and giant ants. The real danger in trekking around the great outdoors is abduction. That's right, abduction by aliens is probably the leading cause of outdoors people disappearing from off the face of the planet. But since abducted humans seldom leave a trace, this problem has gone largely unreported.

The fact that this country has been infiltrated by aliens has been well documented by many of the supermarket tabloids. But how can you know if that person next to you in the checkout line is human or an alien? How can you be sure? What about your spouse?

Up until now there's been no sure way to differentiate a human from an alien cleverly disguised as one, so identifying the aliens (humanoids) among us (July 1995, page 39) has been pretty much a guessing game. So you can imagine our excitement when we received a call about a newly developed and affordable UFO Detector (the older models designed for military use were waaay out of our price range). Would we want to test one? Hey, is our name POPULAR MECHANICS?

Shortly thereafter, a package arrived wrapped in plain brown paper from Images SI Inc., 39 Seneca Loop, Staten Island, NY 10314; 718-698-8305; www.imagesco.com. And it wasn't delivered by a man in black wearing dark sunglasses, but by an employee of the U.S. Postal Service. I called my son, Jonathan, into my office and we quickly locked the door, drew the blinds and opened the package. Ah, there it was--a gen-u-ine UFO detector. All we had to do was install the 9-volt lithium battery and we'd be in the UFO detection business. We didn't have to calibrate anything or read a huge instruction manual. It was simply plug-and-play right out of the box.

The way the detector works is fiendishly clever. It constantly monitors the entire magnetic field of the Earth. Since alien spaceships create an aberration in the magnetic field (a disturbance in the Force, if you will), it sounds an alarm by flashing and beeping so you can head for the nearest UFO shelter.

Once we determined that there were no UFOs in the vicinity of the POPULAR MECHANICS World Headquarters in Manhattan, we got kind of bored. So my son came up with the theory that aliens and humans probably have different personal magnetic fields, and there might be a way to detect this. Working feverishly at his Commodore 64 computer, Jonathan came up with a plan. If we could hook up the detector's Flux Circuit with a digital camera's Frammis Circuit, the resulting digital images might reveal some

interesting differences between humans and aliens. Now, who could we test this on?

The editor-in-chief seemed pretty legit, but so what if he wasn't? Human or not, he still signs my checks. We weren't about to go there. The science editor, a rather strange character, if I may say so myself, seemed to be a good candidate for alienhood. How else could he have so much inside information on UFOs, aliens, time travel, and the secret to making a fluffy omelet? Trouble is, he wasn't available at the time of our test.

That left Sarah Deem, managing editor and all-around good sport. We took a few photos of her on the pretext of being the "PM Employee of the Month." The results speak for themselves.

We did think briefly about testing out the UFO detector in the great outdoors but hey, there are bears and giant ants out there.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Radio And TV Shows In Europe?

From: **Giuliano Marinkovic** <giuliano.marinkovic.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:03:30 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:12:02 -0500
Subject: Radio And TV Shows In Europe?

Dear Colleagues

I am making updated list of radio, TV and Internet shows dealing with ufology, paranormal and free energy subjects in Europe.

If you are aware of any show of that kind in your country or Europe, please send me small info to include it (name of the show, station, schedule, country, e-mail or URL of the station or host - or anything that you have).

Thank you very much in advance.

Giuliano Marinkovic
Snail Mail/Postanska adresa:
Giuliano Marinkovic, Poste-Restante, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia, Europe

Co-writer of the TV show 'On the Edge of Science' - HTV1, Tue - 22:30 GMT
Koscenarist TV emisije 'Na rubu znanosti' - HTV1, Utorak - 23:30 CET
Host of the Radio Program 'UFO_NAUTICA' - Tuesday - 21:00 h GMT

Urednik radio emisije 'UFO_NAUTICA' - Utorak - 22:00 h CET
Radio Student - Zagreb, 100.5 Mhz
Internet Streaming: <http://www.radiostudent.fpzg.hr>

e-mail: uforadio.nul
URL: <http://uforadio.cjb.net> <http://www.clarc.org/~9a4ag>
ICQ: #66584465
SKYPE account: uforadio
gsm: +385-98-900-2649

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Researchers Sure E.T. Life Exists

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 02:51:11 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:15:43 -0500
Subject: Researchers Sure E.T. Life Exists

Source: Long Beach Press Telegram - Long Beach, California

<http://www.presstelegram.com/Stories/0,1413,204~21474~2708324,00.html>

02-12-05

Long Beach Press Telegram

Researchers sure E.T. life exists

Recent discoveries of planets prompt confidence in other life.

By Katy Human
The Denver Post

Researchers are more sure than ever that extraterrestrials exist whether they are microbes eking out a living on an icy planet or intelligent beings inhabiting a watery blue world 5,000 light-years away.

"There must surely be other stars like our sun, and other planets like the Earth," said Geoff Marcy, a UC Berkeley planetary scientist during a planetary conference in Aspen last week. "Primitive life, at least, must be common in the universe."

The planet hunters gathered in Aspen to celebrate the nearly 150 "extra-solar" planets found in the past 10 years, and to discuss new ways to search the skies.

Colorado has become a hub for planetary research. The University of Colorado, for example, is one of the leading universities in the country for research, and Ball Aerospace in Boulder built most of the science instruments used on the Hubble Space Telescope. Many of the planets that have been found are "hot Jupiters" huge, gassy planets so close to their central stars that life seems unlikely.

But in recent months, astronomers have improved their instruments to detect smaller worlds. They're finding planets that orbit far enough from their parent stars to make liquid water possible.

In a few decades, the researchers say, they may be able to detect the chemical signature of life in the atmosphere of an Earth-like planet.

"We're recognizing that life on Earth does not appear to be anything special," said Bruce Jakosky, a planetary scientist at the University of Colorado.

The main message from a decade of planet discoveries is that solar systems dot the Milky Way, circling at least 3 percent of its 200 billion stars. The past decade's discoveries came as surprises.

In early 1995, two teams reported failures in planetary searches. Many scientists began to conclude that our own solar

system was alone, a lucky quirk, said Michel Mayor of Switzerland's Geneva Observatory.

But then, his team calculated that the faint wobble of a sun-like star had to come from a giant planet spinning quickly around it.

Marcy's group confirmed it: The gravitational tug was from a planet half the mass of Jupiter, orbiting its star about every four days.

The techniques used to detect such wobbles have been honed since then. Researchers are experimenting with other telescopic techniques.

But the next big leap in planet detection the discovery of other Earth-like planets probably won't happen until at least 2007, scientists say, when NASA plans to launch the Kepler space telescope.

Engineers with Ball are building that instrument now, said Ball's Harold Reitsema.

NASA and the European Space Agency are also beginning to plan other missions, to launch sometime after Kepler: the Space Interferometry Mission, the Terrestrial Planet Finder and Darwin.

Berkeley's Marcy ran through a series of calculations suggesting there easily could be thousands of advanced civilizations in the Milky Way.

"There's only one problem: Where are they? Why haven't we seen them?" Marcy said.

Copyright2005 Long Beach Press Telegram
Los Angeles Newspaper 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

An Apology From A.J. Gevaerd

From: **A.J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO** <gevaerd.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 08:47:50 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:43:31 -0500
Subject: An Apology From A.J. Gevaerd

Dear Errol and Colleagues on UFO UpDates,

Please accept my sincere appologies for not making the SDI program on Saturday night, as scheduled.

I had a high blood presure crisis that lasted a few hours and had to go to a hospital, preventing me from taking the call from Toronto. I am OK now and under medication, as I have been for 15 years, but something triggered the increase in my blood presure.

I hope that I haven=B4t messed up your schedule. In am sorry in many ways, as I had a lot of info to present to the listeners.

A. J. Gevaerd

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 12:25:25 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:50:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:12:54 +0000
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 07:17:54 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>Oh - and sorry if this was a little too impassioned for your
>>genteel British sensibilities. I imagine Tom Paine was so far up
>>your founder's nose they felt his boot heels on their sweat
>>beaded top lips, too.

>Eh?

...Clear on its face, Mr. Rimmer. Pretending a lack of
understanding is something less than a lack of understanding.
Besides, the fence-sitter alluded to in this thread finds such
convenient lack of understanding tediously disingenuous, I
suspect, forgetting that your lack of comment on the snippage
implies volumes.....

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 13:44:18 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:51:50 -0500
Subject: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help

Okay.

Far too often we drop down to the old arguments.

Bottom line is physical proof.

Not evidence, but proof.

Skeptibunkers are actually doing us a good service in pressing for this proof and researchers and believers may well have what we call proof but if you toss it on a table in front of the average Joe and Jane, would they know it for what it is.

I'm not talking trace cases. There're tons of those. I've been to several and gathered evidence. Now what caused the trace, burnt rocks, deformed critters etc. is still unprovable. So we need that hunk of craft, leg bone, corpse, blood, whatever else grody bio matter or downright crystal clear video.

So that's where we are. We've got years and years of excellent reports, eyewitnesses of sound character and mind, credentialed and numbered. The hunt is therefore on for the elusive hard boiled proof. Something we can all sink our teeth into.

Some of us know where some of it is, or where we've been told it is. That's still a football not in the game. Ya gotta have a ball to play ball.

We've got the upcoming Jennings/ABC Special due. I doubt highly there'll be anything new added to the mix, just a glance at UFOs for ratings only.

Does that mean ABC doesn't have the resources to get that proof or help you researchers who claim to know where the proof is and can't get to it? We'll see in the long run.

Again, we've got history, trace cases up to our ears, witnesses, documents etc. Everything we could want except that one piece of physical proof. I'm not talking exotic combinations of metals and composites that some scientists test and say it couldn't be made on Earth. That's still speculation. I'm talking good ol' fashioned tap the table top with it, let the dog chaw on it, don't give it to the kids to play with physical proof.

Everything else is just rehash. Same things over and over again.

Such and such got abducted, experimented on, has a story to tell.

We've got more than enough to prove that. Interesting and worthy of attention but we need that hard nosed terra firma.

We should focus our attention on where it is, has any been tested, the standards of the testing, who is stonewalling, if at all, and what we can do to break through the stonewalling.

Yes, we know from the experts that the best proof is supposedly locked away in bunkers etc. but how do we get to it?

That's where ufology should stand at right now unless some

awesome groundbreaking story that actually leads somewhere occurs.

Just let folks know that in this great debate that every corner has gleaned irrefutable evidence of interaction with aliens and other beings but getting our hands on something we can show you is the biggest challenge and to do that we need team work.

Maybe an 'Uncle Sam Wants You' poster campaign asking for physical proof.

I know it's a tough charge for all of us but no way could every piece of craft and body and snot rag be hidden to such a degree.

If it's real, it's out there and the Skeptibunkers can help here by not attacking character but by giving us that extra nudge to move our butts to prove them wrong.

If ya can't put a fork in it, it ain't done yet.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

From: **Greg Bishop** <exclmid.nul>

Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:37:56 -0800 (PST)

Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:55:30 -0500

Subject: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

I am the author of the new, Project Beta, book that was mentioned on the List last week.

One of the List subscribers mentioned that Nick Redfern had told his MUFON group that the AFOSI had entered Paul Bennewitz' home when he wasn't around a rearranged the furniture to make him paranoid. I don't remember hearing that in the couple of years I spent working on the Project Beta book. It could have happened, or it could have been Bennewitz' already deteriorating mental state that produced this idea which he may have passed on to others. Nick gave me a very good review (for which I thank him) at his Phenomena Magazine website.

The book discusses the interaction between Paul Bennewitz, Richard Doty, Bill Moore, and various intelligence services. What appears to have happened was that Paul Bennewitz became interesting to the Air Force because of his suspicions about activities at Kirtland Air Force Base, which began in 1979. The Air Force and the NSA were conducting secret research in the area. They realized that he was onto some things that might lead him to compromise these projects (i.e. unwittingly reveal something useful to the Soviets or others.)

Instead of telling him cease and desist, they let him persist in his folly and encouraged it to monitor how he might be gathering information and who might be listening. As he began to grow increasingly paranoid and unstable, the AFOSI and NSA continued to feed him disinformation designed to flatter his prejudices. These included stories about underground bases, aliens exchanging abduction rights for technology, and the idea that aliens had been behind the great spiritual movements in human history. Others (like John Lear and Bill Cooper, etc) began to pick up on this and probably talked to the same people who were watching Bennewitz. Even if they didn't, these stories were unheard of before the AFOSI/ NSA interaction with Bennewitz.

I wasn't concerned with finding out if these stories were true (since that is practically impossible to determine)--I wanted to find out where they were first mentioned and by whom. For example, a "Project Excalibur" mentioned by Lear soon after beginning his contact with Bennewitz also turns out to be the name of a secret project (headed by Edward Teller) that used underground nuclear detonations as an initiating power source for a "Star Wars"-type project that was happening at the Nevada test site at the time. Lear and others said it was some sort of weapon that was being developed to attack underground alien bases.

This is just one example, I uncovered others. The main intent was to tell Bennewitz' harrowing story and make people aware of the events of that era (1979-1990) and realize that we have to determine what is junk so that we can concentrate on more reliable and checkable forms of information.

Note: There is an interview I did with Bill Moore in 2003 available for download at:

<http://www.radio4all.net/proginfo.php?id=11088>

Greg Bishop

In the midst of the cold war, the U.S. Air Force and the NSA drove a man mad and created an alien invasion! Read "PROJECT BETA: The Story of Paul Bennewitz, National Security, and the Creation of a Modern UFO Myth" from Paraview/Pocket Books. Available at your local bookstore or from Amazon. Listen to Radio Misterioso Sundays from 8-10 PM PST at killradio.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:16:44 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:57:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:24:53 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>The point is John, we don't know. Why would we be told about a
>>connection between Roswell and what happened in the outside
>>world? To do so would admit that Roswell represented the
>>recovery of an alien space craft. Clearly there was no intention,
>>then or now, to so admit. For example Samarium-Cobalt permanent
>>magnets were developed at Wright Air Development Center and were
>>widely used in ghetto blasters.

>Blimey! Not only are they abducting us, but they inflicted those
>accursed gadgets on us. I don't know which is the greater crime
>to humanity.

Sometimes, when one can't make a point, one makes a joke.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:30:04 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 09:29:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:20:52 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:50:51 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>So the question remains, John:

>>Why are there so few - if any - female pelicanists?

>If Jerry, on his next visit to the land of decent beer,

I am second to no beer-drinker in the world in my admiration for your country's splendid brews. I must add, however, that if America is worse in just about every other aspect - and declining daily - in the early years of the 21st Century, there is, happily, one positive development to counter, in some small way, all the depressing ones: more and more excellent beer, thanks in good part (though not exclusively) to the proliferation of craft breweries. For example, my home state of Minnesota boasts an extraordinary craft brewery, Summit (in St. Paul), and a very fine traditional, venerable German-style brewery, Schell's (in New Ulm). If such were not there to sustain me, I would not be here typing these words but probably in the ground, expired of thirst.

>come along to a meeting of a splendid organisation known as
>"Sceptics in the Pub" he would find a fair sprinkling of females
>present. Fewer than the number of men, certainly, but then I
>think, despite the names he mentions, the number of women active
>in the UFO world is also significantly fewer than the men.

I presume you are referring to wives and girl friends, not to active pelicanists. I offer no explanation for the reason this is so. It's just an observation. One of those mysteries of gender about which one speculates at one's peril.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Hebert

From: Amy Hebert <ahebert.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 17:58:49 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 10:22:03 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Hebert

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 15:45:46 -0000
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Nikolay Subbotin <paragloss.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
>>Subject: UFO Research Software?

>>Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any
>>software for professional UFO research.

>A lot depends upon what "UFO research software" you want.

<snip>

Howdy, Isaac:

Excellent post.

I use to work on developing UFO databases and similar projects. Made one called the "IFO Database" still available at "ifo.s5.com" (last time I looked). Unfortunately, few people into UFO's found a need to study IFO's so I took a lot of flack for what now seems to be vogue. ;>

After years of fruitless research, I finally stopped filtering information through UFO-tinted lenses and returned to my scientific roots. It wasn't until I knocked my belief systems out of my head that I began to see and think clearer. It was then that I realized the consequences of biased UFO databases.

UFO databases are worthless if they are created and viewed through distortion. As long as UFO databases are compiled and structured according to an author's bias (beliefs/disbeliefs about UFO's), valuable data will be omitted or inaccurately classified and resulting extrapolations become screwed... I mean, skewed. I have found more information in the UFO reports most people ignore than reports that garner major media coverage and foofah in the UFO communities. And as long as we look for UFO's instead of the truth, we will only see what we want to see.

UFO databases and the software developed to compile them will not be accurate until intense and objective analyses of man-made technologies and techniques and alternative explanations are completed. Until this is done, UFO databases will continue to focus on "UFO's" instead of the *data*. (IMHO)

A. Hebert

I don't want to believe. I want the truth.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 15:59:29 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 10:25:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Hatch

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:08:39 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 04:44:02 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>I was really looking at the people who write the books
>and the magazine articles.

<snip>

>>>What do you think it might have been other than an
>>>extraterrestrial craft?

>>I'm still willing to consider a (then) very secret Mogul
>>balloon, or something similar.

>Sounds reasonable to me.

>>Another idea, admittedly half-baked, is some sort of atomic
>>apparatus, extremely top secret, which was mistakenly dropped
>>in the desert.

>>At least that might explain the secrecy, the "UFO crash" as a
>>very poorly chosen cover which immediately blew up in their
>>faces. It would also explain a seemingly flawed Mogul cover
>>story, if that's what it was.

>>Roswell AAF was our atomic airfield at the time.

>Certainly not half-baked. Quite plausible to me.

<snip>

>Same for me, after nearly forty years of being involved
>in publishing UFO-related magazines.

>>It remains my impression that a majority of serious
>>ufologists, Friedman excepted of course, no longer consider
>>'Roswell' the crash of an alien spacecraft. Again, I would like
>>a show

>>of hands, yea or nay, in case I'm wrong in this.

>My impression is to the contrary, or at least that those who
>don't think it's a UFO crash are content to keep their heads
>(and hands) down. at!

I can't possibly cite chapter and verse, but I think it was on
this very List, that somebody wrote something like: " Stanton
Friedman stands virtually alone (within serious ufology) in
support of Roswell as the crash of an alien craft." I'm forced
to paraphrase.

I don't remember much reaction to the contrary afterwards.

I suppose there are a many sitting on the fence, willing to consider Roswell one way or the other. I don't expect them to shoot up their hands and suffer the usual results.

What I don't want to see is the implication that "serious ufology" takes Roswell uncritically as space-alien craft, and is therefore rather dotty and insular overall. That seems unfair.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

The Fermi 'Paradox' - Again

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 19:35:40 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 10:43:39 -0500
Subject: The Fermi 'Paradox' - Again

Scientists gravitate toward E.T. notions

Source:

<http://www.denverpost.com/Stories/0,1413,36~53~2708976,00.html>

"But what will happen next isn't clear, although one thing is: There won't be any manned visits to these planets anytime soon, as they probably are tens or thousands of light-years away.

"Berkley's Marcy ran through a series of calculations suggesting there could easily be thousands of advanced civilizations in the Milky Way.

"'There's only one problem: Where are they? Why haven't we seen them?' Marcy said.

"Researchers have found no writing on the moon, no crashed spaceships on Mars, no messages floating through space."

Commentary:

<http://tinyurl.com/4mkkkr>

Here we go with Fermi's so-called "paradox" again. Firstly, we know next to nothing about the Moon and Mars; it's perfectly conceivable - even probable -- that we will discover conclusive evidence of intelligence if we ever get serious about planetary exploration. Already, we've seen tantalizing hints, as I attempt to summarize in "After the Martian Apocalypse."

Secondly, the problems with conventional SETI sky-searches are innumerable. We're just discovering that our planet possesses a collective unconscious and toying with the prospects of quantum entanglement... yet we naively assume advanced aliens will be playing with radio transmitters and infrared lasers.

To make matters even more interesting, a new scientific paper has come to the defense of the UFO evidence, seriously proposing that we're sharing our niche of the galaxy - and our airspace - with at least one other intelligence (vastly more capable than our own, yet apparently benign).

"Why haven't we seen them?" My retort, as distressing as it may be to vested academic interests, is that it's very likely we already have.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot.nul)

MTVI: <http://www.mactonnies.com>

Posthuman Blues: <http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

Now available!: "After the Martian Apocalypse"
<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/074348293X>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 14](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: bruce maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 23:43:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 10:45:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 12:52:15 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:29:55 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>The "dark areas" are the spaces between the light bulbs on the
>light pole.

>The image of the light standards themselves are oversaturated due
>to a lengthy exposure. The reflected one which causes the flare
>is not as bright as the real light source, so you see the detail
>that is otherwise washed out. Note the lights on the far side of
>the harbor, and how they are grossly large due to the
>oversaturation of a long exposure. Reflections so not produce
>the same amount of light as the source of the light itself.
>They are semi-transparent as opposed to the opaque light source
>itself. The flare produced by a strong light source cannot be as
>bright as the light source itself. In this case, the flare is a
>more accurate representation of what the camera is seeing (the
>reflected light standard) than the actual lightpost image. This
>is not unusual at all, and other than the convenient location of
>this flare in the image (in the sky), not remarkable in the
>least.

>Another point is that the reflection magnifies the light source,
>..so the separations between the elements are more noticeable.

>I again suggest that this very image was presented on this List
>some time ago, or one very similar.

A lens flare cannot make an image that is darker than the background. In this case it doesn't matter if there was a dark area between lights unless you are suggesting that what appears as sky background in the image immediately adjacent to the "UFO" image is a sum of sky background plus some flare light. If so, this would mean that the image is a broad area lens flare plus sky background plus a bright reflection of the light. Don't think I've ever heard of something like that.

Keep in mind that the flare cannot subtract light from the background. All it can do is add light to the background.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 08:55:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:14:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:39:28 -0800
>Subject: Re: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

>>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
>>to: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 15:09:53 -0500
>>Subject: Strange Impressions Found On Argentine Hilltop

>Oh Pshaw, salamanders and Humbug Scott!

Hi Larry,

Don't forget I only report the stuff. Complain to EBK about posting it to UFO UpDates ;-D

Oh, you'd have to contact Chupacabras's management. Your people can call his people.

Scott

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: **Stanton Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 10:18:22 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:17:58 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:46:23 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>Source: ProFindPages.Com

>><http://www.profindpages.com/news/2005/02/12/MN752.htm>

>>02-12-05

>>UFO Sighted Over Washington DC, 10 Feb

>>UFO Pictured Over Washington DC

>>This latest UFO report was brought to our attention by
>>mediavillage.net.

>>Whilst doing some maintenance on another site, they came across
>>"something odd about the Washington image feed". Some screen
>>shots were taken and a UFO appears in the image. Click:

>><http://tinyurl.com/6fzy5>

>The strange object in this picture is not a UFO but very likely
>an U.S. passenger airliner on its final approach to or departure
>from Ronald Reagan National Airport. Actually, this is really an
>international airport but because it is located a little more
>than a "stone's throw" from the Capitol and the Pentagon, the
>only foreign airline allowed to fly in is Air Canada - which
>could have produced this UFO if the picture was taken about 3/4
>of an hour later.
<snip>

The picture was taken at 3:15 a.m. - I doubt that there is heavy
air traffic at that time. Sure doesn't look like an airplane to
me. At 3:15 p.m., maybe..

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

New UFO Sightings Maps

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 01:55:42 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:19:46 -0500
Subject: New UFO Sightings Maps

Hello all:

I have a new *U* Database web page up, one with two maps of North America for comparison.

<http://www.larryhatch.net/NAM1919h.html>

This time, data is divided by hours of the day.

A quick look at this Hourly breakdown:

<http://www.larryhatch.net/HOURLY.html>

shows that UFO sightings are very unevenly distributed.

Sightings for just 5 hours, 1900 hrs thru Midnight, account for fully half the data here. The other 19 hours from Midnight back to 7:00 PM account for the remaining half.

The surprise is that both maps look so much alike. There are differences, but please look for yourself. Maybe you will notice something I missed.

By all means email me if you see something stupid or interesting, offlist if that's faster. I will fix the page pronto before the search engines find it.

Thanks

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Salla & Bassett - Frehley

From: Paul Frehley <slh.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 23:19:18 +0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:24:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett - Frehley

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 19:16:55 -0000
>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 03:46:39 -1000
>>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

>>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 18:42:38 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Salla & Bassett

<snip>

>The "court of public opinion" , i.e. the general public at
>large, is not, I think, the least interested in the anecdotal
>testimony supplied by Steven Greer's witnesses. One reason for
>this is that it is nothing new.

Quite frankly, if we are talking about the public at large, my
experience is that most people couldn't really give a stuff if
ET is real or not. At the end of the day, they believe that they
will still have to get up and go to work tomorrow, and the next
day, and the day after that...

It is usually only a relatively small group of people who find a
particular subject interesting enough to devote more time to its
pursuit than the average person - whether that be motor racing,
growing potatoes, photography, accounting, horse racing or
whatever. And the subject of UFO's and related issues is no
different.

I don't think you can blame the quality of the DP witnesses for
the lack of public interest. Crikey! How long did the ferals
have the environmental agenda to themselves? It wasn't until the
message that the damage we are doing to the environment will
actually end up biting us all on the arse was made clear that
the wider community actually started giving a toss.

So, unless the subject has serious implications - and people
recognise those implications - most people wont give it a second
thought.

And, with respect to publicising the UFO subject and getting the
wider community involved, this is where Greer has been smarter
than most others in this area - he has tried to connect the
subject to something that will ultimately have an impact on
people's everyday lives. He has a long way to go - but he has
made a start at least.

In a nutshell, he has presented some compelling witnesses (some
more compelling than others) whose testimonies - if true - may
have serious implications for our standard of living in the
future. If there are technologies out there (man made or
otherwise) that are capable of purging us of our reliance on
fossil fuels - and they are being withheld - then that is a

serious matter.

And that - in a nutshell - is the message that Greer has been trying to promote.

And quite frankly, I think it is a rather smart strategy to try and get the public's attention.

You can argue about the credibility of the witnesses all you like. I think some are more believable than others. However, having gauged the opinion of a reasonably wide range of people (from pilots to stockbrokers to farmers to accountants to company executives and so forth), I think that there is enough credibility there to suggest he has a reasonable argument. However, the end result is generally the same at this point - "so what? It's too hard for me to do anything about". But I realise you can't please all of the people all the time.

As for comments about Dr Salla & Steven Bassett - there will always be knockers. But that is all they are - knockers. Nothing more, nothing less. But I'm sure Michael and Steven are smart enough to realise that. Good luck boys.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 07:33:00 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:28:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero - Lehmborg

>From: Dave Morton <Marspyrs.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 02:39:44 EST
>Subject: Re: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 11:44:13 -0600
>>Subject: Professor Shaler Pelicanist Hero

<snip>

>>In a recent post, prominent pelicanist Peter Rogerson points
>>out that many imaginary phenomena, such as UFOs, are conjured up
>>by people in remote locations (e.g., swamps) and gazing in
>>isolation into darkness. Once again, pelicanism is there to save
>>us from misguided, quasi-religious belief in pseudo-phenomena
>>such as swamp gas.

>It's interesting that the same or similar swampy arguments have
>been advanced for so long.....

...And that they would smell so similar and be painted with the
same tedious juxtaposition of eight bit paint... no... two bit
paint.

>Pelicanism itself is a religion - a religion of "safety". That
>is, "personal physical and psychological safety".

"Ding Ding Ding", but you left out cowardly.

>Since the 100th anniversary of that article occurred just a few
>years ago, you would have thought that the Pelicanists might
>have noted the event with some kind of event, such as:
>"Celebrating 100 years of Pelicanism - the religion of safety -
>especially when you're all alone in the dark".

No... the method specifically outlined is to ignore that which
does not support your theory, drum up the contrived easily
dismissible in an opponent's argument (even if it is not what
the opponent said), and attack the man when you can't attack his
argument. It's very effective, and can cause your opponent to
commit suicide for additional icing on the cake

>Dave Morton

>(drinking hot cocoa and browsing Reader's Digest, in front of
>the warm, crackling fire, with the doors barred and locked)

Not even pretending interest in the RD (...ewwww! That's like
pretending to like Rush Limbaugh.) will save you from the
ufological neo-cons. [g].

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Lehmberg

From: **Alfred Lehmberg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 09:27:22 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:30:16 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Lehmberg

>From: Amy Hebert <ahebert.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 17:58:49 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

<snip>

>A. Hebert
>I don't want to believe. I want the truth.

I don't want to believe. I want to be able to believe.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 10:42:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:36:24 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:46:23 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>The strange object in this picture is not a UFO but very likely
>an U.S. passenger airliner on its final approach to or departure
>from Ronald Reagan National Airport. Actually, this is really an
>international airport but because it is located a little more
>than a "stone's throw" from the Capitol and the Pentagon, the
>only foreign airline allowed to fly in is Air Canada - which
>could have produced this UFO if the picture was taken about 3/4
>of an hour later.

<snip>

I agree Nick. The photo most likely shows an airplane of some sort probably over the Potomac River (not over the capitol of White House).

Airplanes to and from National Airport fly as much as possible over the river to minimize the noise at Rosslyn (south/west side at the left of but not shown in the picture) while avoiding no-fly areas over the capitol.

Hence the presumed airplane could be at about the same radial distance from the camera as the cars on the George Washington Parkway (heading north/west).

The streaks made by car headlights are the time exposure evidence. In later pictures, at day-break, the car headlights become resolved into pairs of lights showing that the camera exposure time decreases considerably during the day.

I estimate the length of the car headlight streaks along the George Washington Parkway (south/west side of the river, the side closest to the camera) could be over a hundred feet long.

A car traveling at 60 mph covers 88 ft in a sec. Figure it out yourself.

An airplane at roughly the same distance as the car would cover 2 or 3 times the distance of the car. Hence the length of the streak. Dots would be airplane strobe lights.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:36:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:38:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 23:43:29 -0500
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 12:52:15 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:29:55 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

><snip>

>>The "dark areas" are the spaces between the light bulbs on the
>>light pole.

>>The image of the light standards themselves are oversaturated due
>>to a lengthy exposure. The reflected one which causes the flare
>>is not as bright as the real light source, so you see the detail
>>that is otherwise washed out. Note the lights on the far side of
>>the harbor, and how they are grossly large due to the
>>oversaturation of a long exposure. Reflections do not produce
>>the same amount of light as the source of the light itself.
>>They are semi-transparent as opposed to the opaque light source
>>itself. The flare produced by a strong light source cannot be as
>>bright as the light source itself. In this case, the flare is a
>>more accurate representation of what the camera is seeing (the
>>reflected light standard) than the actual lightpost image. This
>>is not unusual at all, and other than the convenient location of
>>this flare in the image (in the sky), not remarkable in the
>>least.

>>Another point is that the reflection magnifies the light source,
>>...so the separations between the elements are more noticeable.

>>I again suggest that this very image was presented on this List
>>some time ago, or one very similar.

>A lens flare cannot make an image that is darker than the
>background. In this case it doesn't matter if there was a dark
>area between lights unless you are suggesting that what appears
>as sky background in the image immediately adjacent to the "UFO"
>image is a sum of sky background plus some flare light. If so,
>this would mean that the image is a broad area lens flare plus
>sky background plus a bright reflection of the light. Don't
>think I've ever heard of something like that.

>Keep in mind that the flare cannot subtract light from the
>background. All it can do is add light to the background.

Hi Bruce,

Although I don't support Kyle's or Mick Balaskas' contention
that this is a lens flare from the foreground light, I am
surprised why no one has made mention-other than myself-of the

fact that this intriguing object doesn't reflect on the water's surface as do the lights below and around it. This makes me think the photo might have been shot through a window catching a background reflection "or" this was deliberately set up using a sheet of glass or other transparency with an image impressed upon it.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 17:39:04 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:41:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Bourdais

>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 21:34:19 -0500
>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

<snip>

>Dominique Weinstein has a preliminary report on this case based on a few interviews conducted during the first year or so of the investigation.

>Velasco's account is confused and incorrect. He had thousands of reports in the French official files, I don't understand why he used this one in which he had no involvement. No witness said he saw the missile silo cover moved nor are there any written records to indicate that.

To Jan and List,

I have been contacted privately by Tom Tullien, and I understand the situation. I hope that he will be able to finish the report soon. Just one thing - the question of the silo door does not, apparently, seem as clear-cut as you suggest.

Gildas Bourdais

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Ufology Trapped In The Middle Ages? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 16:44:43 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:43:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Ufology Trapped In The Middle Ages? - Dickenson

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 11:55:25 -0400
>Subject: Re: Is Ufology trapped in the Middle Ages?

>Might I suggest "Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14"?

>It is about 260 pages long, has 240 charts, tables, graphs and
>maps. It has categorizations of 3201 UFO sightings, quality
>evaluations, statistical cross comparisons between knowns and
>UNKNOWNs, info on duration, color, apparent size, shape etc.The
>work was done by Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, OHIO,
>under contract to USAF Project Blue Book., though their name
>isn't on it.

<snip>

>By the way, I am preparing a new paper "Government UFO Lies" and
>will include some from BBSR 14. Any suggestions for inclusion
>would be appreciated. I already have a long list. But comments
>from government officials in any country would be appreciated.

Stanton and some other Listers

BBSR 14 information much appreciated.

Re: "Government UFO Lies". A query for readers' reports (with an
i/p URL - maybe FORM i/p better than email?) could be carried by
any Lister's (suitably inclined) web-page: a small HTML
table/box is easy to place.

Rig one for your approval in a few minutes (if I'm awake) and am
sure other Listers could do same - you can access readers from
edus, mil & sec, other gov'ts' depts and research labs, plus
esa/nasa, for certain pages.

To return to the data - what I'm sure most readers (&
researchers) long for is searchable databases [_without_
agendas] containing only essentials. I.e. maybe keyworded
SIGHTS/SOUNDS/SMELLS/SENSATIONS reported by each witness at each
event, plus LOCATIONS and TIMINGS.

As Amy Herbert just posted:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/feb/m14-014.shtml>

>"As long as UFO databases are compiled and structured according
>to an author's bias (beliefs/disbeliefs about UFO's), valuable
>data will be omitted or inaccurately classified and resulting
>extrapolations become screwed... I mean, skewed."

Maybe with stripped-down data, no narrative = no bias, there
could be some clear analysis possible.

Hope to contact off-list for the BBSR 14 details.

Cheers
Ray D

~~~~~  
"Perceptions" <http://www.perceptions.couk.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Popular Mechanics On UFO Detector - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:53:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:00:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Popular Mechanics On UFO Detector - Ledger

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 00:02:09 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Popular Mechanics On UFO Detector

>Source: Popular Mechanics

><http://www.popularmechanics.com/outdoors/outdoors/1277516.html?page=1&c=y>

>02-11-05

>UFOs And The Great Outdoors

>By Cliff Gromer

>Forget bear attacks, avalanches and giant ants. The real danger in trekking around the great outdoors is abduction. That's right, abduction by aliens is probably the leading cause of outdoors people disappearing from off the face of the planet. But since abducted humans seldom leave a trace, this problem has gone largely unreported.

<snip>

>Up until now there's been no sure way to differentiate a human >from an alien cleverly disguised as one, so identifying the >aliens (humanoids) among us (July 1995, page 39) has been pretty >much a guessing game. So you can imagine our excitement when we >received a call about a newly developed and affordable UFO >Detector (the older models designed for military use were waaay >out of our price range). Would we want to test one? Hey, is our >name POPULAR MECHANICS?

>Shortly thereafter, a package arrived wrapped in plain brown >paper from Images SI Inc., 39 Seneca Loop, Staten Island, NY >10314; 718-698-8305; www.imagesco.com. And it wasn't delivered >by a man in black wearing dark sunglasses, but by an employee of >the U.S. Postal Service. I called my son, Jonathan, into my >office and we quickly locked the door, drew the blinds and >opened the package. Ah, there it was--a gen-u-ine UFO detector. >All we had to do was install the 9-volt lithium battery and we'd >be in the UFO detection business. We didn't have to calibrate >anything or read a huge instruction manual. It was simply plug- >and-play right out of the box.

<snip>

Why this idiot would spend the money on such a device, not to mention the postage costs and handling when he could easily build one of these toys for about three dollars, is beyond me. Another tongue-in-cheek expert heard from, and from such a lofty, peered-reviewed journal as Popular Mechanics.

I wonder why this piece would even rate space in this publication? It's not hallowe'en, and it certainly doesn't wook for Valentine's day. Some pagan rite, an offering to the God's' before the onslaught of Spring, perhaps?

This is a pretty insular publication-BTW. There's no contact

where one can respond to this condescending piece.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 11:31:24 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:02:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

>From: Greg Bishop <exclmid.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:37:56 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

>I am the author of the new, Project Beta, book that was
>mentioned on the List last week.

>One of the List subscribers mentioned that Nick Redfern had told
>his MUFON group that the AFOSI had entered Paul Bennewitz' home
>when he wasn't around a rearranged the furniture to make him
>paranoid. I don't remember hearing that in the couple of years I
>spent working on the Project Beta book. It could have happened,
>or it could have been Bennewitz' already deteriorating mental
>state that produced this idea which he may have passed on to
>others. Nick gave me a very good review (for which I thank him)
>at his Phenomena Magazine website.

Hi Greg,

That was me. Nick says he got his info straight from the AFOSI
horse's mouth.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2002/dec/ml6-012.shtml>

(see paragraph 5)

Thanks

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Communique Regarding Argentina's Mar del Plata

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:45:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:06:43 -0500
Subject: Communique Regarding Argentina's Mar del Plata

Inexplicata
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
February 14, 2005

Carlos A. Turchuk, a distinguished Argentinean UFO researcher and long-time collaborator of INEXPLICATA, has sent us the following communique from Carlos Ferguson, Coordinator of the Red Argentina de Ovnilogia (RAO - Argentinean Ufology Network), regarding the apparition of the odd marks or indentations last week. Mr. Ferguson is a resident of Mar del Plata.

The discovery of fungi in the Sierra de los Padres imprints does not invalidate the UFO alternative

Researcher Carlos Ferguson, director of the Mar del Plata UFO Research Commission and President of the Red Argentina de Ovnilogia (RAO), has spoked out on the events made public and involving the imprints found in Sierra de los Padres and Parque Palermo, Mar del Plata, stressing the following:

Every case has a certain research time that allows for a final verdict on the event. However, according to the data received only a few hours after the events took place, it can be said with a reasonable amount of certainty that an UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT appeared in the early hours of February 8 of this year, causing at least a pair of prints at Sierra de los Padres. Furthermore, we have already received word on 10 new prints in the Route 88 area, although it is worth noting that these are not related to any UFO sighting whatsoever.

Returning to the Sierra de los Padres case: the testimony of Mr. Romelio Tapia is convincing with regard to the details of what happened. This person, without being influenced or having preconceived notions, restricted himself to describing his observation.

We are then faced with a Close Encounter Of The 2nd Kind event: on the one hand, the witness was alerted by the fear evinced by local animals. Without Tapia's testimony, the case would be limited to the appearance of the prints themselves, which shows the relevance of his experience. He saw a luminous white sphere (the most reported in these cases). When the UFO took off, marks were left behind that usually have a similar diameter. Similar cases have already taken place in Mar del Plata and elsewhere, as our statistics will show.

- 1) 20 August 1965: Outskirts of Mar del Plata = Burn mark.
- 2) 14 June 1968: El Boqueron = Burn Mark.
- 3) July/ August 1968: Parque Camet = Re-greening mark.
- 4) 2 March 1973: Golf Club MDP = 30 charring marks and residue in the form of greyish dust.
- 5) 6 January 1985: Mundialista Area = circle measuring 4.20

meters with greyish dust.

6) 26 February 1987: SMATA campground = Circular and semi-circular dehydration marks.

7) 3 March 1987: As above.

8) October 1988: Santa Clara del Mar = One 5 meter diam. burn mark.

9) March 1989: En Playa Dorada = One 14 meter diam. dehydration mark.

10) October 1989: Santa Clara del Mar = One 4.70 meter diam. dehydration mark.

11) February 1990: Caisamar = 1 print measuring 5 m./diam. with greyish dust.

12) February 1990: Sierra de los Padres = 2 circles, one measuring 4m and another 2 m, containing a sort of greyish dust and fungi.

13) February 1990: Port = 2 circles (One measuring 5 meters/diameter and smaller one) of greyish dust

14) 8 February de 2005: Sierra de los Padres.

15) 8 February 2005: Parque Palermo.

Generally speaking, some scorching, dehydration and a fine greyish dust have been found in these prints. The residues are usually found among some very small fungi. Some are already saying that if fungi are found in the Sierra de los Padres case, the case would be invalidated. Nothing could be further from the truth. These microscopic fungi are generated by something that activates them externally, adding to this the temperature present in the area (high humidity). But this would not invalidate at all the report on the presence of a UFO, which - as we know - possesses electromagnetic energy that could have well been the source of these prints.

This has nothing at all to do with another type of ground mark that UFO researchers know very well, and which are known as FAIRY RINGS. These are indeed a mere disease that occurs in the fields and have nothing to do with UFO prints, but fairy rings are not present in the Sierra de los Padres case.

In summary: We have not had ground marks of this sort in Mar del Plata since 1990 (at least publicly known). On the other hand, the "Pearl of the Atlantic" has a long history of UFO cases, ranking it 5th among Argentinean locales. We cannot make predictions, since it isn't an objective way of dealing with the situation. One thing is certain: according to the statistics in our files, and according to the phenomenon's activity over the past 2 years, we could be facing an intensification of UFO activity in this region.

Translation (c) 2005. Scott Corrales - IHU

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 13:11:32 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:07:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: bruce maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 23:43:29 -0500
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 12:52:15 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:29:55 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

><snip>

>>The "dark areas" are the spaces between the light bulbs on the
>>light pole.

>>The image of the light standards themselves are oversaturated due
>>to a lengthy exposure. The reflected one which causes the flare
>>is not as bright as the real light source, so you see the detail
>>that is otherwise washed out. Note the lights on the far side of
>>the harbor, and how they are grossly large due to the
>>oversaturation of a long exposure. Reflections so not produce
>>the same amount of light as the source of the light itself.
>>They are semi-transparent as opposed to the opaque light source
>>itself. The flare produced by a strong light source cannot be as
>>bright as the light source itself. In this case, the flare is a
>>more accurate representation of what the camera is seeing (the
>>reflected light standard) than the actual lightpost image. This
>>is not unusual at all, and other than the convenient location of
>>this flare in the image (in the sky), not remarkable in the
>>least.

<snip>

>A lens flare cannot make an image that is darker than the
>background. In this case it doesn't matter if there was a dark
>area between lights unless you are suggesting that what appears
>as sky background in the image immediately adjacent to the "UFO"
>image is a sum of sky background plus some flare light. If so,
>this would mean that the image is a broad area lens flare plus
>sky background plus a bright reflection of the light. Don't
>think I've ever heard of something like that.

>Keep in mind that the flare cannot subtract light from the
>background. All it can do is add light to the background.

Hi Bruce and Kyle!

Bruce, I have to agree with Kyle's interpretaion on this one.

The dark horizontal line sandwiched between two brighter lines
passing through the "UFO" which I think you are referring to
that you say is darker than the background sky (which is not
very uniform in darkness anyway) is really an optical illusion.
This dark line does not seem to be as dark in the other two of

three sequential images of the same "UFO" found in the same web site.

The prominent glow or haze around the "UFO" can be explained as scattered light by a dirty (eg. fingerprints) or improperly cleaned camera lens.

The reason the "UFO" seems to be hovering over the same general point can be explained if Gentileza was taking several trial shots of the same night scene with his new digital camera. Since the exposure time will automatically increase when taking night shots, this also explains why one of the three images of the "UFO" is blurry suggesting a tripod was not used.

To be scientific, we must be able to replicate these pictures of the UFO with the same camera taking shots of the same scene from exactly the same location. Why has not this been done before these pictures of a suspected large structured UFO were published?

If such pictures are the best examples the public are being presented as proof that UFOs are real and not manmade objects, then one cannot blame the media for writing articles stating that flying saucers were are a thing of the past.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:03:27 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:08:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:30:04 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:20:52 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 09:50:51 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>>So the question remains, John:

>>>Why are there so few - if any - female pelicanists?

>>come along to a meeting of a splendid organisation known as
>>"Sceptics in the Pub" he would find a fair sprinkling of
>>females present. Fewer than the number of men, certainly,
>>but then I think, despite the names he mentions, the number
>>of women active in the UFO world is also significantly fewer
>>than the men.

>I presume you are referring to wives and girl friends, not to
>active pelicanists. I offer no explanation for the reason this
>is so. It's just an observation. One of those mysteries of
>gender about which one speculates at one's peril.

Gentlemen,

There are thousands of women in "Ufology", actually probably
many more than men.

The only trouble is, they fall under the New Age banner and so
wouldn't last 3 minutes on this List.

Stuart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:17:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:13:23 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:46:23 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>Source: ProFindPages.Com

>><http://www.profindpages.com/news/2005/02/12/MN752.htm>

>>02-12-05

>>UFO Sighted Over Washington DC, 10 Feb

>>UFO Pictured Over Washington DC

<snip>

>The strange object in this picture is not a UFO but very likely
>an U.S. passenger airliner on its final approach to or departure
>from Ronald Reagan National Airport. Actually, this is really an
>international airport but because it is located a little more
>than a "stone's throw" from the Capitol and the Pentagon, the
>only foreign airline allowed to fly in is Air Canada - which
>could have produced this UFO if the picture was taken about 3/4
>of an hour later.

>My conclusion is based on the fact that this is a long exposure
>picture and that there are frequent passenger aircraft flying
>over the Potomac River in the middle ground of this picture with
>the UFO. Since the moving cars produced streaks in this long
>exposure picture and do not even appear as cars, then a faster
>moving airplane on its final approach to the airport just a few
>miles away would have produced a similar streak too, just like
>the one in the picture. Of course, flashing navigation lights on
>this moving airplane would appear as points of light just like
>we see in the picture. With so much air traffic over this part
>of Washington, D.C., especially at the time of day the picture
>was taken, I would be surprised if anyone would even notice this
>illuminated moving UFO that's larger than the Moon.

>Having visited Washington, D.C. a few months ago for my
>godson's wedding and to follow-up on important UFO leads
>(including the alleged alien bodies and flying saucer that were
>once stored in the Capitol's sub-basement during President FDR's
>term of office - and may still be there to this day), I took
>many pictures with very similar views. Some of these pictures
>were taken from President JFK's grave site in Arlington National
>Cemetery and from nearby Columbia Island (the lights of the cars
>in the foreground of this picture are on this same island). I
>also tried to take a few pictures of these airliners from the
>nearby Arlington Memorial Bridge (seen to the right of this
>picture) as they flew along the river on their approach to
>D.C.'s National Airport but by the time my digital camera had
>powered up and was ready to take a picture, the airplanes had
>already zoomed by.

Hi Kyle and Nick,

Of course it's a UFO, Nick. It hasn't been identified, yet.
Let's not forget the true meaning of the word.

There's a problem with apparent speeds here. If this object is close then it should be showing a lot longer streak in the sky than it does compared to the cars on the road in the foreground. I'm guessing the speed limits for the cars is between 30 and 60 mph. If that's the case the distance they cover is 44 to 88 feet per second and their headlight streaks with time delay of one second [we are not privy to that-but anything more would be overkill with today's CCD cameras] would approximate that distance as seen in the daylight shot of the same area. Compare that with the UFO. If it was an airliner it's approach speed would be around 180 mph [its climb out would be faster than that] and it's smear across the picture should be much longer.

Air Canada or not this angle would be kosher for an airliner if it's as close to the camera as appears. The Lincoln Memorial in the foreground was-and possibly still is-a turning point to avoid flying over the Whitehouse just northwest of the Peace Tower when climbing out from RRNA.

I'm assuming it's fairly close because this is another UFO with no water reflection and this is because the foreground is not water. If the aircraft theory was going to work, the object would have to further out, still side-on because we would see it's landing lights very prominently if it was approaching, not so if climbing out. I don't see large area vertical stabilizer lighting and fuselage lighting [lights positioned on the horizontal stabilizer to light up a large area while in hi traffic areas].

I do see a hint of green on the long axis [there is a lot of green in the picture suggesting the camera needs resetting] which might suggest a green nav. light which are located on the right and which would indicate the aircraft is landing. The long white lighted bottom could also be the landing light as seen from the side. There's not much distance to play with by the looks of that cloud cover. If it was behind the Peace Tower it should be reflecting the Potomac.

If the little balls of light were strobe lights then they should be evenly spaced as they strobe at a fixed measured interval.

Can someone get the ceilings for that night? the temp and dew point would help too and might explain the green in the photo. It would also give a max. height at which the "airliner" could be and would help nail down the angular distance.

There is not much detail in that photo to suggest an airliner but it might still be something military.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:18:32 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:15:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 15:23:41 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 21:52:02 +0000
>>Subject: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 22:41:11 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 17:07:03 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

Martin Try as you might you can't get round the fact that the statement:

"UFOs are the product of unknown intelligences possessing unknown powers and motivations"

is a contentless, infinitely elastic hypothesis; what couldn't you explain by it. Scientific hypotheses must surely be testable against nature, even if, at first, its only a case of ensuring that the hypothesis has mathematical consistency. Hypotheses which can explain anything and everything actually explain nothing.

Cheers

Peter

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

UFO Hunters Closer To The 'X files' Truth

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:28:04 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:25:02 -0500
Subject: UFO Hunters Closer To The 'X files' Truth

Source: The Evening Telegraph, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/4rght>

02-114-05

UNexplained Sightings: UFO hunters closer to the 'X files' truth

The truth is out there, and it could be closer than ever.

A UFO enthusiast plans to use the Freedom of Information Act to access previously secret government documents to uncover the truth behind unexplained sightings of flying objects around Peterborough.

Michael Hoffman, of Bruces Close, Conington, near Peterborough, who runs the UFO research group Sky Lights, hopes that the release of so-called "X files" held by the Ministry of Defence (MoD) will finally shed light on why there have been so many alien sightings in the area.

He said: "I think the Act will give us quite a lot of information about UFOs, and it is something our group will definitely use.

"The MoD will not be very forthcoming with information and will find ways to block it, not release it. But I will use the Act to get information.

"They have a Freedom of Information Act in the USA, but still manage to hold stuff back which they want to keep a secret. I hope it will be different here."

This week, the MoD released secret papers under the Act showing that 91 sightings were recorded last year in the UK, including a report of "four dull red lights" hovering above Peterborough.

The latest files also revealed that a government meeting was held to investigate the existence of aliens in June 1951, but dismissed sightings of UFOs by RAF personnel, as well as a series of reports of "luminous bodies" by members of the public.

Minutes of the Government's Flying Saucer Working Party show that they regarded the pursuit of UFOs to be a "singularly profitless enterprise" and recommended no further investigation of mysterious aerial phenomena.

However, a spokesman for the Peterborough Paranormal Society was not convinced that the Act would yield any great discoveries.

He said: "It depends what they release, but normally they just black out anything controversial.

"In the '80s and '90s there were a lot of sightings around Peterborough, but that is probably because they have been testing new aircraft in the area.

"We concentrate more on ghost sightings and have not had any reports of UFOs since we set up a few years ago."

Anyone who has witnessed any strange flying objects can contact Michael Hoffman at link

The paranormal in Peterborough

The first UFO sighting in Peterborough occurred in 1909 when two police officers reported a strange object hovering above the cathedral. It is thought to have been an early Zeppelin craft.

A Peterborough postman claimed a pyramid-shaped cosmic craft performed acrobatic tricks just yards above his head. Thomas Thompson, of Lincoln Road, Peterborough, said he witnessed the glowing orange spaceship at a friend's house, in St Neots, in 1981.

A jet black triangular-shaped UFO hovering above the A47, between Peterborough and Wisbech, in November, was seen by a student, his girlfriend, his mother and a friend, in November 1997.

Bizarre crop circles, hundreds of metres wide, appeared at Sibson Airfield, near Wansford, in 1990.

Brian Dunnett, from Netherton, saw strange lights in the sky at his Heaton Close home, in 1995.

Two black shimmering discs were spotted gliding above Millfield, Peterborough, in November 1997, by Graham Palk, of Gladstone Street.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:33:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:27:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

>From: Greg Bishop <exclmid.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:37:56 -0800 (PST)>
>Subject: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

>I am the author of the new, Project Beta, book that was
>mentioned on the List last week.

>One of the List subscribers mentioned that Nick Redfern had told
>his MUFON group that the AFOSI had entered Paul Bennewitz' home
>when he wasn't around a rearranged the furniture to make him
>paranoid. I don't remember hearing that in the couple of years I
>spent working on the Project Beta book. It could have happened,
>or it could have been Bennewitz' already deteriorating mental
>state that produced this idea which he may have passed on to
>others. Nick gave me a very good review (for which I thank him)
>at his Phenomena Magazine website.

The one time I spoke to Bennewitz was in 1985. I was in Albuquerque on business and had visited his company, Thunder Research, but he wouldn't see me. But he did arrange to talk on the phone as I was about to leave (I was in the airport while talking to him). The only reason he was willing to talk to me was because I had been recommended by Hynek, Anyway, he was telling me all sorts of bizarre things, the most bizarre being that several times a day some alien would sneak up on him and stick a needle in his neck, or something like that. It was clear that the guy was "on the edge" at that time. This was several years after he was personally investigated by the AFOSI at Kirtland (Oct. Nov. 1980)

I was checking up on sightings ner Kirtland AFB and published a psper about the Kirtland Landing called "Welcome to the Cosmic Watergate" available at:

<http://brumac.8k.com> ...

>The book discusses the interaction between Paul Bennewitz,
>Richard Doty, Bill Moore, and various intelligence services.
>What appears to have happened was that Paul Bennewitz became
>interesting to the Air Force because of his suspicions about
>activities at Kirtland Air Force Base, which began in 1979. The
>Air Force and the NSA were conducting secret research in the
>area. They realized that he was onto some things that might lead
>him to compromise these projects (i.e. unwittingly reveal
>something useful to the Soviets or others.)

>Instead of telling him cease and desist, they let him persist in
>his folly and encouraged it to monitor how he might be gathering
>information and who might be listening. As he began to grow
>increasingly paranoid and unstable, the AFOSI and NSA continued
>to feed him disinformation designed to flatter his prejudices.
>These included stories about underground bases, aliens
>exchanging abduction rights for technology, and the idea that
>aliens had been behind the great spiritual movements in human
>history. Others (like John Lear and Bill Cooper, etc) began to
>pick up on this and probably talked to the same people who were
>watching Bennewitz. Even if they didn't, these stories were
>unheard of before the AFOSI/ NSA interaction with Bennewitz.>

I expect some of this to be in a book to be published soon By Robert Collins and Richard Doty called "Exempt from Disclosure"

>I wasn't concerned with finding out if these stories were true
>(since that is practically impossible to determine)--I wanted to
>find out where they were first mentioned and by whom. For
>example, a "Project Excalibur" mentioned by Lear soon after
>beginning his contact with Bennewitz also turns out to be the
>name of a secret project (headed by Edward Teller) that used
>underground nuclear detonations as an initiating power source
>for a "Star Wars"-type project that was happening at the Nevada
>test site at the time. Lear and others said it was some sort of
>weapon that was being developed to attack underground alien
>bases.

It is my recollection that this was Teller's attempt to make an atomic bomb powered X-ray laser. I seem to recall that they did get one or two tests which proved the principle. Of course, "the laser" was destroyed.

For a "preview" of the book I suggest interested readers go to the UFO UpDates web site and access the messages starting Dec. 12, 2002 and from then on for several days. You will find a long, multiple person discourse by me, Redfern, Goldstein and others on Bennewitz.

You will also find the following short statement by me:

"Someday someone ought to write this all down as a story.... Of course the readers would think it all fiction. <LOL>"

Guess someone finally has written it. Will it seem like fiction? Only time will tell!

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Researchers Sure E.T. Life Exists - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:33:17 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:29:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Researchers Sure E.T. Life Exists - Maccabee

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 02:51:11 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Researchers Sure E.T. Life Exists

>Source: Long Beach Press Telegram - Long Beach, California
><http://www.presstelegram.com/Stories/0,1413,204~21474~2708324,00.html>
>02-12-05

>Long Beach Press Telegram

>Researchers sure E.T. life exists

>Recent discoveries of planets prompt confidence in
>other life.

>By Katy Human
>The Denver Post

>Researchers are more sure than ever that extraterrestrials exist
>whether they are microbes eking out a living on an icy planet or
>intelligent beings inhabiting a watery blue world 5,000 light-
>years away.

>"There must surely be other stars like our sun, and other
>planets like the Earth," said Geoff Marcy, a UC Berkeley
>planetary scientist during a planetary conference in Aspen last
>week. "Primitive life, at least, must be common in the
>universe."

<snip>

>Berkeley's Marcy ran through a series of calculations suggesting
>there easily could be thousands of advanced civilizations in the
>Milky Way.

>"There's only one problem: Where are they? Why haven't
>we seen them?" Marcy said.

This guy should read "Inflation Theory Implications for ET
Visitation" available now at:

<http://brumac.8k.com>

scroll down to Breakthrough Paper.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:33:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:32:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Maccabee

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:39:13 EST
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>No coverup can perfectly cover up 100%, especially at the
>inception of a coverup of something that is unplanned and
>unprecedented in history that is suddenly forced on you. There
>will be leaks and there will be visible policy impacts on the
>national policymakers - two different things. How visible the
>policy impacts and how big the leaks are a matter of degree and
>a matter of sufficient access to "all source" information and
>sufficient interest and intellect to connect the "dots" after
>finding them, and avoiding the connection of imaginary and
>fabricated "dots" which the UFO community so dearly loves to do
>because of its incipient poor judgment (e.g., Greer, MJ-12).

Brad says if Roswell were "real" there would have been leaks and
policy repercussions. He says he himself has located a document
that implies policy repercussions.

As for leaks, well, we have Marcell and a bunch of others coming
forward in the 1979-1990 time frame. And the EBD and so on.

Point: if there had been no 'leaks' we wouldn't know anything
about Roswell and MJ-12, etc.

So, there have been 'leaks'. The question then is, do the leaks
refer to a true event or are they prt of disinformation,
possibly to cover up something else?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

MUFON N.C. Debates Aztec Crash

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:46:11 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:35:19 -0500
Subject: MUFON N.C. Debates Aztec Crash

Source: The Salisbury Post, Salisbury, North Carolina,

<http://slspublish.bits.baseview.com/area/282614563478764.php>

02-14-05

UFO Group Gathers To Share Research

By Jonathan Weaver
Salisbury Post

"I believe." Those words were conspicuously displayed below a rendering of the archetypical extra-terrestrial =97 rail thin with saucer eyes and an oversized egg-shaped head =97 at Ellis Park Sunday as about 50 people from all parts of the state gathered for the first of this year's four meetings of the N.C. Chapter of Mutual UFO Network (MUFON).

The group elected officers for the year and heard from speakers such as Scott Ramsey of Mooresville, who talked about his exhaustive research on the 1948 UFO crash at Aztec, N.M.

Ramsey and his wife, Suzanne, are penning a book called "Fallen Angel, The Recovery in Hart Canyon."

George Fawcett of Lincolnton, who formed the North Carolina chapter and was its first state director, said the group is "dedicated to educating the public as to what's happening in our home towns" concerning UFO activity.

His philosophy is perhaps best summed up on his address label, which reads, "The Truth is Down Here".

MUFON-NC's purpose statement says the group strives to "provide the ultimate answer to the UFO enigma" and serves as a sounding board for those who have had close encounters "new or old" to tell their stories without "fear of ridicule or censorship."

Since the age of 14, Fawcett has looked into about 3,500 reported UFO sightings, he said.

Though he couldn't recall any recent sightings in Rowan, Fawcett said MUFON received 75 reports of UFOs in North Carolina and 54 in South Carolina last year.

Fawcett, an honorary member of the Board of Directors for the International UFO Museum and Research Center in Roswell, N.M., recently finished his second book, "Unique Studies, 1940 - 1984: Global UFO Repetitions and Human Reactions."

Fawcett was one of several MUFON-NC leaders who came to Ellis Park Sunday.

"My interest is because of personal experience," said Granville Angell, a counselor from Lincoln County. "It's time we all woke up and find out we're not alone in the universe."

Those experiences "led me to believe there was more than what the media and government tell", he said.

Angell helps with "experiencer support" with MUFON-NC, he said.

That entails talking to folks who have had experiences with UFOs, he said.

During his presentation, Ramsey, a Rowan County resident, showed overheads of declassified documents and an excerpt from a documentary in which he was interviewed.

Ramsey has long been interested in UFOs, he said, but his research into the mysterious Aztec crash began in October 1988, while he was on a business trip to Farmington, a New Mexico town near Aztec.

He heard some Navajos talking about going hunting near the "crash site."

So when he returned to North Carolina, Ramsey started digging.

He spent a lot of time researching in libraries. He also called other researchers, many of whom told him that the crash was a hoax and he was wasting his time.

If it was a sham, so be it, he figured. He wanted to find out on his own.

Ultimately Ramsey sifted through 2,200 declassified government documents and interviewed more than 60 people with first-, second- or third-hand knowledge of the crash.

The result: "There is no smoking gun.", he said. "But there is enough evidence to show that something happened."

Witnesses have said the crash, which occurred March 25, 1948, involved a craft that was 100 feet in diameter and contained 14 to 16 bodies.

The site was found by civilians about 5 a.m. that day.

"I don't know if we'll ever find out what happened." But he vows to continue the research. "We've still got a lot of work to do."

Ramsey said he became involved with the Salisbury meeting after MUFON International in Colorado contacted him to write an article for a publication.

He did, and later MUFON-NC officials invited him to Sunday's meeting.

For more information on MUFON, visit the website at www.mufon.com.

MUFON-NC's individual dues are \$10 per year, \$5 per year for those under 18. A family can join for \$15 a year.

Meetings are generally held the first Sundays of February, May, August and November at different locations.

Contact Jonathan Weaver at 704-797-4266 or jweaver@nufon.com

c. 2005, The Salisbury Post

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 13:17:19 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:36:55 -0500
Subject: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

Source: Fox News

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,147469,00.html>

02-14-05

Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

WASHINGTON =97 Senior Defense Department officials said Monday they have no knowledge of any U.S. drone flights over Iran, and U.S. intelligence officials would not comment on any such flights.

The responses came one day after the Washington Post ran a story saying that the United States has been running unmanned spy flights over Iran for the past year for evidence of nuclear weapons programs and to probe air defenses.

The Iranian government has lodged a protest with Washington over the matter through Swiss channels since the two nations have no formal diplomatic relations, the Post said.

But a defense official at the Pentagon (search) told FOX News that "the story has a lot of people scratching their heads in this building.

"We're not the only ones who fly those things," the official said.

The U.S. intelligence community has its own fleet of unmanned drones. The U.S military did confirm that it has been operating unmanned and manned flights along the Iraq-Iran border to assist local border patrol in Iraq.

In the Post story, three sources identified as U.S. officials with knowledge of the effort said the small, pilotless planes use radar, video, still photography and air filters designed to pick up traces of nuclear activity to gather details not accessible by satellites.

It reported that one U.S. official acknowledged that drones (search) were being used, but that the Iranian complaint focused on manned military aircraft overflights, which the United States denied.

Iranians living along the Caspian Sea and on the Iraq border first started reporting sightings of UFOs in late December, according to Iranian newspaper reports. Eyewitnesses commonly reported red flashes, streaks of green and blue and low lights that quickly disappeared. The Iranian air force determined from the reports that the lights were spy drones, the Post reported, adding that Iranian officers are familiar with U.S. tactics since being trained in the United States more than 25 years ago.

The Post quoted an unidentified senior Iranian official as saying Iran's National Security Council decided not to engage the pilotless aircraft because it did not want to reveal the

country's air defense capabilities. The decision is considered a major policy move to demonstrate the council's belief that an attack is unlikely anytime soon, the newspaper said.

Asked about the Iranians' restraint, one senior defense official said: "If you think the Iranians would not shoot the drones down, you're smoking something."

U.S. military commanders point out that the flights would be very risky since Predator (search) and other drones are very slow and could easily be shot down. A crash, which is not uncommon for drones, could also present a host of problems.

Word of the drones comes on the heels of stepped-up calls by the Bush administration for Iran to submit to international observation of its nuclear activity to ensure that it is not developing nuclear weapons.

The U.S. government believes Iran is using its nuclear energy program to conceal an effort to manufacture nuclear weapons and is relying, for the time being, on France, Britain and Germany to negotiate curbs on any such efforts.

The Post said U.S. officials confirmed that the drones were deployed along Iran's northern and western borders, first in April 2004 and again in December and January.

FOX News' Bret Baier and Nick Simeone and The Associated Press contributed to this report.

Copyright 2005 FOX News Network, LLC. All rights reserved.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 17:10:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:39:31 -0500
Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 12:35:56 EST
>Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

<snip>

>>These days, it's a lot easier to home brew your own documentary,
>>and I wonder if the time is right for Ufology to have 'it's own
>>brand' out there?

>The quality would be the problem, and if people go around
>peddling cheapo documentaries it could turn people off

Alex Jones' videos, and those from a colleague Dave von Kleist, are not at the Peter Jennings or History Channel quality. But they are at the 'locally produced TV newscast' quality level, which is more than adequate to get the government UFO whistleblowers' testimony out to the public. That content is so important that it is worth the try, and Alex's and Dave's videos earn profits too, which UFOlogy is short of.

Here is your chance to select out the whistleblowers the seniour UFOlogists consider as passing muster, and have a far greater long term impact than Dr. Greer's presentation. You all wanted to have only vetted whistleblowers heard, well, here's your chance.

And being a volunteer says nothing about the quality of work they turn out. In an adult upgrading course I took, where the class members were typically in their 40s, we had to do some presentations. Some were superlative.

It boils down to the question: Is it important to get the exopolitics side of UFOlogy known to the public, as part of getting at the ultimate truth through public pressure on government, or not?

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 17:14:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:40:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - White

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:23:57 -0800
>Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection

<snip>

Your humour is lost on mind control/electronic harassment/gang stalking targets who come home and find their dog with its throat slit.

Instead of ridiculing people who are being harassed, you might consider thanking God you aren't among us.

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Bueche

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:09:46 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:44:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Bueche

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 13:44:18 EST
>Subject: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help

>Okay.

>Far too often we drop down to the old arguments.

>Bottom line is physical proof.

>Not evidence, but proof.

>Skeptibunkers are actually doing us a good service in pressing
>for this proof and researchers and believers may well have what
>we call proof but if you toss it on a table in front of the
>average Joe and Jane, would they know it for what it is.

>I'm not talking trace cases. There're tons of those. I've been
>to several and gathered evidence. Now what caused the trace,
>burnt rocks, deformed critters etc. is still unprovable. So we
>need that hunk of craft, leg bone, corpse, blood, whatever else
>grody bio matter or downright crystal clear video.

<snip>

If this alien encounter experience is a meeting of two worlds, a meeting of what we might currently call a transitory meeting of different dimensions, then you may not be able to provide more than what you are calling "trace cases".

If we're talking about two worlds (for lack of a better word) that are being brought together for a few minutes by alien technology, that seems to be a theory which stands up to all the descriptions that experiencers provide about strange light effects, feelings of the pace of time being altered, sound dropping away, passing through solid walls, and on and on. If this is a meeting of worlds whose natures are different, then you aren't going to get physical proof, because these different worlds aren't physical relative to each other (even if each is physical unto itself). (Except during the moments of an encounter or flyover or whatever).

What you're calling "traces" - i.e. things that were already present in our reality show signs of having been touched by something - may be about it. That evidence seems common. We have that, and memories of course.

I am not a physicist, and I expect most reading this are not either. So if pressed to come up with an example, I'd have to compare being asked to produce a chunk of something from another dimension to being asked to produce a chunk of something from tomorrow.

That is, I am fairly certain the action figure sitting on my desk will still exist tomorrow. I'd go so far as to say I am sure it will exist tomorrow (and I pray it does). But knowing it exists there in that tomorrow place doesn't mean I have any way to take hold of it and bring it into today. Would probably

violate some natural laws to have it here. I'd be able to sell the extra on ebay if it could be done. Maybe it could be kept here if I were some kind of super scientist with tools at the ready. But I doubt it. We are, each of us, locked into this time, this world. And sometimes some creatures keep step with us for a bit.

My opinion is that the fifty years or so of unsuccessful searches for physical evidence is NOT because those who have looked are pathetic, nor do I think fifty years of unsuccessful searches for physical evidence is because the so-called aliens are exceptionally neat and precise. No one is that perfect. If something could be left behind, it would have been by now.

Rumors of Roswell debris aside (maybe there is a way for matter to be left behind under unusual, terrible circumstances??), the lack of physical evidence may reveal much about the nature of the experiences.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:21:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:46:43 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 15:45:46 -0000
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Nikolay Subbotin <paragloss.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 15:24:41 +0500
>>Subject: UFO Research Software?

>>Who uses special UFO research software? I cannot find any
>>software for professional UFO research.

>A lot depends upon what "UFO research software" you want.

<snip>

Please refer to this comprehensive treatise on UFO Databases:
(and apologies for this late response..)

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/feb/m13-001.shtml>

<snip>

>Larry Hatch's *U* Database - Given Larry's frequent posts to
>UpDates, his database probably does not require any introduction
>or any reference to his website at the following link:

><http://www.larryhatch.net/>

>As far as I've seen, this database has not discussed in many
>books so far. However, Larry's objective appears to be very
>similar to that of Dr Willy Smith's Project UNICAT (i.e. a
>filtered catalogue of higher quality UFO reports). Project
>UNICAT's database has been discussed in several of the
>references given above, and elsewhere (e.g. in the entry
>entitled "UNICAT Project" at pages 943-944 of Jerome Clark's
>"UFO Encyclopedia 2nd Edition : Volume 2 L-Z:" (1998).

>Larry's database is currently only available as a Microsoft DOS
>program and its appearance is a rather basic. The sound effects
>may have been cutting edge for DOS software but are now simply a
>bit irritating. However, these rather superficial issues should
>not cause the database itself to be underestimated. The database
>is a useful tool and I look forward to seeing Larry release a
>new version of his database once its been given a new, glossy,
>Windows user interface. (Again, I find it interesting that the
>references given by Larry's database rarely seem to overlap with
>the references given for the same sightings by UFOCAT).

If I may add a few comments:

I guess Isaac refers to the 5 second "Flying Saucer Theme"
(option #2 off the main menu of the DOS program).

Yeah, its irritating when you hit the wrong key, as close to a
simulated theramin I could get using the "beep" speaker on old
DOS machines before the advent of Soundblaster cards.

Its usually good for a chuckle when discussions get too serious,
I didn't have the heart to take it out.

Less known is a sound feature not found elsewhere.

If you have working copy of *U*, display some map. (the North
Atlantic is good). Press the keys [R][+] to show sightings "in
rotation". (Old ones vanish as new ones appear, and more slowly
than usual). Activity shifts back and forth across the "pond".

Then press the 2 keys [S][+]. Two tones alternate, one for
longitude, one for latitude. I tried to hear if there were
musical clues not immediately obvious to the eye.

Sadly, that comes thru the same lo-fidelity beeper.

- - -

"I find it interesting that the references given by Larry's
database rarely seem to overlap with the references given for
the same sightings by UFOCAT."

I hope most people find that a plus. Neither database being a
copy of the other by any means, researchers have two independent
resources.

Most of my sources are listed here:

<http://www.larryhatch.net/USOURCE.html>

I'm sure Don has a list of his sources for comparison.

Best wishes

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia]

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:50:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia]

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 15:59:29 -0800
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:08:39 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 04:44:02 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>>What do you think it might have been other than an
>>>>extraterrestrial craft?

>>>>I'm still willing to consider a (then) very secret Mogul
>>>>balloon, or something similar.

OK Larry. Here's my lengthy two cents.

Almost the entire Mogul balloon scenario depends on the memories of only one man, former Mogul engineer Charles Moore, who claimed his lost Flight #4 from June 4, 1947, probably accounted for the crash at the Brazel Ranch.

Flight #4 was a convenient fall guy, because the Mogul Project was operating in New Mexico at that time. But better still for debunkers like the Air Force counterintelligence squad, #4 has zero documentation to prove what happened to it or that it even existed. (All that exists is a hole in the Mogul records between Flight #3 and Flight #5, plus a diary of one of the Mogul scientists indicating an unnumbered flight attempt in that gap being attempted but cancelled on account of cloudy weather, with a balloon cluster, not necessarily an actual fully configured Mogul later being released. There is nothing in the official flight summaries mentioning an actual flight, no balloon schematics, and no data on flight trajectory or tracking, even though Moore claims they tracked it.)

Again it all comes down to Moore's more recent claims that he specifically remembers them launching and tracking Flight #4 to within 17 miles of the ranch before losing it.

Nearly three years ago, Brad Sparks and myself discovered that Moore had engaged in a scientific fraud to try to "prove" that Flight #4 would have ended up at the ranch. He claimed that winds would have carried the balloon "exactly" to the Foster Ranch crash site, but what he really did was cook his numbers and calculations to take it there.

Calculating Moore's own mathematical model correctly actually shows that Flight #4, if it indeed existed, would have had the winds take it dozens of miles NE or ENE of the Foster Ranch, probably as much as 70-100 miles away, hardly an "exact" hit at all.

Flight #4's big miss virtually eliminates it as a possible explanation. Sordid details on Moore's hoax at:

www.roswellproof.com/flight4_trajectory.html

www.roswellproof.com/Mogul_hoax_FAO.html

If Flight #4 was such a good fit to the Roswell crash, why did Moore perpetrate a hoax to try to prove it got there? Why did the Smithsonian Press, a government printing house, publish it?

Further, how does Flight #4 explain the numerous accounts of highly anomalous debris recovered from the Foster Ranch? The primary components of the early Moguls were rubber weather balloons and occasionally radar targets made of balsa wood, foil/paper, and Scotch tape, all very ordinary, common, and familiar to practically anybody. Nobody in their right mind would attribute superstrong, very hard, heat resistant properties to such flimsy material.

For eyewitness testimony about the anomalous debris and the large debris field:

www.roswellproof.com/debris_main.html

On the other hand, the emerging field of nanotechnology plus other modern materials science, now show that material properties described by witnesses to the 1947 crash, very light, very hard, heat resistant, superstrength metals or composites with "plastic" or memory properties, are indeed possible. See:

www.roswellproof.com/debris9_nanotechnology.html

But nobody in 1947, or around 1980 when the first debris witnesses were interviewed, such as Jesse Marcel, Bill Brazel Jr., or Loretta Proctor, knew about such futuristic materials. Yet their descriptions are remarkably similar. Brazel Jr. and Marcel for sure didn't know one another and I find it virtually impossible to explain how they could independently "confabulate" almost identical accounts about anomalous debris, the large, linear debris field, and Brazel Sr. finding the debris after hearing a huge explosion during a violent thunder and lightning storm.

>>Sounds reasonable to me.

>>>Another idea, admittedly half-baked, is some sort of atomic >>>apparatus, extremely top secret, which was mistakenly >>>dropped in the desert.

Glad you realize it's half-baked, since there is even less evidence for this than a Mogul balloon, zero in fact.

Metallic and other debris was scattered over a very large, linear area, very easy to spot from the air. Something large crashed at the Brazel ranch, not some tiny instrument, and it was traveling at high speed to create the linear path, according to first investigator, Roswell intel chief Jesse Marcel. Some small atomic or other device would not have created such a debris field. According to Leonard Stringfield, Marcel also told him they used a geiger counter to check for radioactivity and found none.

Nor could a Mogul balloon, whose quantity of debris has been greatly exaggerated by debunkers, create such a large debris field. Shredded weather balloons and radar targets would have created some mild littering over a much more confined region. It also doesn't account for the distribution of metallic debris, which Marcel said was heaviest to the NE and thinned out to the SW along its long linear path, indicating to him the object was traveling from the NE to the SW, not the other way around, i.e. Moore's claimed wind-blown distribution of shredded Mogul balloon.

It is also the wide open spaces out there, a vast plain. You can literally see a hundred miles in any direction. A big debris field would have been easily spotted from the air if somebody was out searching for some lost top-secret project. Obviously nobody was.

If some unknown super-top-secret project did somehow explain it, it would have been well-tracked and quickly recovered. They wouldn't need a sheep-rancher coming to town to tell them where to find it.

Any sort of atomic accident, though embarrassing back then, would very unlikely still be secret now. There have been literally dozens of "broken arrow" atomic accidents, most of them initially classified. Now they are in the public domain. Where's the documentation for a Roswell/Corona broken arrow atomic crash? Nada - it doesn't exist. Why would it still be kept secret?

Need I mention that according to Richard Rhode's books on the development of the A-bomb and H-bomb, America's big atomic secret in 1947 was that we were out of bombs at the time, nothing to use against the Russians in case they tried to do something like invade western Europe. It might have made more sense in terms of scaring Russians to have turned it into an atomic accident rather than hiding it.

Finally, how would this explain the numerous descriptions of highly anomalous debris that couldn't be made back then? An atomic accident of other secret project can't explain that either, any more than a Mogul balloon.

>>>At least that might explain the secrecy, the "UFO crash" as a >>>very poorly chosen cover which immediately blew up in their >>>faces. It would also explain a seemingly flawed Mogul cover >>>story, if that's what it was.

It might explain the secrecy back then but not now. It makes no sense in many respects and, more importantly, there is absolutely nothing to back it up. If there were something to it, I'm sure the Air Force counterintelligence "investigators" would have seized upon it in 1994 instead of a Mogul balloon to try to debunk Roswell. An atomic accident or previously unknown super-secret project I think would have impressed the public a lot more than a balloon or crash dummies form the future.

>>>Roswell AAF was our atomic airfield at the time.

>>Certainly not half-baked. Quite plausible to me.

Nope, we didn't even have any bombs at the time. It makes no sense for a number of reasons, including a complete lack of documentation in the present that anything like this happened.

><snip>

>

>>Same for me, after nearly forty years of being involved >>in publishing UFO-related magazines.

>>>It remains my impression that a majority of serious >>>ufologists, Friedman excepted of course, no longer consider >>>'Roswell' the crash of an alien spacecraft. Again, I would like >>>a show of hands, yea or nay, in case I'm wrong in this.

I have been at meetings of "serious Ufologists" where the majority obviously do consider a crashed "alien spaceship" to be a very viable explanation. If they are here, why wouldn't they occasionally crash? Nobody's perfect, not even if they were millions of years older than us. I assume even ancient aliens have to put their pants on one tentacle at a time.

The "perfect aliens" argument seems to assume a race of beings totally incapable of such things as pilot error, and craft honed to such perfection that nothing could possibly go wrong with them. But what law says beings millions of years older than us are a million times less prone to error or can make things a million times less likely to fail? Far more likely, eventually biology and technology approach limits.

To cite one example, "Moore's Law" of microelectronics states that the number of transistors packed on microcircuits is in exponential growth and doubles about every two years or so. This has held true for over 30 years, but nobody in the business believes it likely to hold true for the next 30, much less a million years. In fact, physical limitations imposed by Nature indicate probably only another decade or two before Moore's Law ends and the complexity of silicon circuits plateaus.

Exponential growth can only go on for so long, whether it be technology or biology.

Another example is the strength of materials. Carbon nanotubes may be 100 times stronger than steel, but laws of chemistry and physics do not indicate any way to make materials 100 times stronger than nanotubes. The strength of chemical bonds have their limits, so ultimately the strength, heat resistance, and hardness of futuristic materials will reach limits as well. Aliens presumably are limited by the same laws of Nature as we are.

Thus there are limits to how honed-to-perfection technology can become. It doesn't matter if aliens are only a thousand years ahead of us or a ten million years. Eventually even their technology will hit a wall (or a New Mexico arroyo).

One thing that can probably be agreed upon is that most Ufologists believe that aliens are here and most (?), or at least many, agree the extraterrestrial hypothesis (i.e. they come from somewhere else in our Universe) to be the most likely explanation for their origins.

Well if they are here and they are subject to the same ultimate physical limits as we are, why can't their craft crash?

We are talking very high performance aircraft here, subject to much higher mechanical and thermal stresses than ordinary aircraft and traveling at much higher speeds. There is much less margin for error by pilots or technology than in something like a Boeing 747. High-performance, supersonic human aircraft crash much more frequently than lower performance, subsonic aircraft. You are nearly a million times more likely to die in a space shuttle accident than on a jet liner, despite shuttles being subject to much more intensive maintenance and inspection.

Maybe a thousand years from now our spacecraft will be a million times safer than they are now, and passenger space travel will be as common as jet travel today. But even then there will be the occasional crash. Pilots will still make mistakes, highly advanced technology will still sometimes fail, and the unexpected will still happen. Nothing is ever perfect.

>>My impression is to the contrary, or at least that those who >>don't think it's a UFO crash are content to keep their heads >>(and hands) down. at!

>I can't possibly cite chapter and verse, but I think it was

>on this very List, that somebody wrote something like: "
>Stanton Friedman stands virtually alone (within serious
>ufology) in support of Roswell as the crash of an alien
>craft." I'm forced to paraphrase.

>I don't remember much reaction to the contrary afterwards.

I fail to see the point. Stan certainly isn't alone even if people didn't raise their hands on the List.

It's not just a few "Ufologists" who consider Roswell to be an alien space crash. How about astronaut Edgar Mitchell's many statements about high-level generals and government officials telling him off-the-record that Roswell was indeed a real ET event?

Or remember Senator Barry Goldwater's many public statements about wanting to get access to the alien artifacts he heard were held at Wright-Patterson and being cussed out by his good friend Gen. Curtis LeMay, who told him that even he didn't have access and to never bring up the subject again?

(Among other things, Goldwater had been Republican Presidential nominee in 1964 and would have been briefed on matters of national security, was a Brig. Gen. in the AF reserve, a right-wing hawk, and well-connected to the military establishment, and had been Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and Select Committee on Intelligence, all rich potential sources of high-level, insider information on UFOs.)

Some generals have gone public. Remember Brig. Gen. Arthur Exon's interviews where he stated unambiguously that Roswell was

the crash of an alien spacecraft and he was aware of other crash recoveries during his tenure as C/O at Wright-Patterson? He also stated he was told bodies were recovered at Roswell and told of analysis at W-P of highly anomalous materials:

www.roswellproof.com/exon.html

Or how how Brig. Gen. Thomas Dubose, eyewitness to what happened at Roswell and Gen. Ramey's right-hand man? Dubose never came out and said Roswell was a crashed spacecraft. But he did drop a broad hint when he told Stan Friedman that he was on the right track. Dubose did publicly talk about high secrecy surrounding Roswell, including the matter going clear up the White House, about highly secret shipments of debris, and how he was ordered from Washington to cover the whole thing up, including using a shill weather balloon as an explanation for what happened. Would a Mogul balloon explain this? I think not.

www.roswellproof.com/dubose.html

Disclosure witness Brig. Gen. Steven Lovekin (Army National Guard) has also discussed the subject. His story was being briefed about a 1947 New Mexico alien crash around 1960 when he was a young lieutenant in the Army Signal Corp and stationed at the Eisenhower and Kennedy White House. He said the Pentagon briefings including being shown actual debris, such as an I-beam covered with symbols, and being told that bodies were recovered. He also claimed he was told that some people had been "erased" as examples to others and that such terrorism had been a big factor in maintaining the coverup. (Of course, he hasn't been the only person to mention this. Several Roswell witnesses, e.g. the family of Roswell Sheriff Wilcox, have also mentioned death threats against Wilcox and his family to keep Sheriff Wilcox in line.)

www.roswellproof.com/lovekin.html

Last October I had a chance meeting with Gen. Wesley Clark when he was campaigning for John Kerry. The year before in the primaries, Clark had stated his belief that mankind would eventually travel faster than light and go wherever they liked. He outlined a 100 year program in fundamental research to make this a reality, a remarkably ambitious and radical proposal for a Presidential candidate to make for something that is supposedly impossible to achieve. When I brought up Clark's previous statements about FTL travel and then asked him if he had ever been briefed on the subject of UFOs while in the military, Clark coyly dropped a number of broad hints indicating that he had. He said that he had "heard a bit," that there were indeed "things going on," but that we would have to "work out our own mathematics," a statement he also made when he outlined his FTL research plan. And, oh yes, he dropped another broad hint by spontaneously bringing up the subject of Roswell, saying he was going to be there that night.

[www.roswellproof.com/Gen Wesley Clark UFOs.html](http://www.roswellproof.com/Gen_Wesley_Clark_UFOs.html)

Other Generals and Admirals have also made public statements, not about UFO crashes, but about UFOs being very real physical craft, like Gen. Nathan Twining (USAF Chief of Staff and Chairman of Joint Chiefs), Admiral Delmar Fahrney (former head of the Navy's guided missile program), Admiral Roscoe Hillenkoetter (alleged MJ-12 member, first CIA director, board member of NICAP), and a number of others. Gen. Douglas MacArthur also dropped hints. On at least two occasions he made statements that the nations of the world might have to unite in the future to fight an interplanetary war.

>I suppose there are a many sitting on the fence, willing to
>consider Roswell one way or the other. I don't expect them
>to shoot up their hands and suffer the usual results.

I presume you mean the sniping from one side or another that often occurs on this List. But again what does that have to do with whether Roswell was a real ET event or not? Not many generals or admirals or astronauts put up their hands either, perhaps partly because of lack of knowledge or fear of the consequences, but occasionally some do.

>What I don't want to see is the implication that "serious
>ufology" takes Roswell uncritically as space-alien craft, >and

is therefore rather dotty and insular overall. That >seems unfair.

Hey, even I, and I bet Stan, are more than willing to consider a _serious_, actually _documented_ conventional explanation where a primary witness doesn't need to resort to hoaxing to try to bolster the claim and where the advocates can actually produce something of substance and not just conjecture.

But to the question as to whether Stan Friedman is alone in the UFO community - of course not! He has a lot of company, even if they don't necessarily put up their hands when skeptics demand a show of hands on UFO Updates. Many simply don't want to be bothered by such baiting.

And the company isn't just limited to dumb Ufologists, but seems to also extend into the upper reaches of government and the military. Besides the examples I've already cited, some Presidents like Jimmie Carter and Bill Clinton were "believers" and wanted answers as well (Clinton specifically wanted to know about Roswell) and were largely thwarted in their attempts to get at the information.

Remember recent statements by Clinton's Chief of Staff, John Podesta, and Energy Secretary, Bill Richardson, now governor of New Mexico? They dropped broad hints as well, saying UFOs and/or Roswell should be taken very seriously. Podesta added there was only so much he could reveal. I'm sure much more would come out if security oaths on the subject were completely lifted.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:32:06 -1000
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:52:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

>From: Greg Bishop <exclmid.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:37:56 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

>I am the author of the new, Project Beta, book that was
>mentioned on the List last week.

<snip>

Aloha Greg, thanks for the information. I've placed an order with Amazon and look forward to getting my copy so I can reply in more detail to the main theses you advance in the book. In the meantime, let me respond to what you have written so far and what I read in Nick Redfern's review. Let me say up front that I do question the three main theses you are promoting. First, that the Dulce affair concerning a secret underground ET government base was disinformation fed by Bill Moore and AFOSI to Bennewitz to discredit him. Second, that the genesis of subsequent secret underground ET bases featuring captured humans, etc., owe their genesis to the disinformation fed to Bennewitz. Third, Bennewitz was led to a nervous background because of the disinformation and intervention of AFOSI and other intelligence agencies.

As far as your first thesis is concerned, the two main sources for this as far as I'm aware are what Bill Moore himself said, and what Linda Moulton Howe was told by Agent Richard Doty in an interview. The trouble with the 'Bennewitz was fed disinformation thesis' is that the two sources for this are questionable. Moore himself admits to agreeing to pass on disinformation (even though he claims he didn't actually do so), and Richard Doty was an AFOSI agent. Why would one believe either source? While its possible that Bennewitz was fed disinformation to discredit his research into classified projects in New Mexico, it's also possible that claims of disinformation were disseminated as a ruse in order to create sufficient confusion over what was true and was disinformation. It seems that if you are going to substantiate this thesis, you would have more evidence to back it up rather than the testimony of an AFOSI agent and an AFOSI asset. I hope to find this in your book.

Now there are a number of independent sources confirming different aspects of what Bennewitz claimed was happening at Dulce. One was an alleged security guard at Dulce, Thomas Castello who claims to have led a revolt there in 1979, and got information out in the form of his testimony and some photos and a video. Bill Hamilton did an investigation on Castello's information and certainly didn't dismiss it as disinformation. Bill thought Castello's story was possible and was something that needed more investigation (perhaps Bill can better clarify his position on this). Another whistleblower who confirmed part of the Dulce underground base story was Dan Burisch. Burisch claimed to have been interviewed at Dulce and heard humans screaming and was threatened with indefinite detention for turning down a job at Dulce which he declined (Bill Hamilton might like to clarify this further). Another alleged whistleblower is Phil Schneider who talked about a firefight at

Dulce with ETs he was involved in during 1979. Bob Lazar also claimed to have read of a firefight between ETs and humans at a secret underground location in 1979. I've included many of these stories in a report I did on Dulce which you can find at:

<http://www.exopolitics.org/Dulce-Report.htm>

Now I want to say a couple of things about your second thesis of Dulce disinformation being the source of subsequent stories of ET-government underground bases. First, the idea of secret underground bases with humans being abducted by aliens, etc., is not something that can be traced to the alleged disinformation fed to Bennewitz. The 1978 book, *Alternative 3* by Leslie Watkins, discussed similar ideas in terms of civilians secretly being abducted and taken to underground bases whether on Earth or off-planet. Also, the contact notes of Billy Meier refer to rogue aliens performing abductions and that they had made agreements with different Earth governments. Of course, this all happened before Bennewitz began investigating Dulce. Now alleged whistleblowers such as Burisch and Lazar, presumably knew nothing of the Dulce affair when they disclosed their ET related information. One might say that Schneider was influenced by what Lear and Cooper were putting out, but I don't think either Burisch or Lazar came across any UFO literature before disclosing their information on Dulce or an underground battle between special forces and ETs.

Finally, let me say that as far as your third thesis is concerned, there is another possibility for what led to Bennewitz's breakdown. The lack of support and ridicule heaped upon him by mainstream UFO researchers who did little to acknowledge Bennewitz's data and support him in the face of an intelligence blitzkreig. While I understand that Bennewitz's information was very controversial and open to interpretation, the lack of support and ridicule he experienced would certainly have influenced his deteriorating mental condition. If Bennewitz was fed disinformation, then you are correct that AFOSI has much to answer for. If Bennewitz was telling the truth despite whatever disinformation was fed to him, then the UFO community has much to answer for as a result of its inability to think outside the box. I think there are many distorting factors in the collection and analysis of evidence, and this needs to be understood.

In conclusion, I think the Dulce case is very significant and I'm glad you've researched this and tried to make sense of it. While I'm skeptical of your main theses, I'm keen to examine what you've written and what information you bring forward to support your theses.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 00:27:21 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:54:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: bruce maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 23:43:29 -0500
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 12:52:15 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:29:55 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

><snip>

>A lens flare cannot make an image that is darker than the
>background. In this case it doesn't matter if there was a dark
>area between lights unless you are suggesting that what appears
>as sky background in the image immediately adjacent to the "UFO"
>image is a sum of sky background plus some flare light. If so,
>this would mean that the image is a broad area lens flare plus
>sky background plus a bright reflection of the light. Don't
>think I've ever heard of something like that.

>Keep in mind that the flare cannot subtract light from the
>background. All it can do is add light to the background.

Hi Bruce,

I received confirmation that this image was referenced on this
List back in October 2004. It is not an image of the Iqueque UFO
which is referenced in the accompanying story.

As for this image, the photographer and several others met at
the same place and time of day and recreated the scenario, and
were able to duplicate what was seen in the image. Details are
here:

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/sightings/chile/041000.shtml>

Now, does anyone have the image from Iqueque?

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Johnson

From: Don Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 22:59:43 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:57:23 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Johnson

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:20:47 -0800
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Donald A. Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 23:18:43 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

<snip>

>I can't find an excuse NOT to toss cases like these.

Dear Larry,

If I sent you a list of cases you had tossed out between the two versions of U that you have sent me, could you give me the criteria so that I can flag them as explained or probably explained in UFOCAT? As you know, UFOCAT never deletes an entry, hence the URN or "Unique Record Number", but we can flag a case as worthless and say why.

I did take your list of discredited cases, or "stinkeroos" and add them to UFOCAT. All the citations to those cases were given the new PRNs, or Primary Record Numbers of the stinkeroos, so that your version of what happened would emerge first in any list of citations to those cases.

Don 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Hebert

From: Amy Hebert <ahebert.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 03:16:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 08:58:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Hebert

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 13:44:18 EST
>Subject: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help

>Okay.

>Far too often we drop down to the old arguments.

>Bottom line is physical proof.

>Not evidence, but proof.

<snip>

One of my old professors once said, "There is no such thing as proof, all we ever have is evidence."

What may constitute 'proof' to one person many not be 'proof' to another. Same thing for the evidence. I think that's what really keeps this field so divided. It not lack of evidence, it's lack of perception of the evidence that exists and lack of agreement about how to interpret it.

If you found a cocktail napkin on the ground where you saw a UFO take off, you might interpret it differently than I or others might interpret it. If a saucer-shaped craft landed on the front lawn of the White House, some would interpret it as "contact" while others might see it as a hoax. There will never be any one defining artifact or physical "proof" because it's just not that simple.

<snip>

>If ya can't put a fork in it, it ain't done yet.

Maybe it is and ya just need the right tools. ;>

A. Hebert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:20:11 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 09:01:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:03:27 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Gentlemen,

>There are thousands of women in "Ufology", actually probably
>many more than men.

>The only trouble is, they fall under the New Age banner and so
>wouldn't last 3 minutes on this List.

Are you quite sure about that? ;-)

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 15](#)

Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 07:52:08 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 09:02:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 11:31:24 -0600
>Subject: Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

>>From: Greg Bishop <exclmid.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:37:56 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

>>I am the author of the new, Project Beta, book that was
>>mentioned on the List last week.

>>One of the List subscribers mentioned that Nick Redfern had told
>>his MUFON group that the AFOSI had entered Paul Bennewitz' home
>>when he wasn't around a rearranged the furniture to make him
>>paranoid.

<snip>

>Hi Greg,

>That was me. Nick says he got his info straight from the AFOSI
>horse's mouth.

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2002/dec/m16-012.shtml>

>(see paragraph 5)

Nick informed me that it was actually a member of the British
Home Office working with the AFOSI that related the "furniture"
story to him.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 22:32:37 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:09:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:30:04 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:20:52 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>So the question remains, John:

>>>Why are there so few - if any - female pelicanists?

>>If Jerry, on his next visit to the land of decent beer,

>I am second to no beer-drinker in the world in my admiration for
>your country's splendid brews. I must add, however, that if
>America is worse in just about every other aspect - and
>declining daily - in the early years of the 21st Century, there
>is, happily, one positive development to counter, in some small
>way, all the depressing ones: more and more excellent beer,
>thanks in good part (though not exclusively) to the
>proliferation of craft breweries. For example, my home state of
>Minnesota boasts an extraordinary craft brewery, Summit (in St.
>Paul), and a very fine traditional, venerable German-style
>brewery, Schell's (in New Ulm). If such were not there to
>sustain me, I would not be here typing these words but probably
>in the ground, expired of thirst.

On this at least I am in total agreement with Jerry. Between my
two visits to the States in the 80s and 90s, the quality, range
and availability of excellent beer had improved immensely. It
was inspiring.

>>come along to a meeting of a splendid organisation known as
>>"Sceptics in the Pub" he would find a fair sprinkling of females
>>present. Fewer than the number of men, certainly, but then I
>>think, despite the names he mentions, the number of women active
>>in the UFO world is also significantly fewer than the men.

>I presume you are referring to wives and girl friends, not to
>active pelicanists. I offer no explanation for the reason this
>is so. It's just an observation. One of those mysteries of
>gender about which one speculates at one's peril.

What a strangely chauvinistic response from someone I had always
considered to be politically and socially progressive.

Maybe in the staid bars of Canby, MN., which you have so vividly
described to us, ladies need to be accompanied by husbands or
gentlemen friends, lest they be considered flappers and
floozyies, but in the more cosmopolitan centres of both our great
nations, young (and not so young) ladies are free to visit bars,
pubs and other licensed premises without the necessity of
chaperones; and I assure you this is that case with those who
attend "Sceptics in the Pub" meetings.

Cheers.

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Warren

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 06:49:41 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:11:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Sonora UFO Sightings - Warren

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 09:22:32 -0800
>Subject: Sonora UFO Sightings

>Fellow Listerions,

>I received some interesting correspondence from Mr. Mark Olson
>in response to my last article; with his permission I'm posting
>the gist of that here:

>1-25-05

>Dear Mr. Warren:

>I read your blog article with interest as I have emailed, phoned
>and wrote to all the newspapers, radio stations, and UFO
>organizations I could find regarding the ongoing UFO Wave over
>Sonora, CA to no avail. Nor have I been able to get any
>organization to independently investigate these unidentified
>aerial objects. It has been extremely frustrating. I do not
>believe I am qualified to investigate these things on my own,
>but I'm doing the best that I can.

>Are you are familiar with the Sonora UFO Sightings? There have
>been some very remarkable sightings that have been videotaped
>since May of 2004 and the sightings continue. Please see
>www.sonorasightings.com for video clips of these extraordinary
>objects and details of the sightings.

>I wrote:

>Thank you for your consideration of my article. In perusing your
>web-site it would seem that you have done an excellent job in at
>the very least "documenting" your experiences. The mainstream
>media's response of course isn't a surprise, but I am curious;
>what UFO organizations have you been in contact with?

>Hello Mr. Warren,

>I have contacted NUFORC, NARCAP, and MUFON. I have also
>contacted any and all UFO Organizations I could find, but never
>received a response.

>Peter Davenport never acknowledged the video that I sent to him,
>while the Asst. Director of Northern California held my video
>for over four months before "remembering" to give it to the
>Director, and only after I asked what happened to it. Peter
>Davenport asked me if the first triangular object I videotaped
>on May 31 was the Space Station, because "it flew over your area
>an hour later", that without looking at the footage.

>I still have yet to hear from MUFON whether they have even begun
>to analyze the footage. I finally emailed the Board of Directors
>of MUFON. Only then did I get a response from Ruben Uriarte, the
>Director of No. Cal. MUFON.

>I have yet to see any investigation of these sightings. I've
>repeatedly asked that someone come out for at least a week as

>these objects don't appear every night. Sometimes, I would wait
>for days before seeing another object.

>If someone had responded and investigated, these objects could
>have been videotaped by the investigators. I began asking for
>investigators in May of 2004.

Fellow Listerions,

On Mr. Olson's behalf I forwarded his e-mail to Ruben Uriarte
and (Northern California MUFON State Director) who replied:

Hi Frank

This was true in the beginning and I understand Marks
frustration as we were working out the coordination schedules at
least with Mufon, but since then Mark has been visited by a
number of researchers. Both my chief investigator and I from Nor
Cal Mufon and another researcher did meet with Mark in October
and I had him as our main speaker at one of our Mufon meetings.
He shared his videos and I have forward copies to several
researchers for analysis. Mark has been keeping me informed of
any sightings both on the phone and email. I am planning to
visit him in several weeks. There are a number of other
sightings in Northern California and we are checking with Mark's
sightings events for any correlation. Mark has since then been
on a number of radio shows and magazines. I am very grateful for
his hard work and keeping us informed. He is a dedicated person
who is keeping his eyes to the skies. There is something unusual
occurring in Sonora! and with Mark and a number of other
people's assistance, we may get some answers. Time will tell.
Thank you

Ruben Uriarte
Nor Cal Mufon State Director

To that Mr. Olson replied:

Hi Mr. Warren,

Allow me to clarify. After numerous emails, the sending of my
footage to Ruben's Assistant Director and then, months later,
writing to every Director of the Board of MUFON, Ruben did begin
an investigation. He visited me in October. He is planning to
come back to Sonora.

I understand that Ruben has many different investigations going
on, and I appreciate his willingness to assist me, but I feel
that the sightings in Sonora haven't drawn the attention of
independent investigators as it should have. It has been almost
a year since the sightings began here and while Ruben is willing
to investigate, and I do appreciate that he is, it has been very
difficult to get anyone to come to Sonora to investigate. To be
frank, one day out of the year is not enough. These events
should be investigated more thoroughly. Not one of the other UFO
organizations I have contacted has replied to my numerous
requests for assistance. Five months after I sent the video
footage to the Assistant Director, I asked Ruben if it had been
analyzed. Ruben didn't even know it had been sent. I had to ask
about it, before it was revealed to Ruben that it was in their
possession. I have not, as of yet, heard of any analysis of my
footage.

As to the "number of radio shows and magazines", those were
implemented because of my own requests for interviews and not
from any UFO Organization assistance.

Sir, I understand that most UFO sightings are a once in a
lifetime event. That's why I find it imperative that these
numerous sightings be investigated thoroughly. I hope you can
understand my frustration that they are not.

I hope that clarifies your concerns, sir. I'm at your disposal
if you have any other questions.

Sincerely,

Mark Olson

In a second e-mail he also wrote:

Another thing that I forgot to point out, Ruben's assertion that I have been visited by "a number of researchers" is incorrect. He brought two researchers with him on that one day in October, Chuck Reeve and Mario Lopez, and I have not been visited since by any researcher. I do not understand his assertion that there were a number of researchers that have visited 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:13:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>Maybe a thousand years from now our spacecraft will be a million
>times safer than they are now, and passenger space travel will
>be as common as jet travel today. But even then there will be
>the occasional crash. Pilots will still make mistakes, highly
>advanced technology will still sometimes fail, and the
>unexpected will still happen. Nothing is ever perfect.

I was buying your arguments up until this point.

It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I assume that they place some value on their lives and also realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward engineered by potentially hostile humans.

No, if the alien race is far advanced then there are no limits to the safety or defense of their vehicles. There is not pilot error because the control would be handed over to automated intelligences which are constantly generating millions of scenarios every milisecond to assure the safety of the crew. Failure of hardware can obviously occur but are these aliens cheapskates who only have zero-fault tolerance? I doubt it. The most likely design of any spacecraft with beings would be two fault tolerance. And remember these beings should be able to afford it because they have already decided to invest vast sums of resources to get to Earth.

The design method of making an alien spacecraft is not going to be a fashion show. It will involve vast computer simulation models which we can only marvel at. Plus they will have had millenia of test models and operational experience to revise and improve these vehicles to make them able to handle any situation.

So I doubt very much that the Roswell event was the one set of dumb aliens driving their beater spaceship that they bought second hand from a guy named Nick who accidentally hit the accelerator instead of the brakes.

The only possibilities for "crashed" alien ships are 1) the vehicles were attacked and destroyed by other hostile (or friendly to us) aliens with even more advanced or at least different technology, 2) they wanted to crash because they are suicidal or maybe wanted to help our race by giving it their technology, 3) some weird unpredictable highly improbable spacetime muck up happened and blasted them either from the past or future to 1947 or across space.

Only the first one seems likely if you want to believe in UFO crashes in general.

No way does our technology have a chance to bring one of them down.

The dumb alien scenario doesn't work because they would have been eliminated by now by our friend Darwin from the universe by blundering way before they got to us.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 15:18:06 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:14:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:18:32 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>Martin Try as you might you can't get round the fact that the
>statement:

>"UFOs are the product of unknown intelligences possessing
>unknown powers and motivations"

>is a contentless, infinitely elastic hypothesis; what couldn't
>you explain by it. Scientific hypotheses must surely be testable
>against nature, even if, at first, its only a case of ensuring
>that the hypothesis has mathematical consistency. Hypotheses
>which can explain anything and everything actually explain
>nothing.

Peter, can you think of any hypothesis to explain the UFO
phenomenon of which this could not be said?

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Analysis Of Digital Picture Requested

From: Max Burns <max.burns.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 16:13:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:15:15 -0500
Subject: Analysis Of Digital Picture Requested

Errol & Listers,

I have in my possession a picture which I would like to offer up to anyone on the List for analysis who would be willing to have a look at it for me?

I have all the information about the circumstances of the picture. I will supply this info to anyone who wishes to have a look at it. Distance from camera, elevation etc.

So I ask would a number of people on the list who have the technical know how to have a look at the picture please can you take a look at this picture for me?

You can contact me direct:

max.burns.nul

Thank you in anticipation

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran -

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 11:25:47 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:17:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran -

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 13:17:19 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>Source: Fox News

><http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,147469,00.html>

>02-14-05

>Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>WASHINGTON =97 Senior Defense Department officials said Monday
>they have no knowledge of any U.S. drone flights over Iran, and
>U.S. intelligence officials would not comment on any such
>flights.

>The responses came one day after the Washington Post ran a story
>saying that the United States has been running unmanned spy
>flights over Iran for the past year for evidence of nuclear
>weapons programs and to probe air defenses.

<snip>

>Iranians living along the Caspian Sea and on the Iraq border
>first started reporting sightings of UFOs in late December,
>according to Iranian newspaper reports. Eyewitnesses commonly
>reported red flashes, streaks of green and blue and low lights
>that quickly disappeared. The Iranian air force determined from
>the reports that the lights were spy drones, the Post reported,
>adding that Iranian officers are familiar with U.S. tactics
>since being trained in the United States more than 25 years ago.

One thing bothers me about the (logical) drone explanation: why
the H would the US gov't/intelligence be so stupid as to attach
lights to the drones? Isn't this supposed to be a overt
operation? Red, green, blue... why? To attract attention and
make people think UFOs are flying over? Wouldn't it be better
for secrecy to have no lights?

And how about noise? Anyone ever report the sound of a small
airplane?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 11:52:41 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:18:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:36:37 -0400
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 23:43:29 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>>Keep in mind that the flare cannot subtract light from the
>>background. All it can do is add light to the background.

>Hi Bruce,

>Although I don't support Kyle's or Mick Balaskas' contention
>that this is a lens flare from the foreground light, I am
>surprised why no one has made mention-other than myself-of the
>fact that this intriguing object does't reflect on the water's
>surface as do the lights below and around it. This makes me
>think the photo might have been shot through a window catching a
>background reflection "or" this was deliberately set up using a
>sheet of glass or other transparency with an image impressed
>upon it.

Hi Don!

Your observation that there is no reflected light in the water
below this relatively bright UFO in the sky does not rule out
the lens flare explanation. In fact, it further supports it.

Of course, if this UFO was real object and it was radiating only
polarized light perpendicular to the surface of the water, then
it would be detected visually and recorded with a camera but
there would be no reflection off the water making it what Bruce
would call a TRUFO. Of course, the easiest way to test this is
to use the same camera to take a picture of the same scene under
similar conditions at night from exactly the same location. If
the UFO appears, it is an IFO. If it does not, then it must be a
TRUFO - which only raises even more questions, one of them being
why didn't others observe and report such a bright and massive
UFO?

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 7

From: John Hayes <John.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 17:22:53 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:34 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 7

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan.nul>

=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 10, Number 7
February 16, 2005
Editor: Joseph Trainor

E-mail: Masinaigan.nul
Website: <http://www.ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

LARGE TRIANGULAR UFO SIGHTED OVER PARIS

"A large triangular object was observed over Paris two nights ago," i.e. on Monday, February 7, 2005."

At 9:50 p.m., French ufologist Mathieu Cozanet and a friend were walking through "a small public park at the corner of the Rue D'Alesia and the Rue Vercingetorix in the First Arrondissement (urban district--J.T.) of Paris. The object was seen about 9:50 p.m., moving slowly through the sky at about rooftop height."

"It was dark and, for Paris, an unusually clear night," Cozanet reported, "'And I chanced to look up to see the stars. At that moment, I saw the craft, just visible against the night sky, moving across the Rue Vercingetorix and disappearing over the roof of a building. Unfortunately, the other person was looking in another direction and did not see anything.'"

"On June 30, 2004, another witness in Paris observed a triangular object, lit with a bright light at each corner and a red one in the center, passing silently overhead. Shortly thereafter, a second triangle appeared, this one brightly lit, and remained visible for a few seconds." (See Banque OVNI for February 7, 2005, "Triangle au-dessus de Paris." Merci beaucoup a Robert Fischer pour cette nouvelles.)

UFOs SIGHTED IN KENT AND CAMBRIDGESHIRE

"Strange bright lights seen in the sky of Chatteris," Cambridgeshire, "were reported to the Ministry of Defence (MoD) last month (January 2005) and was one of Britain's first UFO sightings of the new year."

"These observations, which were reported by members of the public on Saturday, January 15, 2005, was one of a number of cases revealed from records of unidentified flying objects released by the Ministry of Defence's UFO Unit."

"Also this night, another similar sighting was reported from Whitstable, Kent, UK, and a 'flying saucer' was reported over Stoke-on-Trent."

"When the Cambs. Times asked people in Chatteris about the sighting, some said they saw a number of bright

lights in the sky at around the time the (UFO) reports were submitted" to MOD.

"From the information released, it was revealed that MOD's UFO Unit received 88 reports from members of the public concerned about strange objects in British skies." (See the Wisbech Standard for February 10, 2005, "UFO sightings in Chatteris first of year." Many thanks to Robert Fischer and Stuart Miller for this newspaper article.)

CROP CIRCLES APPEAR IN EASTERN ARGENTINA

"More circles in grass were found at a potato processing plant on Route 88" near Mar del Plata, a large seaport in Argentina's Buenos Aires province. "The circle is completely closed and (the area) was monitored" by closed-circuit TV cameras.

"No explanation for the strange phenomenon has been found."

"More mysterious circular formations were found yesterday (Thursday, February 10, 2005) on the grass in several local areas, similar to the one found at El Paraiso at the 20-kilometer marker on Route 226."

"This time, one of the cases--believed by many to be associated with UFO sightings--took place at the Fernando Hermanos Potato Processing plant, located on Route 88 in Hernandezarias, 6 kilometers (4 miles) from El Paraiso."

"The discovery was made Wednesday morning (February 9, 2005) but was reported yesterday by company management."

"While it did seem to be something strange, we gave it little importance," a spokesman for Fernando Hermanos told the Argentinian newspaper La Capital, "'When we read in the paper that something similar had happened on Route 226, we reported the case.'"

The crop circles, "around 10 in number--appeared in a broad lot in the middle of the establishment, next to a greenhouse and a truck loading and unloading dock."

"The premises are fenced in and monitored, thus dismissing the possibility that a stranger could have broken in during the night."

"One of the first to become aware of the situation was Hugo Giovannangelo, who performs maintenance duties for the company. 'I arrived at 7 p.m. and, when I went out to the lot, I saw some very strange rings. I was accompanied by a co-worker, with whom I jested that UFOs might be involved.'"

"According to company management, no activity was carried on in that part of the premises which could account for the strange phenomenon. 'We only mow the grass there. No chemical products are dumped there, and trucks weren't allowed to park on it.'"

"Giovannangelo was startled by another fact. He stated that the guard dog was 'very nervous and aggressive' when he went out to feed it."

"Oddly enough, at El Paraiso, where a local resident claimed having seen a light in the night sky, something similar happened to the animals. 'We couldn't sleep all night because the dogs were restless and the pigs were squealing,' said one woman."

"There were no witnesses on hand to explain what happened Wednesday morning in the case recorded at the potato plant. All of the personnel left Tuesday (February 8, 2005) at 10:30 p.m. after having eaten a meal. Only a watchman was left on the site, who claims having seen nothing at all."

Footage of the crop circles was aired in Argentina on Canal (Channel) 2 in Mar del Plata and on Canal (Channel) 9 in the city of Buenos Aires. The cable TV channel Cronica also aired TV footage of the phenomenon.

A farmer saw a UFO about 10 kilometers (6 miles) from El Paraiso at the same time the crop circles appeared. "Romelio Tapia, a local resident, reported hearing a strange noise around 2 a.m. 'similar to that of a strong wind or a turbine,' and he raised some blinds in his bedroom to see what was going on. At that time, he noticed a pair of yellowish lights--similar to mercury vapor lamps--floating above a small grove of trees not far from his house. Tapia estimates that the lights were 3 to

4 meters (10 to 13 feet) above the ground. The lights seemed diffused, as though surrounded by a mist, and rose into the air before they vanished."

"Upon examining the terrain at first light, locals discovered two strange circular marks of equal diameter" that "had appeared at the Tapia farm. Upon closer examination, they ascertained that it was some kind of ash that left a greasy black residue upon contact with the skin."

"After the report to the local authorities, elements of the forensic police arrived at the site to collect samples of the ash and the grass, but they subsequently decided to remove" the entire layer of topsoil "leaving it utterly bare."

"It is interesting to note in the days prior to the incident, the daughter of one of the residents suffered nightmares in which a luminous object 'was after her.' Upon awakening, she would make drawings of the object, which showed a typical saucer shape, with a crystal dome and legs in some cases." (See the newspaper La Capital of Buenos Aires, Argentina for February 11, 2005, "Mystery prints found at industrial park." Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales y Christian Quintero por este articulo de diario.)

BRAZIL RELEASES FILES ON 1977 UFO FLAP

Brazil recently declassified security files pertaining to Operation Saucer, a top-secret investigation by the Fuerza Aerea Brasileira (FAB or Brazilian Air Force--J.T.) into the 1977 UFO flap in the northern state of Para.

"During the months of October, November and December 1977 and the first half of 1978, the Brazilian state of Para had been invaded by UFOs," the newspaper O Liberal reported, "And it wasn't simply sightings. Nothing to do with mysterious lights wandering at high altitudes. It was about bright objects in several shapes and sizes flying over the Baia de Marajo region (a bay at the mouth of the Amazon River, about 800 kilometers or 500 miles north of Brasilia, the national capital--J.T.) at low altitudes, a few meters above the trees and firing strange light beams at people."

"The people harmed by the phenomenon--one of the most important in world ufology--gave several names to the bright and silent objects--vampire lights, bugs, the thing, and simply chupa-chupa (Portuguese for the sucker--J.T.)"

Witnesses "said the object's pilots were no more than 1.2 to 1.3 meters (3 feet, eight inches to four feet) high."

"The people called it chupa-chupa because of the neck scars that some of the witnesses bore on their bodies. The light beams used to leave strange marks on their skin. Among many, the scars were on their heads. They seemed to lose blood during the attacks."

"Men and women complained of giddiness and fatigue after the attacks. The inhabitants of the cities of Colares, Santo Antonio de Tauca, Mosqueiro and Baia do Sul pondered on those days of bitter remembrance. The panic even reached the state's capital, Belem, with a sequence of strange lights reports and chupa-chupa attacks in several quarters of the city."

"The military report, called Operation Saucer, holds 2,000 pages, 500 photographs and 16 hours of (movie) film. It was sent to the leading officers of the Brazilian Air Force. At that time, however, the country was under a dictatorship and, because of this, the documents were classified Top Secret for 23 years. The Servicio Nacional da Informacoes (SNI) and the FAB Special Services Unit lobbied hard to keep the report classified."

FAB Capt. Uyrange Hollanda gave an interview to Ademar J. Gevaerd, editor of the Brazilian monthly magazine Revista UFO, describing many of the cases investigated by Operation Saucer. Capt. Hollanda "was the operations commander sent by the (Brazilian) government to investigate the facts and interview the chupa-chupa witnesses."

"One of the most interesting reports came from

Claudomira Paixao of Baia do Sul. 'On the night of October 18, 1977,' Claudomira "woke up when a strange light appeared through the house's window. The air got warmer. At first the light was green. It touched my head and covered my face. I woke up completely, and the light became red. I could see a creature, like a man, wearing something like a diver's clothes. It held a device like a pistol. It aimed at me, and the (pistol-like) object blinked three times, as if shooting at my breast, almost landing at the same place. It was hot and hurt me. I felt like some needles were piercing me. I think they collected my blood. I was terrified. I couldn't even move my lips. I was shocked."

"Also in Baia do Sul, witnesses 'were talking about the appearance of a space couple that shot at a woman with a light-beam pistol, leaving her fainted for several minutes.'"

"Capt. Hollanda recalled, 'We always told them, 'Don't shoot! Don't shoot!' But once, a strange light had been aimed at a carpenter. The man was 50 or 60 years old. He took his rifle and shot at the flying saucer. The light surrounded him, and he fell to the ground, almost paralyzed. For 15 days, the carpenter could barely move. On the first day, that man didn't move at all. He could see, hear and speak. But it was very difficult for him to move.'"

"A Colares fisherman also saw UFOs coming in and out of the waters of Baia de Marajo (bay). Sometimes they could see the bluish light moving under the water."

"'Once I was sleeping when the sergeants--members of the (FAB) operation--told me they had just taken a photograph of a flying saucer diving into the water close to a fishing boat. I went to the dock and waited for the fisherman. When he came back, he told me what had happened. He was terrified,'" the captain said.

"'Several weeks later, I saw a light close to a fishing boat. It was blue and circled the boat, covering about 300 meters (1,000 feet). Then it dived into the water. There wasn't any sound. It was like a blade passing through the water,' Capt. Hollanda said."

"Operation Saucer never came to an end. The FAB cancelled the research" in June 1978 "without any explanation."

Following his interview with Revista UFO in 1997, Capt. Hollanda "was found hanged with his own bathrobe belt on the second floor of his house by his daughter." (See the Brazilian newspaper O Liberal for February 7, 2005. Muito obrigado a T. Peter Park, Steve Wilson Sr. e Brunilda Barros por este articulo.)

UFOs APPEAR TWICE OVER MEXICO'S POPOCATEPETL

On Friday, February 4, 2005, a silvery daylight disc appeared over Mount Popocatepetl, a lofty volcano located 65 kilometers (40 miles) southeast of Mexico City.

According to the witnesses, "We were astounded, to say the least, after reviewing our video recordings on February 4th, when a television camera turned towards a glowing object that was fixed in the daytime sky and began to zoom in on what can only be described as an Unidentified Flying Object. We were able to obtain some pretty good coverage free of static showing the outlines of the silver object. We then saved the image we had recorded and added it to the rest of the photos we have posted."

"Another amazing fact is that the same object returned on Saturday, February 5 (2005) in the same spot in the sky at the exact same moment. This has been confirmed by the time-index of the photo which was 13:37 (1:37 p.m.)."

"Although the Feb. 5th photos came out less clear than those of the previous day, the object is still quite visible."

The operators have been monitoring Mount Popocatepetl since February 2001 and "have seen similar shaped objects numerous times."

UFO Roundup readers can check out the photos at this URL... <http://community.webshots.com/user/spyman05>

Mount Popocatepetl is probably Mexico's hottest UFO

spot, with hundreds of sightings since 1993. Silver daylight discs have been seen and videotaped just west of the volcano at San Rafael, Ozumba, Tepetlixpa and Tlalmanalco, as well.

(Many thanks to "Spyman" for this report.)

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS UFO OVER IQUIQUE, CHILE

On Friday, February 4, 2005, "Carlos Bruna, an official with the city of Iquique in Chile's First Region," just south of that country's border with Peru, "visited Playa Tres Islas (beach), a ten-minute drive from the city to take a break. Since he had purchased a digital camera in recent days, he began taking photos of the (Andes) mountains and their contrast with the summery blue sky."

(Editor's Note: Right now it's summer in Chile and Australia and the other countries of Earth's southern hemisphere.)

"To his surprise, upon loading the photos into his computer, he saw that one of the images showed a lens-shaped object, expelling some sort of white energy, flying high above the mountains."

"The fact is that when they informed me that this was the case, I only expected to see the alleged evidence. I thought it might correspond to one of many explained phenomena. But I think the photo shows some interesting details," said Rodrigo Fuenzalida, "director of the Chilean UFO group AION."

"When I received the material, I found that the mountains were too well-outlined, and the colors had a curious clarity. However, upon listening to Carlos, I found his account to be an honest one. I think the photo is genuine. Now the challenge consists of determining the origins of the stimulus captured by the camera's eye," Fuenzalida added.

"According to AION's representative in (Chile's) Region 1, Mario Pizarro, the image is genuine and studies conducted on the site" at Playa Tres Islas "suggest that the object had a diameter of 3 to 4 meters (10 to 13 feet)." (Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales y Guillermo Gimenez para estas noticias.)

MYSTERY STREAK CAPTURED ON CAMERA IN HAWAII

"An unidentified streak moving through the night sky above Hawaii has sky watchers puzzled."

"The streak, which can be viewed in motion on a NASA Webpage, was captured on film by a camera positioned on an active volcano at Haleakala, Hawaii. It moved from southeast to northwest. According to the NASA site, the streak was spotted on the night of December 17, 2004."

"Another camera, trained on the night sky of Hawaii, at Mauna Kea also captured the image."

"While the streak may have been dismissed as a satellite, NASA says no record of a satellite in that position exists on a Web site" devoted to satellite research.

One observer commented online, "What is truly bizarre is that this object is visible for a good 55 minutes at Haleakala and then for 30 minutes at Mauna Kea. Usually, satellites take a few dozen seconds or so--at the most, a couple of minutes--to cross the entire sky. If this was a satellite, it was either very slow-moving or at a very high altitude. I observed all the possibilities at Heavens Above, and no satellite passage seems to fit the description. It is also impossible to be a meteorite." (See WorldNet Daily for February 8, 2005, "UFO over Hawaii puzzles astronomers." Many thanks to Steve Wilson Sr. for this article.)

NIGHT SAUCER SPOTTED BY PAIR IN SYRACUSE, N.Y.

On Monday, February 7, 2005, at 10 p.m., Jackie K. and her sister were walking in Schiller Park in Syracuse,

New York (population 147,306) when they spotted "something strange approaching from the east."

"It was a large disc-shaped object which I saw on a walk on my street with my sister," Jackie reported, "We were looking towards a large parking lot when we noticed this very large craft, which was low in the sky. At first we thought it was a large airplane. It was moving very slowly, had very bright lights and was very long."

"It was at treetop level and was continuing on a steady course. It then dipped behind a building at the street corner, so we ran down the sidewalk to see where it was going."

"By now, I could see that there was no visible protuberance or tail on the craft. At this time, the object came to a stop, at an angle, and disappeared behind the trees and houses and out of our sight."

"I was absolutely shocked. I could not believe what I had just seen, and my sister couldn't believe it, either. She ran home to get my binoculars. I stayed at the spot to see if I could see anything else. I didn't observe any other activity."

"As she returned with my binoculars, we walked to a point where we thought it may have landed. We did not have any luck, and we both were disappointed but very excited over what we had seen. It didn't seem to make any sound, but we were a distance from it. I would estimate that we were two to three blocks away, but it was gigantic to me, at least three average-sized jetliners long."

The UFO "was extremely low. I would estimate that it was 40 feet (12 meters) above the ground, maybe lower. The speed of the object was around 10 to 15 miles per hour (16 to 24 kilometers) per hour as it approached. I would say it headed away a lot faster." (Email Form Report)

SEMI-OCTAGONAL UFO SEEN IN LOS OSOS, CALIFORNIA

On Wednesday, February 9, 2004, at 8:30 p.m., eyewitness D.R. was at the Montana de Oro State Park two miles (3 kilometers) south of Los Osos, California (population 10,500) when he spotted something strange approaching from the northeast.

"As I entered the campground in my car, I noticed a semi-octagonal arrangement of bright white lights hanging in the sky, unmoving, northeast of the campground," D.R. reported, "Within the circumference of the shape, there were two larger and more brilliant lights, one red, one blue, and each seeming to be round in shape. I estimated that they were 5 to 10 miles (8 to 16 kilometers) away from me. The red and blue lights moved freely and erratically. They rapidly changed speed and direction and in a manner that was extremely unnatural."

"My car rounded a bend, and I lost sight of the spectacle. As I parked my car and started up a campfire, I thought over what I had seen and dismissed it as some sort of celebratory event that most likely included helicopters with searchlights."

"However, less than 10 minutes later, the blue and red lights appeared again, this time over the larger of the low hills directly north of the campground. They appeared to be closer now, perhaps 2 to 5 miles (3 to 8 kilometers) out. (That is, they were either nearer or else bigger than before, seeing that their observable size had increased in one way or another, or both--D.R.)"

"They were now visible not as lights but as luminescent and roundish objects with exteriors featuring several types of light sources--twirling, flashing and steady directional lights. The objects dived about. There was no discernible pattern to their movement. They would alternately revolve around each other, separate and move in a different direction, hang still, etc."

"At least four times, the blue ball moved closer to the campground, shining a very powerful and concentrated beam in my direction (and sending a chill up my spine--D.R.). The campground lit up with blue-white light each time this happened, but the diameter of the beam, where it hit the campground, was only about 60 feet (18 meters)."

"The display as seen from my position lasted for about 10 minutes until the object dropped beneath the horizon and did not re-emerge. I search the sky for a few

more minutes, but the object did not reappear."

"I took an empty water bottle and started walking with it to the water tank in the campground. A bright red star to the south-southwest caught the corner of my left eye. I stopped walking and examined the star, because its brilliance and heft of color was very unclear. I surveyed the star for probably 30 seconds before concluding that the red star might be the red object I had been observing earlier. I stood and examined the object for a good two to three minutes, during which time it did not appear to move. In fact, it stood still enough that I was convinced it was a star. The night sky, after all, was quite littered with stars on this particular evening."

"I filled my water bottle at the tank. As I was returning to my campsite, the red star now caught the corner of my right eye as I turned to see that it was now moving east or northeast. It moved in a straight line for a few seconds, then "bobbed, made small loops and made other small changes in velocity. The passage of the object took it out of my sight, past the dozens of nearby trees after a burst of generally eastward movement."

Los Osos, Cal. is located 12 miles (20 kilometers) east of San Luis Obispo. (Email Form Report)

BLACK HELICOPTERS AND BLACKOUT IN REHOBOTH

On Friday, February 11, 2005, at 12:30 p.m., UFO Roundup correspondent Mary Lou Jones-Drown reported, "I was running the washing machine when I heard a strange noise outside. A couple of minutes later, I recognized it as helicopters. I went out into the backyard. I saw two of them right over my house" in Rehoboth, Mass., 30 miles (48 kilometers) south of Boston. "They were black helicopters. Military. All black. Looked like (UH-60) Blackhawks. They weren't very high up. Five hundred feet (150 meters), I'd say. They hovered over my house for several minutes and then they headed (east) towards Taunton (population 55,976)."

An hour later, she added, "I heard helicopters again. I went out to the barn and saw two of them. They were quite a distance away, right on the eastern horizon, flying from southeast to the northeast. There were two of them, one in front of the other. It looked like they were heading for Boston. When I went back in the house, both the TV and the lights went out. No power. We were without power until just before 3 p.m."

By 3:30 p.m., Mary Lou reported, her telephone was ringing off the hook. "I had over a dozen reports of black helicopters. One elderly lady phoned me and said, 'Did you see how the power went off when they flew over?'"

Some of the callers saw both sorties; most reported seeing only the south-to-north overflight. A woman in South Attleboro, Mass. called Massachusetts Electric and was reportedly told, 'We're having a power outage,' but was not given a reason for the loss of power.

In the Dodgeville section of nearby Attleboro, Mass., a woman was driving south on Route 152 when "two black helicopters came over the fire station from the east, just above treetop height, and shot over the cemetery. Then they took off to the northwest."

In North Rehoboth, a resident "saw the black helicopter hovering over my garage. I went outside, and it took off, heading for Route 118."

In Seekonk, students at the high school, located at the corner of Fall River Avenue and Ledge Road, spotted "a line of black helicopters coming from Providence (Rhode Island, i.e. the west--J.T.) and going toward Rehoboth" while boarding school buses at 2 p.m.

The same Friday, witnesses driving on Route 16 in Hopedale, Mass. (population 4,518) "saw three black helicopters circling low over the old textile mill. By the time we got to Nipmunk Pond (southwest of Hopedale--J.T.), they broke off and flew away to the northeast. They were very loud."

Hopedale is located 30 miles (48 kilometers) northwest of Rehoboth, well out of the immediate area of the Friday sightings. (Many thanks to Mary Lou Jones-Drown for these reports.)

NASA ABANDONS HUBBLE
SPACE TELESCOPE

"NASA plans to bury the Hubble Space Telescope rather than fix it, the space agency revealed Monday," February 7, 2005.

"Outgoing NASA chief Sean O'Keefe made the announcement as he unveiled the agency's \$16.46 billion budget proposal for 2006."

"Hubble, which was launched in 1990, is widely considered the crown jewel of U.S. space science. Astronomers, politicians and members of the public have been lobbying for a mission to extend its life."

"But O'Keefe says NASA's priorities are to meet President (George W.) Bush's call for exploration of the moon and Mars. He also said the space agency had to meet obligations to finish construction of the International Space Station and launch a space shuttle this year."

"NASA will continue financing Hubble operations until its failure, which is expected sometime after 2007. O'Keefe plans to bring the telescope out of orbit and dispose of it in the atmosphere by 2013."

"'It is my judgement call,' O'Keefe says. He cited two reports:"

"(1) The Columbia Accident Investigation Board's safety requirements for shuttle flights rule out Hubble repairs by astronauts. The board was formed after seven astronauts were killed in the disintegration of the space shuttle Columbia in 2003."

"(2) A National Research Council panel maintained last year (2004) that a robot repair mission in 2007 was technologically too risky."

"After a public outcry last year when O'Keefe disclosed plans to let Hubble die, the director backed off. He publicly supported a robotic repair mission, which will get a NASA review next month."

"But by removing money from this budget for a robotic rescue, the window of opportunity to revive such an effort before Hubble's batteries or stabilizing gyroscopes fail becomes much narrower."

"'The lock of money for a robotic Hubble mission is both an opening move in what the White House certainly knows will be a heated interaction with Congress and a 'logical' response to the NRC report,' says John Logsdon of George Washington (D.C.) University."

"The House Science Committee plans a hearing on NASA's budget and Hubble this month."

"'Hubble's best days are ahead of it, not behind it,' says Sen. Barbara Mikulski (Democrat of Maryland). 'I will fight in the Senate this year to fund a servicing mission to Hubble by 2008.'"

"A second science mission, the 2015 Jupiter Icy Moons Orbiter, is not financed yet. NASA's Craig Steidle says the nuclear reactor needed for the mission was too advanced a technology to pull off by 2015."

"'My first reaction to the budget is quite positive,' says Lennard Fisk, who heads the Research Council's Space Studies Board. He notes that the budget includes financing for a Mars orbiter, a Pluto mission and an infrared telescope for 2011." (See USA Today for February 8, 2005, "NASA decides to abandon, not repair, deteriorating Hubble telescope," page 9D.)

SATURN IN THE NEWS

"Astronomers using a giant telescope atop a volcano have discovered a hot spot at the tip of Saturn's south pole."

"The infrared images captured by the Keck I telescope at the W.M. Keck Observatory atop Mauna Kea on the Big Island of Hawaii suggest a warm polar vortex--a large-scale weather pattern likened to a jet stream on Earth that occurs in the upper atmosphere. It's the first such hot vortex ever discovered in the solar system."

"The team of scientists say the images are the sharpest thermal views of Saturn ever taken from the ground."

"This warm polar cap is believed to contain the highest temperatures on Saturn; the scientists did not

give a temperature estimate."

"On Earth, the Arctic Polar Vortex is typically located over eastern North America in Canada and plunges cold arctic air to the northern Plains in the United States."

"Polar vortices are found on Earth, Jupiter, Mars and Venus, and are colder than their surroundings. The new images from the Keck Observatory show the first evidence of a polar vortex at much warmer temperatures."

"'Saturn's is the first hot polar vortex that we've seen because it's been sitting in the sunlight for about 18 years,' said Glenn S. Orton, a scientist at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California and lead author."

"Saturn, which takes many Earth years to orbit the sun, just had its summer solstice in 2002."

Meanwhile, the robot spacecraft Cassini, now orbiting Saturn, picked up some interesting new data this week.

"New natural-color images from the orbiting Cassini spacecraft show that Saturn's northern hemisphere has the blues."

"The color of Saturn's northern latitudes may be linked to the apparently cloud-free upper atmosphere, scientists say."

"The images were taken with Cassini's wide-angle camera on (Tuesday) December 14 (2004) from a distance of 446,900 miles (715,040 kilometers). The Cassini/Huygens mission is a collaboration between NASA, the European Space Agency and the Italian Space Agency."

UFO Roundup readers can check out Cassini's images at this Web site: <http://www.nasa.gov/cassini> (See the Duluth, Minn. News-Tribune for February 5, 2005, "Astronomers discover polar 'hot spot' on Saturn," page 5A; and USA Today for February 10, 2005, "Cassini snaps blue views of Saturn," page 8D.)

From the UFO Files...

1966: LAIR OF THE REPTOIDS

Numerous texts of ancient India contain references to space travel and alien beings. For example, the Surya Siddhanta, one of the oldest books on astronomy, "speaks of Siddhas and Vidyaharas, or philosophers and scientists, who were able to orbit the earth in a former epoch 'below the moon but above the clouds.'"

Were these fanciful science fiction tales the ancient Hindus concocted to amuse themselves? Or were they fragmented recollections of a previous Space Age "when men flew in the air in skyships and heavenly beings came down from the sky?"

One who tried to find out was Andreas Boncza-Tomaszewski, better known as "Andrew Tomas." Born in 1906 to a wealthy Polish family living in St. Petersburg, then the capital of Russia, Andrew and his family fled during the Bolshevik Revolution in 1918. Andrew emigrated to Australia in 1948 and, with Edgar Jarrold, founded the Australian Flying Saucer Bureau in 1952.

In 1966, Andrew, intrigued by references to vimanas (UFOs) in the ancient writings of India, traveled to Darjeeling and visited the Ghum Monastery. From there he made the pilgrimage north to Mount Kinchinjunga, which he mentions in both of his books, *We Are Not the First* and *On the Shores of Endless Worlds*.

"Old Sanskrit texts speak of the Nagas, or Serpent Gods, who live in underground palaces lighted by luminous gems in the vastness of the Himalayas," Andrew wrote, "The Nagas are flying creatures who go on long voyages in the sky. The belief in the Nagas is so firmly imprinted in the (Indian) national consciousness that even today motion pictures and large plays exploit this theme to the delight of Indian audiences."

"The subterranean city of the Nagas--Bhogawati--brilliantly illuminated by diamonds may perhaps be a folklore image of a space base, lighted and air-conditioned. We wonder if those cosmonauts are still there."

Judging from the recent reports coming out of the Himalayas, we'd have to say YES.

Is Bhogawati the name of the Reptoids' base in the

Himalayas? During his 1966 pilgrimage, Andrew interviewed a sadhu (itinerant Hindu holy man--J.T.) who said he knew someone who had actually been there.

"Even in this jet-age, every Hindu is familiar with and usually believes in the legend of the Nagas, the 'serpents' (Reptoids?) which live in extensive underground palaces in the rocky Himalayas. It is believed that these creatures are able to fly in space and that they possess amazing magical powers and intelligence. They are not too fond of man if he is a curiosity seeker, explorer or mountaineer."

"According to the sacred traditions of the Hindus, the deep caverns of the Nagas contain fabulous treasures, illuminated by flashing precious stones. The subterranean abodes are known to be in certain parts of the Himalayas and Tibet, particularly around 'the Lake of the Great Nagas,' Lake Manasarowar."

A few weeks after his stay in Darjeeling, Andrew "decided to go to the Kulu Valley in the Western part of the Himalayas to visit Naggar, where Nicholas Roerich had lived. Since I had known him personally (in the 1930s--J.T.), the trip had a sentimental overtone."

"A narrow curving road, a precipice on one side with rocks and avalanches on the other, were not conducive to an enjoyable journey to this remote region near Ladakh and Tibet. The village of Naggar derives its name from Naga, the Serpent. High up in the mountains lies Roerich's estate. Having been an artist of note, his two-storied house contains a museum of his paintings." (Editor's Note: Nicholas Roerich also spotted a silver daylight disc over the Himalayas while riding in a caravan in July 1926.)

"As I began my ascent on the mountain path, I saw a tall, gray-haired sadhu, sitting by a mountain torrent. In his hand he held a cobra-shaped staff, which together with the markings on his forehead, signified that he was a devotee of Shiva. During the earlier, more peaceful times of the British Raj (1757-1947) these pilgrims would travel to the Lake of the Great Nagas, Lake Manasarowar, or to Mount Kailas, the abode of Shiva, in Tibetan territory."

"I climbed the mountain and reached the terrace on which Roerich's house is built. I spent at least an hour studying the master's paintings. On the way back, I admired the narrow valley and the looming snow-capped mountain ridges on each side."

"The sadhu was still there. I thought, 'A place called Naggar, a devotee of the Nagas with the cobra staff, if he does not know something about the Nagas, then who does?' Knowing the ways of the East, I saluted the holy man with the folded hands in the fashion that is customary in India, and waited for the older man to speak first."

"'You like Roerich's paintings?' he said in fluent English."

"'Very much, indeed. Tell me, did you know the Master in life?'"

"'Yes, for many years. A great Rishi (Hindu wizard--J.T.) and a friend of (Prime Minister Jawarlahal Pandit) Nehru.'"

"'Venerable sadhu, I believe in the Nagas. Have you seen them?' I asked diplomatically."

"'I am a poor sadhu. I know nothing, sahib. But about twenty years ago (1947, the year of Kenneth Arnold's UFO sighting--J.T.), my yogi teacher went into the mountain kingdom of the Nagas. Bright light everywhere, big halls like the Taj Mahal. Wonderful. The Nagas have many, many things and machines. They are clever, like Cambridge men, maybe more clever, sahib.'"

"I could not help laughing."

"'Your yogi must have been a Rishi. Don't the Nagas destroy men by their sting?' I asked."

"'Yes, though the Nagas are gods and wish nothing but good to man, they do not like men who have no business near their palaces,' he replied."

"'If you ever see the Nagas, give them my greeting,' I said before parting."

"The sadhu tilted his head sideways three times, which in India replaces our (Western) nod."

"'China lets in no more pilgrims, I can only go through the long holes (ancient Uighur underground tunnels--J.T.), but I am too old now,' he concluded."

"Walking towards the village I looked back at the old sadhu with the cobra staff. My two encounters remain fresh in my memory," Andrew wrote, "The one under the silvery glaciers of Kinchinjunga, the other by the torrent of Naggar, on the bank of which sat that ascetic of Aryavarta, the holy land of the Mahabharata." (See the books We Are Not the First by Andrew Tomas, Bantam Books, New York, N.Y., 1973, pages 108, 109, 116 and 117; and On the Shores of Endless Worlds by Andrew Tomas, Bantam Books, New York, N.Y., 1976, pages 119, 120, 121, 123, 150, 151, 155, 156 and 157.)

Well, that's it for this week. Join us next time for more UFO, Fortean and paranormal news from around the planet Earth--and occasionally, Saturn--brought to you by "the paper that goes home, UFO Roundup." See you next time.

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2005 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their Web sites or in news groups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan.nul> or use the Sighting Report Form at:

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/submit/sightings.shtml>

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster.nul>

UFOINFO: <http://www.ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives for UFO Roundup, AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI Magazine plus archives of Humanoid Sighting Reports (Albert Rosales), Filer's Files, Oz Files, UFO News 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 12:27:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:23:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Reynolds

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. >54]

>Hey, even I, and I bet Stan, are more than willing to consider a
>_serious_, actually _documented_ conventional explanation where
>a primary witness doesn't need to resort to hoaxing to try to
>bolster the claim and where the advocates can actually produce
>something of substance and not just conjecture.

>But to the question as to whether Stan Friedman is alone in the
>UFO community - of course not! He has a lot of company, even if
>they don't necessarily put up their hands when skeptics demand a
>show of hands on UFO Updates. Many simply don't want to be
>bothered by such baiting.

Okay, David...

So there was an alien craft down in Roswell, in 1947. Will anyone be able to get the government to admit that, even with all the circumstantial evidence that's been accumulated?

Didn't anyone in Roswell, in 1947, have a camera? Were the residents all hicks?

Perhaps balsa wood and balloon detritus was as exotic for them as cameras, which no one used to take photos of the landing site or the material in hand, even though there was a time-frame wherein someone, the local newspaper for instance, could have snapped a pic or two.

Either the population of Roswell was fraught with hooples, which is a distinct possibility when one see the witness interviews, and those people were baffled by uncommon weather equipment or the "crash" was an hysterical extrapolation, fostered by and exacerbated by the press and government inquiries.

But let's assume it was a bonafide alien craft, downed by the weather or equipment malfunction.

Can anyone get their hands on that craft or its occupants or material which will prove that aliens visited the Earth in 1947?

Move on....(and keep a camera handy, and a lie-detector).

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 17:45:36 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:24:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Miller

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:20:11 -0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:03:27 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>Gentlemen,

>>There are thousands of women in "Ufology", actually probably
>>many more than men.

>>The only trouble is, they fall under the New Age banner and
>>so wouldn't last 3 minutes on this List.

>Are you quite sure about that? ;-)

Hello Cathy.

Your question is open to interpretation but either way, I'm quite sure about the entire statement.

<http://www.hamptonroadspub.com/bookstore/index.php?cPath=72>

If you follow the above link, just for example, you will find 5 books related to the ET/Alien phenomenon. Of those five, 3 are authored by women. Search around elsewhere. You'll find similar percentages etc. The New Age market is undoubtedly female led.

As for "not lasting 3 minutes on this List" I refer you to just a small sampling from the archives below.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2001/jun/m21-004.shtml>

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2002/feb/m22-007.shtml>

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2004/jul/m06-024.shtml>

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2004/jul/m06-024.shtml>

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2004/jun/m16-013.shtml>

We've been here before Cathy, a few times. You can hold your own here and generally run rings round most on this List but in part, its because you use words of more than three syllables, you aren't flakey and you lean the right way philosophically. While you're not "nuts and bolts", you are social sciences led, so you're "OK".

I am not griping about the lack of New Age related posts on this List, far from it, but once again I am moaning about the level of intolerance demonstrated here to virtually anything that crosses a very narrow boundary line.

But, it's funny how things run. Exopolitics for example hadn't

seriously dented my personal radar before. I was aware of it but not particularly interested, principally because of the heavy negativity towards it here and elsewhere. Josh Goldstein's recent run in with Dr. Michael Salla and in particular Dr. Salla's initial response I thought was magnificent. He laid out the Exopolitical philosophy perfectly and made me want to learn more (thanks Josh!).

Trouble is, if I keep going that way, I'll end up wearing a dress and living in Sedona. Where do you shop for clothing Cathy? You're not a "catalogue girl" are you?

Stuart (aka "butch" but not for very much longer)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 14:58:48 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:29:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:39:13 EST
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>Again, the same applies to Roswell. As I have said there does
>seem to be some evidence of a top secret policy response to
>Roswell. I'm still working out the full dimensions of it all. I
>still think it should just resolve into a big MOGUL balloon but
>it has absolutely no apparent connection, the policy response is
>quite obviously not to "one of ours" as such a defense policy
>would be unnecessary by definition.

Any chance of helping on this? Several times, Brad, you have
claimed to have break through information, but it seems to
dissipate.

One of the impacts (we seem to have squishy definitions of what
impact means) was that the military and intelligence communities
instiituted a major policy of covering up information about
important sightings of flying discs.

Roswell has brought forth a major government debunking effort.

If it didn't happen, why program General Ramey (via DuBose from
McMullen) to put out a new story within hours of the first one?

Why stage a launch for the press the very next day at Alamogordo
of a weather ballon radar reflector combo?

The Alamogordo Daily news on July 10 has a front page story
headlined "Fantasy of Flying Discs Explained Here" with three
pictures.

That weather balloons don't normally move at speeds of
hundreds of miles per hour, as reported so often from June 24 to
July 10, doesn't matter.

Why threaten witnesses such as the Sherriff, Mack Brazel, etc?

Why many years later lie about Mogul Balloons (which really
don't fit at all) and then lie about crash test dummies?

Why tabloidize the story by falsely claiming that it came out
first in the Enquirer in 1978?

Why have Cavitt lie about how much wreckage there was and never
meeting the rancher? There are many other misrepresentations. Or
are we supposed to believe only the Air Force and the CIA and
NSA tell the truth?

Why treat Congressman Schiff (and later the GAO) so badly?

One can judge the impact of contraceptive pills by studying birth rates. Judging the impact of Roswell is not nearly so easy. I readily agree that coverups are rarely 100%. They don't have to be. As David Rudiak has pointed out, they haven't been. People like Marcel, DuBose, Haut, Jud Roberts, Bill Brazel etc have spoken out.

Incidentally, what is the linkage between Greer and MJ-12? I am certainly not a Greer fan .Why can't listers who want to attack MJ-12 speak plainly with facts and data instead of just making general negative claims... just about all of which specific ones have been refuted?

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:55:36 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:44:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:18:32 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>Martin Try as you might you can't get round the fact that the
>statement:

>"UFOs are the product of unknown intelligences possessing
>unknown powers and motivations"

>is a contentless, infinitely elastic hypothesis; what couldn't
>you explain by it.

Hi Peter,

This, as you phrase it, isn't an hypothesis. It isn't even much of an idea. It is barely - in scientific terms - even the germ of what Roger Penrose called "an idea for an idea". But this does not place the principle of intelligent agency beyond the pale of "scientific naturalism" which, I repeat, was your contention.

>Scientific hypotheses must surely be testable
>against nature, even if, at first, its only a case of ensuring
>that the hypothesis has mathematical consistency. Hypotheses
>which can explain anything and everything actually explain
>nothing.

Of course useful hypotheses must be testable, but you have not demonstrated that an hypothesis involving intelligent agency cannot be made testable, which you would have to do in order to place it beyond the pale of "scientific naturalism".

In UFO terms, intelligent agency may be, as yet, formally untestable in practice. But we could take a given report which perhaps we both agree is an "unknown" and intriguing (I assume we could find one?), and I doubt that you could demonstrate any hypothesis to account for it that is testable in practice, otherwise you would have explained it and we would not be discussing it. Nevertheless there must be an explanation, and if we knew how we should be able, in principle, to test it. That, it seems to me, is the operational basis of "scientific naturalism".

Cheers also,

Martin

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:48:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hatch

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

>OK Larry. Here's my lengthy two cents.

>Almost the entire Mogul balloon scenario depends on the
>memories of only one man, former Mogul engineer Charles Moore,
>who claimed his lost Flight #4 from June 4, 1947, probably
>accounted for the crash at the Brazel Ranch.

>Flight #4 was a convenient fall guy, because the Mogul Project
>was operating in New Mexico at that time. But better still for
>debunkers like the Air Force counterintelligence squad, #4 has
>zero documentation to prove what happened to it or that it even
>existed. (All that exists is a hole in the Mogul records between
>Flight #3 and Flight #5, plus a diary of one of the Mogul
>scientists indicating an unnumbered flight attempt in that gap
>being attempted but cancelled on account of cloudy weather, with
>a balloon cluster, not necessarily an actual fully configured
>Mogul later being released. There is nothing in the official
>flight summaries mentioning an actual flight, no balloon
>schematics, and no data on flight trajectory or tracking, even
>though Moore claims they tracked it.)

<snip>

>Glad you realize it's half-baked, since there is even less
>evidence for this than a Mogul balloon, zero in fact.

>Metallic and other debris was scattered over a very large,
>linear area, very easy to spot from the air. Something large
>crashed at the Brazel ranch, not some tiny instrument, and it
>was traveling at high speed to create the linear path, according
>to first investigator, Roswell intel chief Jesse Marcel. Some
>small atomic or other device would not have created such a
>debris field. According to Leonard Stringfield, Marcel also told
>him they used a geiger counter to check for radioactivity and
>found none.

<snip>

Thanks Dave, and sorry for all the <snips>.

I was just looking for votes yea or nay on Roswell.

I presume I can count you along with Stan on the Yea side, and
yes there are bound to be others.

The implication that most of serious Ufology still takes Roswell
as ET, and that it is therefore insular if not dotty; that's
what inspired me to say anything at all.

I usually avoid Roswell for very predictable reasons, rancor and
endless bush-beating high among them.

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hatch

Do you feel that most serious ufologists still take Roswell as the crash of an alien craft, or do you consider yourself (along with Stan and others) in a minority position?

I'm willing to accept other views on Roswell itself, even if I don't agree with them.

Best wishes

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 14:06:37 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:49:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection - Hatch

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 17:14:34 -0500
>Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 08:23:57 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Infrasound UFO Detection

><snip>

>Your humour is lost on mind control/electronic harassment/gang
stalking targets who come home and find their dog with its
throat slit.

>Instead of ridiculing people who are being harassed, you might
consider thanking God you aren't among us.

> Eleanor White

Hello Eleanor:

I'm shocked to hear about the poor dog, and of course its
owner... was that you?

Do you have some way to connect the dog mutilation with mind-
control/harassment activities, or could this be an grisly but
unrelated act of vandalism?

Mind control is one thing, vandalizing gangs seem quite another.

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 16:08:26 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:51:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Clark

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:18:32 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 15:23:41 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>"UFOs are the product of unknown intelligences possessing
>unknown powers and motivations"

>is a contentless, infinitely elastic hypothesis; what couldn't
>you explain by it. Scientific hypotheses must surely be testable
>against nature, even if, at first, its only a case of ensuring
>that the hypothesis has mathematical consistency. Hypotheses
>which can explain anything and everything actually explain
>nothing.

This goes to support something I once wrote: that nothing new or novel could ever emerge from the hermetically sealed world of pelicanist logic. The premise is that since everything important is known and it is forbidden to engage in research and theory-making about unknown important things, only known entities can figure in any discourse because only known entities exist or, at any rate, matter in the pursuit of knowledge.

We may be grateful, of course, that scientists believe no such thing, or science would never have progressed. Science, in fact, would not exist as we know it; there would only be pelicanism in its place. One can note, with all appropriate humor, that even pelicanist heroes such as Donald Menzel and Carl Sagan have engaged in fervent, to all appearances sincere speculation about the existence and nature of "unknown intelligences and motivations."

In the meantime, though, Peter Rogerson surely can more usefully employ his time writing scientists involved in SETI research and speculation. He can inform them that if they don't want to be judged pseudoscientists, they'd better cease and desist from looking for and thinking about "unknown intelligences and motivations." The only acceptable SETI books, Rogerson will sternly lecture them, will be those that engage in no guesswork about the hypothetical nature of ETI; such books should only debunk the very concept as a priori false and contrary to good pelicanist principles.

On the other hand, if Rogerson continues to propound this theme in Updates postings directed against powerless and marginalized ufologists, and if he fails to direct his polemics to places where his message most urgently needs to be heard -- astronomical journals and books (including textbooks) wherein ETI theories are discussed -- we may assume that he is not serious and that he knows it. He will have confirmed, at any rate, my own hypothesis, based -- I might add -- on known entities: that in matters like the above, pelicanists are simply

playing a game and only thinly pretending to engage in actual intellectual discourse.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 14:31:20 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:54:31 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Research Software? - Hatch

>From: Don Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 22:59:43 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 14:20:47 -0800
>>Subject: Re: UFO Research Software?

<snip>

>>I can't find an excuse NOT to toss cases like these.

>If I sent you a list of cases you had tossed out between the
>two versions of U that you have sent me, could you give me the
>criteria so that I can flag them as explained or probably
>explained in UFOCAT?

Hi Don:

It sounds like a major chore, but I will give it a try. Its best to send the full records present in the older *U* version (but missing in the newer one).

To do this, TAG each missing items in the old record by pressing the letter T when the record is centered in the Examine/Edit screen (tan background). Tagged listings gain a green background.

Make sure no other records are tagged first! Do a batch Untag (Ctrl-U) with no search limits set, first thing, to clear any of those out.

Having tagged the missing ones, create a file of just those:

Revert to the main entry screen (main menu). Press [Shift][^] the second key being the Carat symbol above the '6' key. When prompted for a filename, enter MISSING (no extension).

You will be prompted for Search limits. Press [V] key the [Y] yes for tagged records. Press [Esc] to avoid setting any other search limits. A file should be created on your Desktop display.

Write me directly if any of this doesn't work.

Just attach that file to an email and I will check through it, make notes, and send it back.

Again, this is a real chore on both ends. I would bet, even without looking, that the majority were tanked for either low information content, highly likely mundane explanations (night-lights etc.) and/or important fields missing (date, location ..)

>As you know, UFOCAT never deletes an entry,>hence the URN or "Unique Record Number", but we>can flag a case as worthless and say why.

That is an advantage of UFOCAT. Even discredited cases (properly

tagged) remain in the records for reference.

Due to my mapping and statistical routines, and not having set up a mechanism for stinkeroos in the first place 20 years ago, I need to delete them.

I've come to regret that omission when a tired old case crawls out from under the rocks, thus my online list of discredited cases:

<http://www.larryhatch.net/DISCREd.html>

Sadly, space only allowed the worst offenders, about 125 of those.

>I did take your list of discredited cases, or
>"stinkeroos" and add them to UFOCAT. All the citations
>to those cases were given the new PRNs, or Primary
>Record Numbers of the stinkeroos, so that your version
>of what happened would emerge first in any list of
>citations to those cases.

That's fine, glad to hear it.

Best wishes,

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 17:06:33 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:56:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Clark

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:18:32 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 15:23:41 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 09 Feb 2005 21:52:02 +0000
>>>Subject: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>is a contentless, infinitely elastic hypothesis; what couldn't
>you explain by it. Scientific hypotheses must surely be testable
>against nature, even if, at first, its only a case of ensuring
>that the hypothesis has mathematical consistency. Hypotheses
>which can explain anything and everything actually explain
>nothing.

Rogerson is, of course, using this as an argument that UFO phenomena cannot a priori be associated with an unknown intelligence. But his resistance to "hypotheses which can explain anything and everything" is, in the usual pelicanist fashion, highly selective.

In the pelicanist literature, where we are led to believe that all seemingly extraordinary, consensus reality-defying experiences are subjective and psychological, we have been informed that the states in which these hallucinations are likely to occur are as follows:

relaxation
excitation
boredom
excitement and ecstasy
isolation
participation in a group
concentration
distraction
questioned faith
unquestioned faith
anxiety
peace of mind
doubt
belief
full consciousness
sleep or near-sleep
lighted room
outdoor darkness

and so on.

It appears that the psychological state in which one is most likely to have an extraordinary encounter is being alive. You

might say, in other words, one can be entirely rational in one's perceptions and in full possession of a grip on actual (i.e., pelicanist-approved) material reality only when you're dead.

One influential text by a regular Magonia contributor argues, for example, that CE3s could not involve actual ETs because the alleged ETs' behavior is "illogical, no matter how much allowance we make for the possibility ET logic may be different from ours." A mere 50 pages later, we are told that such reports cannot be interpreted as alien in nature because the supposed ETs' patterns of behavior are "humanlike in so many ways."

Pelicanism: the means by which one can construct hypotheses which explain anything and everything, in other words nothing at all.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:14:22 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:57:38 -0500
Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 17:10:22 -0500
>Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

<snip>

>Here is your chance to select out the whistleblowers the seniour
>UFOlogists consider as passing muster, and have a far greater
>long term impact than Dr. Greer's presentation. You all wanted
>to have only vetted whistleblowers heard, well, here's your
>chance.

There is a plethora of what I would call amateur (which does not necessarily denote "lousy") UFO films out there - Stan Friedman, for example, has a couple. The "whistleblowers" seem to be fairly well represented as well, perhaps more so in print than video, for good or ill. This is clear to anyone who has attended even a single UFO conference.

I don't think the problem is not enough UFO related documentaries and books; I think the problem is that there are not enough independent, objective and balanced UFO documentaries and books. This too should be clear to anyone who has attended a single UFO conference.

There is a big difference between the two types of films, or books.

I have high hopes that the ABC special will help fill the gap, to a very large audience.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Women In Ufology [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

From: Sheryl Gottschall <gottscha.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 10:43:55 +1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:00:28 -0500
Subject: Women In Ufology [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:03:27 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Gentlemen,

>There are thousands of women in "Ufology", actually probably
>many more than men.

>The only trouble is, they fall under the New Age banner and so
>wouldn't last 3 minutes on this List.

Without this getting into a gender difference issue (hopefully)
I have to agree with Stuart.

By nature females have a different focus to males so we tend to
explore areas that males wouldn't. Often these other fields of
interest are considered to have less impact on the UFO subject
because females (generally) will focus on the more nebulous
areas which are indeed thought to be anything but "scientific"
and possibly New Age-ish.

To understand why, by nature the males of our species focus on
things and objects while females focus on people and feelings,
that's the way we are made for survival. But it would not be
untrue to say that in the past the male focus on objects has
taken precedence in UFO research. Even the name change by many
UFO organizations to include the term UFO rather than the word
alien or extraterrestrial is a reflection of the turn away from
the female focus on people or living beings.

In truth, it may have served UFO research far better if UFO
organisations had included "alien" or ET in their titles. At
least this would not have caused the same depotentiating effect
as the term UFO which now diffuses what the UFO subject is
really about, that is, extraterrestrial life NOT unidentified
flying objects!

Traditionally, men have held the commanding influence in the UFO
field but I wonder how Ufology might change if more of the
female focus were included. Would we take the same path, explore
the same issues, align ourselves to the same "research" values,
respond to the same influences? My observation is that UFO
research today is lopsided and besides the complex nature of the
phenomenon I feel it's also hindered by the
male mindset and world view.

Sorry guys. No offence but we need both.

To read more please go to my article
Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus,
So Where Does That Leave Ufology?
at www.uforq.asn.au/articles/marsvenus.html

Sheryl Gottschall
gottscha.nul

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

What's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth About

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 16:59:36 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:08:14 -0500
Subject: What's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth About

Source: The Seattle Post-Intelligencer - Seattle Washington

http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/tv/211976_tv15.html

02-15-5

What's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth About UFOs

By Melanie Mcfarland
Seattle Post-Intelligencer Television Critic

In the span of more than 40 years with ABC News, Peter Jennings has built one of the most respected reputations in television journalism.

Recently, Jennings anchored "World News Tonight" from Iraq. He returned to the States, only to hit the road again. Tomorrow and Thursday "World News Tonight" reports from Seattle, where Jennings and his team will examine our region's industries.

"One of the great frustrations common to people like me ... is not getting out enough," he said in a phone interview, calling his Iraq tour some of the happiest days he's had in his life.

Having spent more than two decades as the face the country's second-highest-rated evening news broadcast, the Ontario-born Jennings has become synonymous with descriptors such as urbane, aristocratic and sophisticated. And although these adjectives are not always used in a positive sense -- some viewers equate them to haughtiness -- they're undeniably apt.

It probably will come as a surprise, then, to hear that urbane, sophisticated Jennings' next documentary chases down the truth about UFOs. As in, flying saucers and little green men.

Seriously.

"UFOs -- Seeing Is Believing," airing Feb. 24 from 8 to 10 p.m. on KOMO/4, is the latest entry in the "Peter Jennings Reporting" series. His goal is to take a serious look at a subject most scientists, the government and the media tend to brush off as lunacy. When some 80 million Americans claim to have seen a UFO, he explained, it's worth an investigation.

"I grant you that there may be a lot of people out there in the country who think they've had these experiences, and some of them may even be unhinged," he said, "but I think even those people deserve a serious hearing from a serious reporter."

It probably doesn't hurt ABC to air it during sweeps, either, even if Jennings insists the all-important ratings period played no part in his choice of subject.

To Jennings, tackling UFOs is part of the natural progression of the long-form projects he has produced through PJ Productions, an independent documentary production company he formed about four years ago.

"When we got to the end, I realized two things. First of all, that many of the people who had these experiences were the very people -- police officers, pilots, military personnel and ordinary citizens -- who we regard as being trustworthy and, not only that, very valuable to our society because they protect us.

"Secondly," he continued, "we came to conclude, as with the Kennedy program, that the government, by not taking something particularly seriously at various moments in time, has contributed to undermining people's trust and probably contributing to some theories that don't hold water."

Not many newshounds are looking skyward with him, however. Much more has been made recently about his status as the last man standing in a long-lived trio of broadcast news giants.

"World News Tonight's" main anchor since 1983, Jennings has outlasted Tom Brokaw and Dan Rather, once the latter returns to being a reporter in March. Speculation abounds as to how he'll fit into the next generation of network news. For his part, "There isn't much time, to be honest, to think much about it."

Jennings has a similar nonchalance toward the many people who decry his reporting as slanted. "I recognize the accusation of bias is there. Sometimes I think the accusation is made by people who want to advance their own bias.

"But ... people do tend to see the media through their own particular prism. What I find lacking in television and in broadcasting information these days, is that reporting is outweighed by opinion. ... Most people don't understand what they're getting unless they absorb a wide variety of information from numerous sources."

At 66, Jennings is one of the most recognizable faces on American television. His career was built on jumping time zones: Following a failed first run at the anchor chair, Jennings cut his teeth as a foreign correspondent based in Rome beginning in 1968.

>From there, he went on to establish America's first TV news bureau in the Middle East. He has since gained interviews with leaders from every part of the social and political spectrum, bore witness to historic moments while they were still in the making, and opened parts of the world to American audiences that other outlets could not.

Considering all this, why not an earnest probe into whether the truth is out there?

"I feel the same way about reporting about UFOs as I feel about reporting on Iraq," Jennings said. "The great joy we have in our business... is the opportunity to learn new stuff every day, and to write about it."

P-I TV critic Melanie McFarland can be reached at 206-448-8015 or tvgal.nul

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Minot B-52 Case - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 20:44:52 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:10:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case - Aldrich

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 17:39:04 +0100
>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

>>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 21:34:19 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Minot B-52 Case

><snip>

>>Dominique Weinstein has a preliminary report on this case based
>>on a few interviews conducted during the first year or so of the
>>investigation.

>>Velasco's account is confused and incorrect. He had thousands
>>of reports in the French official files, I don't understand why
>>he used this one in which he had no involvement. No witness said
>>he saw the missile silo cover moved nor are there any written
>>records to indicate that.

>I have been contacted privately by Tom Tullien, and I understand
>the situation. I hope that he will be able to finish the report
>soon. Just one thing - the question of the silo door does not,
>apparently, seem as clear-cut as you suggest.

The question of the silo door is perfectly clear. There is no wiggle room here... I said there are no witnesses we have talked to who knows anything directly about the silo door(s). There is no written record concerning the silo doors. There is second hand information on this and a number of other things in Velasco's account which are like the silo doors unverified and unsupported by first hand testimony... Velasco apparently did not understand the difference between established and verified accounts and second and third-hand accounts or things which have not been independently verified.

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947
<http://www.pro>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 20:55:09 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:12:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Sparks

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:33:24 -0500
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:39:13 EST
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>No coverup can perfectly cover up 100%, especially at the
>>inception of a coverup of something that is unplanned and
>>unprecedented in history that is suddenly forced on you. There
>>will be leaks and there will be visible policy impacts on the
>>national policymakers - two different things. How visible the
>>policy impacts and how big the leaks are a matter of degree and
>>a matter of sufficient access to "all source" information and
>>sufficient interest and intellect to connect the "dots" after
>>finding them, and avoiding the connection of imaginary and
>>fabricated "dots" which the UFO community so dearly loves to do
>>because of its incipient poor judgment (e.g., Greer, MJ-12).

See my full post at:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/feb/m13-020.shtml>

>Brad says if Roswell were "real" there would have been leaks and
>policy repercussions. He says he himself has located a document
>that implies policy repercussions.

Actually I did not say I had found just "a document" and I can't
particularize that any further. Just re-read my posting. Yes,
policy repercussions.

>As for leaks, well, we have Marcell and a bunch of others coming
>forward in the 1979-1990 time frame. And the EBD and so on.

They didn't leak anything that emerges from the TOP SECRET
policy response to Roswell. There is no trace of the TS policy
in the EBD or any other MJ-12 documents, evidently because the
hoaxers did not have very good background knowledge of US
national security history and poor imaginations in the 80's and
90's.

There was also a lower-level SECRET policy response to the non-
Roswell events in 1947, and the two parallel track policies must
have been coordinated at a very high level, but from the
historical evidence they do not directly interact. But again the
MJ-12 hoax documents know nothing of this SECRET policy either.

In fact the UFO community has never stumbled upon or found any
trace of either the TS or the SECRET policy responses to the
events of June-July 1947. Indeed, the UFO community does not
even have the correct agencies with their actual correct and

realistic jurisdictional functions. The UFO community is fixated on entirely the wrong agencies and for that reason alone could not possibly "find" any of the TS or S policies I am finding. For example, the CIA is the eternal boogie man of UFO conspiracy theorists. Yet the bitter truth is that the CIA was an almost zero agency in 1947, with zero accomplishments of any note, and near-zero clout. Thus whenever you see any purported "leaked" documents making out the CIA or CIA Director as an important part of some highly secret intelligence operation in 1947 you will know from the start it is a hoax. But the UFO world does not know that and refuses to know that no matter how many times it is told, and of course it refuses to research that historical fact on its own -- it's "negative evidence" you see. You can't find a big important role for the CIA in 1947 because there is none. Only legislation declared the CIA into existence and gave it a role with the NSC but in actual reality the CIA had little to do with anything then. Indeed the CIA has no great accomplishment in its history until 1956 when it leaked a copy of Khrushchev's speech denouncing Stalin, and when it launched the U-2 AQUATONE overflights.

In fact the CIA was so unimportant back then that this out-of-the-loop unimportance led to the CIA making the most ridiculous and absurd intelligence blunder in all history in 1949, like a psychic predicting an event wrongly after the date being predicted!: The CIA made a false prediction after the date in the prediction was known to be proven false! If a psychic in 2005 predicts that the world will blow up in 2004, after the fact and after it didn't happen the way predicted, well you see my point.

On Sept 20, 1949, the CIA Office of Reports and Estimates (ORE) issued a TOP SECRET intelligence estimate "predicting" that "the earliest possible date by which the USSR might be expected to produce an atomic bomb is mid-1950 and the most probable date is mid-1953." But the USSR had already produced and exploded an atomic bomb the month before, on Aug 29, 1949, and almost the entire US Government (so to speak, not literally) knew this and had numerous high-level conferences to settle the intelligence issues and had already arranged for President Truman to make a public announcement all in the works before Sept 20, 1949, when the CIA declared that the Soviet A-bomb was still years away in the future! No one had bothered officially notifying the CIA of all this high-level intelligence policy reaction going on behind the scenes. The CIA was just not important enough to be included in the loop on this shocking intelligence revelation by the AF nuclear intelligence unit AFOAT-1. So if you see CIA or its Director being included in "above the H-bomb" type supersecrets you should laugh.

>Point: if there had been no 'leaks' we wouldn't know anything
>about Roswell and MJ-12, etc.

We still don't "know" anything from MJ-12 because it is a hoax, a fraud, disinformation.

>So, there have been 'leaks'. The question then is, do the leaks
>refer to a true event or are they prt of disinformation,
>possibly to cover up something else?

Well you are already succumbing to disinformation by accepting MJ-12.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Secrecy News - 02/15/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 21:03:14 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:15:18 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News - 02/15/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 17
February 15, 2005

** REPORTERS ORDERED TO TESTIFY BEFORE GRAND JURY
** DENIAL OF HISTORICAL INTEL BUDGET DATA CHALLENGED
** INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT: A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT
** DECEPTION 101
** MORE FROM CRS

REPORTERS ORDERED TO TESTIFY BEFORE GRAND JURY

A federal appeals court panel today said that two reporters must respond to a grand jury subpoena requiring them to identify their confidential sources or else they may be jailed for contempt.

Judith Miller of the New York Times and Matthew Cooper of Time Magazine have no First Amendment protection from a grand jury subpoena seeking the identity of sources for their reporting on the matter of former covert CIA officer Valerie Plame, the court said.

The decision is posted here:

<http://tinyurl.com/6s8d6>

In response to this and similar cases, new legislation has been introduced in the House and Senate to limit the government's authority to compel disclosure of confidential sources.

"This important legislation will provide reporters with protection from being compelled to disclose sources of information in any Federal criminal or civil case without meeting strict criteria," said Rep. Mike Pence (R-IN), who introduced the "Free Flow of Information Act" (HR 581) with Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA).

"It is important that we ensure reporters certain rights and abilities to seek sources and report appropriate information without fear of intimidation or imprisonment," said Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN), who introduced a companion bill (S. 340) in the Senate. "This includes the right to refuse to reveal confidential sources."

See the introduction of the "Free Flow of Information Act" here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/congress/2005/s340.html>

DENIAL OF HISTORICAL INTEL BUDGET DATA CHALLENGED

The decision by a federal court last week to categorically deny release under the Freedom of Information Act of historical intelligence budget data from 1947 to 1970 (SN, 02/11/05) was challenged today in a motion to amend the decision.

The decision included a technical error, the Federation of American Scientists argued, because it failed to require the CIA to disclose the 1963 CIA budget figure even though the court found that that number - \$550 million - was not exempt from disclosure.

The possibility of an appeal of the decision as a whole remains open. See the FAS motion to amend here:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/foia/1947/sa021505.pdf>

The decision was reported by Ryan Lozar of the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press here:

<http://www.rcfp.org/news/2005/0214-foi-public.html>

INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT: A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT

The challenge of legislative or parliamentary oversight of intelligence and security agencies is explored in a new study published last week by the Parliament of Norway.

Based on a comparative analysis of oversight practices in liberal democracies in the Americas, Europe, Africa and Asia, the authors derive some proposed legislative standards and best practices.

See "Making Intelligence Accountable: Legal Standards and Best Practice for Oversight of Intelligence Agencies" by Hans Born and Ian Leigh (editors), February 2005, linked under "new publications" on this page:

http://www.dcaf.ch/news/thisweek_index.html

DECEPTION 101

A new U.S. Army War College report provides an introduction to the practice of deception as a tactic in military and political conflict.

The report, which does not represent official Army policy, surveys a variety of past and present instances of deception and proposes some broad general principles.

See "Deception 101 - Primer on Deception" by Joseph W. Caddell, U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, December 2004:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/deception.pdf>

MORE FROM CRS

Some newly updated publications of the Congressional Research Service obtained by Secrecy News include the following.

"Tactical Aircraft Modernization: Issues for Congress," updated January 19, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/IB92115.pdf>

"Latin America: Terrorism Issues," updated January 14, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21049.pdf>

"Intelligence Issues for Congress," updated February 1, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/IB10012.pdf>

"Tracking Current Federal Legislation and Regulations: A Guide to Basic Sources," updated January 13, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/98-461.pdf>

"Social Security Reform," updated February 4, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/IB98048.pdf>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to secrecy_news-request.nul with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

The Foo Fighters

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:55:25 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:17:33 -0500
Subject: The Foo Fighters

UFO: The Complete Sightings
by Peter Brookesmith
Barnes & Noble, Inc.
120 Fifth Avenue
New York City, NY 10011

The Foo Fighters
pp. 35-36

TYPE: Close encounters of the first kind
PLACE: European, Asian and Pacific theaters of war
DATE: 1943-45

BACKGROUND

The 'foo fighters' were balls of light, varying in color and in size from several feet to a few inches across, that pursued warplanes in the later stages of World War II. Allied pilots assumed they were enemy inventions, either reconnaissance drones or psychological warfare weapons. Reports of foo fighters were also made in the Korean War. A short selection of World War II sightings follows.

THE EVENTS

- In 1943, US bomber pilots flying missions from Burma to China reported being buzzed and circled by 'glittering' objects. Instruments failed to operate until the objects flew off.

- On 14 October 1943, US B-17s of the 348th Bomb Group had started a bombing run over Schweinfurt, Germany, when they ran into a formation of 'scores' of small, silvery disks, about one inch (2.5cm) thick and four inches (10cm) in diameter, flying toward the bombers. Major E.R.T. Holmes reported that one struck the tail of one aircraft, but without effect.

- On 10 August 1944, Captain Alvah M. Reida was piloting a B-29 bomber based at Kharagapur, India, on a mission over Palembang, Sumatra, when his right gunner and co-pilot noticed a sphere 'probably five or six feet (1.5-1.8m) in diameter, of a very bright and intense red or orange in color' that constantly throbbed, about 12,500ft (3750m) off the starboard wing. It paced the B-29, then flying at 210 mph (340km/h) at 14,000ft (4200m). Reida jinxed his plane to shake it off, but it stayed in the same relative position until, after eight minutes, it 'made an abrupt 90=B0 turn and accelerated rapidly, disappearing in the overcast.'

- On 22 December 1944, Lt. David McFalls of the US 415th night-fighter squadron was over Hagenau, Germany. At 6:00am, he saw two 'huge bright orange lights' climbing toward the plane. McFalls dived, banked and turned his plane, but the UFOs stuck with him for two minutes, then peeled off and blinked out.

ASSESSMENT

Interrogation of captured enemy aircrew revealed that both German and Japanese fliers had also been pursued by foo

fighters. Donald H. Menzel proposed that these fighters were light reflections from tiny ice crystals formed by super-cold air eddying around battle damage on the aircraft (hence their reappearance in Korea). However this does not account for the reported arrivals from elsewhere of foo fighters, or their effect on aircraft electro-magnetic systems. Many modern ufologists now believe that the foo fighters are a form of plasma or ball lightning.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

The Los Angeles Air Raid

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:55:43 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:19:13 -0500
Subject: The Los Angeles Air Raid

UFO: The Complete Sightings
by Peter Brookesmith
Barnes & Noble, Inc.
120 Fifth Avenue
New York City, NY 10011

The Los Angeles Air Raid
pp. 33-34

Unknown intruders run into an anti-aircraft barrage

TYPE: Lights in the sky
PLACE: Environs of Los Angeles, California, USA
DATE: 25 February 1942

BACKGROUND

Less than three months after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the US military forces could not rule out an aerial attack on the continental USA. Tension on the Pacific coast was running high.

THE EVENTS

At 2:25am on 25 February air raid sirens sounded over Los Angeles. The city blacked out, and at 3:16am anti-aircraft artillery (AAA) batteries began firing at 'unidentified aircraft' coming in over the ocean, as searchlight beams pursued them through the sky. There seemed to be at least two types of craft involved in the incident. Witnesses saw fast-moving, high-flying small objects, red or silver in color, that arrived in formation and then appeared to dodge their way through the AAA salvos at speeds of up to five miles (8km) per second -- 18,000 mph (29,000km/h). There was also a large object that remained stationary for some time, was caught in searchlights over Culver City, and then moved at a stately 60 mph (100km/h) to the coast at Santa Monica and then southward toward Long Beach, before being lost to sight. This large object reportedly took numerous direct hits. The AAA continued firing until 4:14am, using 1430 12.8lb (6kg) shells in all. No bombs were dropped and no aircraft were downed.

ASSESSMENT

On 26 February, General of the Armies George C. Marshall informed President Franklin D. Roosevelt that as many as 15 unidentified aircraft had been logged over Los Angeles, flying at speeds of up to 200 mph (320km/h) and at altitudes of between 9000 and 18,000ft (2700-5400m). General Marshall surmised that the enemy had used commercial aircraft operated by enemy agents to spread alarm, locate AAA positions in California, and slow up US war production.

No proof that any of these conclusions was accurate has ever been forthcoming. Official estimates of the UFOs' speeds are hugely and worryingly at variance with those of witnesses, and the behavior of the objects was unlike that of any conventional aircraft of the period -- it is very difficult to imagine why

hostile aircraft would show their lights during an air raid over enemy territory.

There has been speculation among many commentators that the US military was aware all along that these were unusual targets, because in the 50 minutes between the time they were first alerted and the time they opened up the AAA barrage, aircraft of the 4th Interceptor Command had not been sent to engage the intruders. Furthermore, for reasons that have never been explained, the US Department of Defense strenuously denied having any records of the Los Angeles Air Raid until 1987.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 21:32:06 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:20:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - King

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 13:17:19 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>Source: Fox News

><http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,147469,00.html>

>02-14-05

>Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>WASHINGTON =97 Senior Defense Department officials said Monday
>they have no knowledge of any U.S. drone flights over Iran, and
>U.S. intelligence officials would not comment on any such flights.

<snip>

Hi Stig,

What is interesting about this post is that the story nowhere states what the headline states.

Senior Defense Dept.. officials say they are not aware, and the CIA has no comment. How does this in any way constitute a denial?

Then later in the story, it is admitted that drones are indeed flying overhead...precisely where "UFOs" are being sighted.

Journalism is not what it once was.

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 22:09:21 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:23:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - King

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:09:46 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 13:44:18 EST
>>Subject: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help

<snip>

>That is, I am fairly certain the action figure sitting on my
>desk will still exist tomorrow. I'd go so far as to say I am
>sure it will exist tomorrow (and I pray it does). But knowing it
>exists there in that tomorrow place doesn't mean I have any way
>to take hold of it and bring it into today. Would probably
>violate some natural laws to have it here. I'd be able to sell
>the extra on ebay if it could be done. Maybe it could be kept
>here if I were some kind of super scientist with tools at the
>ready. But I doubt it. We are, each of us, locked into this
>time, this world. And sometimes some creatures keep
>step with us for a bit.

<snip>

Hi Will,

Man, you had me right up to...

"...the action figure on my desk..."

Yikes... couldn't you have used something, anything else as an
example?

But for the record, what particular action figure is it on your
desk? If you don't mind the question. <LOL>

But seriously, I agree with your point, and find it refreshing
to read it here.

Physical traces are surely suspect when caused by what could
very well be a metaphysical or super-physical or alter-physical
event.

Like if someone said they had the Holy Grail on their desk. <g>

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:25:06 -0500
Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific methods for UFO research. As an advocate of the latter approach, I believe it important to justify why this should be done in a systematic way. The basis of my argument is that there is a distorting factor in the investigative process of the UFO phenomenon. This distorting factor is primarily political and is related to national security, cultural and religious concerns over the ramifications of UFO research and the extraterrestrial hypothesis. This distorting factor needs to be systematically factored in to UFO research in order to properly deal with the growing volume of whistleblowers and others coming forward with first hand testimony of classified UFO research and sightings, and of working with alleged extraterrestrial related technologies and beings.

The distorting factor in UFO research requires a systematic application of the principle of Uncertainty in the investigation and analysis of such whistleblower testimonies which highlight a significant inverse relationship between the Truth of whistleblower/witness testimony, and Evidence supporting such testimony. I am therefore advocating that UFO researchers apply to their investigations what I will henceforth describe as a variation of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle. Just as an Uncertainty principle is systematically applied to quantum theory research on the 'Position' and 'Momentum' of quantum particles, I advocate an Uncertainty Principle needs to be systematically applied to UFO research in terms of Truth and Evidence concerning witness/whistleblower testimonies, UFO sightings and other UFO related phenomena.

The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle for Quantum Physics is expressed as follows:

"The more precisely the POSITION is determined, the less precisely the MOMENTUM is known"

What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty Principle for UFO Research"

"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less precisely the EVIDENCE is known"

The application of the Uncertainty Principle to UFO research would make it legitimate to study and analyze the implications of testimonies of witnesses/whistleblowers to multiple aspects of the UFO phenomenon where evidentiary support is lacking or not compelling. The Uncertainty Principle gives support to a systematic analysis of wide-ranging testimonies that reveal a complex relationship between Truth and Evidence that emerges due to a distorting medium in UFO research. I look forward to hearing the forum's views on the systematic application of an Uncertainty principle in UFO research.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 23:51:19 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:27:47 -0500
Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 17:10:22 -0500
>Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 12:35:56 EST
>>Subject: Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary?

<snip>

>Alex Jones' videos, and those from a colleague Dave von Kleist,
>are not at the Peter Jennings or History Channel quality. But
>they _are_ at the 'locally produced TV newscast' quality level,
>which is more than adequate to get the government UFO
>whistleblowers' testimony out to the public. That content is so
>important that it is worth the try, and Alex's and Dave's videos
>earn profits too, which UFOlogy is short of.

<snip>

Hi Eleanor,

There is a big difference between whistleblowers and
horn-tooters.

Jones toots with the best of them. Two illustrative items...

1) His website includes an interview with a man he says was the former German Minister of Defense, and was also the former Minister of Intelligence. Uhh... wrong. Andreas von Bulow was a legislator... a member of the Bundestag... a Congressman. A real insider <duh>. He wrote a book saying that 9/11 was planned by Mossad. Fair enough. But his evidence? Please Google "Andreas von Bulow". You'll find the interview in the first search result or so. You have to read it.....

2) During a radio interview, Jones got a call which prompted him to give the caller an "Insider's test". He asked the guy what the Bohemian Grove "secret handshake" was. I'm not making this up. The radio show is included in his site archives. I'd give the address, but I'm sure you have it bookmarked.

Ufology needs Alex Jones like it needs a 24-hour network for discussion of rods and orbs with your host, Sean David Morton.

I probably shouldn't have written that last...May sweeps are right around the corner.

Eleanor, please look behind the horn-tooting. There are truths that we are not privy to, but Alex Jones is neither the bearer of these truths, nor is he an honest, principled, credible journalist. He is a conspiracy theorist, and a guy that makes money by preying on our worst fears. He is a parasite. In Friedman-speak, he is a "noisy negativist"...for profit.

But don't take my word for it, please read his stuff but then do

Re: How About A Ufologist-Produced Documentary? -

your own research. You will learn, and that is a positive step for anyone.

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

ET Visits More Likely Deep In The Past?

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 21:58:16 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:34:54 -0500
Subject: ET Visits More Likely Deep In The Past?

Source: Nature Magazine - 433,668

<http://tinyurl.com/5pxdz>

02-10-05

Under Martian Ice

Stephen Baxter

Stephen Baxter's most recent novel is Exultant (Gollancz, 2004).
He lives in Northumberland, UK.

Cold... and never more alone.

I suppose it was the Fermi paradox that drew me into science in the first place. I never expected to find a resolution to the paradox =97 not here! But that, it seems, is what lies beneath the ancient ice of Mars.

It's a shame that this discovery is hogging all the headlines back home, for our assault on the martian South Pole is an epic in its own right. The ice here is old and dirty, polluted with traces that might let us reconstruct Mars's climatic history, just as on Earth. And the morphology is extraordinary, with vast canyons spiralling out from a central dome, a self-organizing system 1,000 kilometres across.

But the adventure here is very human. We're deep into our first Earth-year-long polar winter. We're occupying ourselves with sample analysis, mailing home, teaching one another languages =97 would you believe a dozen spoken fluently by our polyglot six-strong crew? In other words we're over-wintering, just like Shackleton.

And, along with the rest of humanity, we're mulling over the implications of our discovery under the ice.

The bedrock under the ice is among the oldest on Mars. One of our key objectives here was to assemble detailed maps of the hidden landscape with sounding radar and active seismology. What we found was something utterly unexpected.

It's a quite inhuman layout, of low walls outlining pentagonal and hexagonal areas, within which boxy structures huddle. We don't know its purpose, but the 'city' under the ice is unmistakable as a sign of intelligence. Somebody has been here before us.

Of course these structures are not native. Eighty years after the first successful robot landers, we were sure that life here never advanced beyond stromatolites. I have a sneaking feeling that whoever built the city wasn't so terribly unlike us. They were drawn by the adventure of reaching the pole, just as we were.

But it drives me crazy that we'll probably never know. It's already clear that their visit must have been long ago =97 long

even for a geologist like me, billions of years back. Which is where Fermi comes in.

I'm sure you're familiar with the question Enrico Fermi asked in 1950: "Where is everybody?" If extraterrestrial aliens exist, they should have spread everywhere by now. So how come we don't see them? Our vision of the Universe has expanded greatly since 1950, but we've still turned up no incontrovertible evidence of intelligence away from Earth. Until now.

In retrospect, we should have expected to find traces of long-gone travellers. Interstellar visits were actually more likely in ancient times than now. The Galaxy's peak star-formation rate seems to have been some five billion years ago =97 just before the birth of the Sun =97 so most stars and planetary systems must be older than our own. The Galaxy's climax as an arena for nurturing civilization was deep in the past.

And if they did come to the Solar System so long ago, where would they have visited?

Early Mars was more hospitable to life than Earth. Being smaller, Mars cooled quicker, and life made an earlier start. Mars was less of a target for the planet-sterilizing impactors that roamed the young Solar System. Young Mars even enjoyed an atmosphere rich in oxygen. Indeed, as everybody knows by now, we've confirmed that the original source of life on Earth was in fact Mars, transmitted by impact-detached meteorites.

There's the resolution to Fermi, at last. We don't see anybody because they have long gone, their worlds exhausted. And when they did come long ago, they didn't visit a roiling young Earth, but the relatively advanced biosphere of Mars.

We talk of nothing else. Our key activity next summer was to have been our ice core, kilometres long, all the way down to the basement rock. Now we don't care about Mars; we're diverting the core to try to get a sample of the 'city'. The biologists are excitedly debating how to distinguish any traces of life. But if the alien visitors practised Planetary Protection Protocols as scrupulously as we do, they may have left no trace of themselves at all.

It's driving me crazy. I'm bending mission rules to do it, but I go out in sleep periods, and walk away from the base, and think.

We humans are just not used to being alone. We evolved in a world full of non-human hominids, other kinds of mind. That's why we fill the sky with demons and aliens; we can't stand the echoing silence we have created. And now we know that we will find nothing out there among the stars but exhausted worlds, and museums, and ruins.

I keep these thoughts to myself. The martian winter is long, and morale is everything. I let it all out on the frozen air, under Jupiter's wheeling moons, a 50-year-old geologist as mixed up as a 10-year-old. Then I walk back to the human warmth of our base.

c. 2005 Nature Publishing 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 23:58:27 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:39:29 -0500
Subject: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

Source: NBC Nightly News via MSNBC,

<http://feeds.bignewsnetwork.com/redir.php?jid=3Db759b97391328a82&cat=3Db8de8=e630faf3631>

Go to the site for TV stream!

'Beam Me Up, General!'

Could 'Star Trek' technology help transport troops?

By Tom Costello
Correspondent
NBC News

Updated: 7:31 p.m. ET Feb. 9, 2005

To anyone who's ever watched Star Trek, teleportation is as basic as warp drives and dilithium crystals. But could science fiction become science fact? Is it possible to beam tanks and troops across the globe or behind enemy lines?

To find out, the propulsion research lab at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio =97 the same cutting-edge lab that helped bring stealth technology and lasers to the Air Force =97 commissioned a study.

"We have to be looking well into the future, not just the needs of tomorrow or even next year," says Col. Mike Heil, who directs the laboratory. "We're looking at perhaps 30 years."

The Air Force paid \$25,000 to a researcher at a company in Las Vegas called Warp Drive Metrics.

What they got back was 78 pages of mathematical calculations and diagrams. And after much talk of "wormholes" and "parallel universes," came a conclusion: "We are still very far away from being able to entangle and teleport human beings and bulk inanimate objects," reads page 46 of the report (PDF file).

In other words, says Heil: "The concept of transporting any large amount of matter is highly impractical and looks to be highly impractical well into the future."

Not according to Capt. Kirk.

"I could lead this whole thing!" jokes actor William Shatner.

Now retired from Star Fleet, he says a transporter, not teleporter, would have great practical use.

"From my house to these studios and avoid the traffic, it would be incredible," says Shatner.

The study's author thinks so, too. He recommends in the report spending \$7 million a year to see if it might be possible. NBC News tried to contact Warp Drive Metrics, but the calls were not

returned. The Air Force says the program will now disappear.

"The Air Force has made a decision not to invest in that anymore," says Heil.

It's science fiction with a price that's no fantasy.

c. 2005 MSNBC Interactive

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

New Info On Varginha At March Laughlin Convention

From: A. J. Gevaerd - Revista UFO <gevaerd.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:39:08 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:53:42 -0500
Subject: New Info On Varginha At March Laughlin Convention

Dear Colleagues:

For those of you planning to attend the 14th Annual International UFO Congress Convention and Film Festival, from March 6 to 12, in Laughlin, Nevada, I will be presenting, with Dr. Roger Leir, an in-depth lecture about the Varginha Case. Two non-human creatures were captured by the Brazilian Army after a crash of a flying object, January 20, 1996.

We have shocking info to deliver to the audience about the capture and removal of the creatures, about the autopsy procedures conducted on one of them, about the treatment and death of a military policeman who touched the second creature captured and about the procedures implemented at a hospital as an attempt to keep the second creature alive.

All of these issues will be presented in a fully illustrated, and much documented, lecture.

For those interested in attending, please visit:

www.ufocongress.com

or

e-mail: ufocongress.nul

A. J. Gevaerd, editor
Brazilian UFO Magazine
www.ufo.com.br
gevaerd.nul

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Bennewitz-Related Questions

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 3:21:06 -1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:59:47 -0500
Subject: Bennewitz-Related Questions

Nick Redfern,

I have gone through the posts by you, Bruce Maccabee, myself, and others in the December 2002 UFO UpDates archives. It is interesting to review the Bennewitz case and I have Greg Bishop's book on order.

Aside from all the craziness around Bennewitz, it is good to remember (as Bruce Maccabee jut reminded us) that there were genuine UFO sightings reported by members of the military.

Nick, in your December 16, 2002 post you stated that your two USAF contacts were to soon release their account of the above. I don't remember that happening. Did they ever release anything? Do you have any thing to add on this matter?

Thanks,

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:27:58 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:01:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Shough

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>If they are here, why wouldn't they
>occasionally crash? Nobody's perfect, not even if they were
>millions of years older than us. I assume even ancient aliens
>have to put their pants on one tentacle at a time.

Hi David

Nice! I nominate the above for Quote of the Month! :-)

>The "perfect aliens" argument seems to assume a race of beings
>totally incapable of such things as pilot error, and craft
>honed
>to such perfection that nothing could possibly go wrong with
>them. But what law says beings millions of years older than us
>are a million times less prone to error or can make things a
>million times less likely to fail? Far more likely, eventually
>biology and technology approach limits.

Not sure about this. The marvel of biological and, especially,
cultural evolution is that it is self-transforming and
redefines its own limits. By technology, in the broadest sense
of manipulating nature, we continually redefine the Laws of
Nature for the purpose of challenging them again.

>To cite one example, "Moore's Law" of microelectronics states
>that the number of transistors packed on microcircuits is in
>exponential growth and doubles about every two years or so. This
>has held true for over 30 years, but nobody in the business
>believes it likely to hold true for the next 30, much less a
>million years. In fact, physical limitations imposed by Nature
>indicate probably only another decade or two before Moore's Law
>ends and the complexity of silicon circuits plateaus.

Which invites transition to imminent new plateaux - photonics,
spintronics. And after that? Maybe the dreams of today's
theorists will lead to carrying out logic operations by
exploiting compactified string dimensions because the
"unification" energy really does turn out to be accessible in
the macroworld, well below the Planck regime, thus making not
only 2D wafer area but even 4D spacetime volume irrelevant to
"circuit design".

>Exponential growth can only go on for so long, whether it be
>technology or biology.

How long can an inflationary 4-space cosmos expand? What are the
"limits to growth" (yes I remember the 'sixties!) in an
infinite-dimensional inflationary multiverse?

>Another example is the strength of materials. Carbon nanotubes
>may be 100 times stronger than steel, but laws of chemistry and
>physics do not indicate any way to make materials 100 times
>stronger than nanotubes. The strength of chemical bonds have
>their limits, so ultimately the strength, heat resistance, and

>hardness of futuristic materials will reach limits as well.
>Aliens presumably are limited by the same laws of Nature as we
>are.

Suppose you don't need those old chemical bonds, even those old atomic structures? Suppose you re-engineer your matter without the weak links of electron bonds and all that old QED based science is in a museum somewhere? Suppose you've graduated to QCD-based technology with ways of manipulating the asymptotic freedom of the colour force, using gluon-boded quark structures that grow stronger the more you attempt to break them, in the limit of infinite rigidity? Suppose the 20th-century physics that hints at these way-out prospects is merely quaint from the perspective of a billion years of alien scientific paradigms, each more unimaginably strange than the last?

>Thus there are limits to how honed-to-perfection technology can
>become. It doesn't matter if aliens are only a thousand years
>ahead of us or a ten million years. Eventually even their
>techology will hit a wall (or a New Mexico arroyo).

Maybe. Perhaps the one wall that has been most widely and authoritatively held to be insurmountable by any technology, and for the longest time, is the speed of light in vacuum.....

>Last October I had a chance meeting with Gen. Wesley Clark when
>he was campaigning for John Kerry. The year before in the
>primaries, Clark had stated his belief that mankind would
>eventually travel faster than light and go wherever they liked.
>He outlined a 100 year program in fundamental research to make
>this a reality, a remarkably ambitious and radical proposal for
>a Presidential candidate to make for something that is
>supposedly impossible to achieve. When I brought up Clark's
>previous statements about FTL travel and then asked him if he
>had ever been briefed on the subject of UFOs while in the
>military, Clark coyly dropped a number of broad hints indicating
>that he had. He said that he had "heard a bit," that there were
>indeed "things going on," but that we would have to "work out
>our own mathematics," a statement he also made when he outlined
>his FTL research plan.

Maybe there really ain't no mountain high enough?

Regards,

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - Cammack

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 15:31:12 +0200
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:05:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - Cammack

>From: Sheryl Gottschall <gottscha.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 10:43:55 +1000
>Subject: Women In Ufology [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:03:27 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>There are thousands of women in "Ufology", actually probably
>>many more than men.

>>The only trouble is, they fall under the New Age banner and so
>>wouldn't last 3 minutes on this List.

<snip>

>Without this getting into a gender difference issue (hopefully)
>I have to agree with Stuart.

<snip>

>Traditionally, men have held the commanding influence in the UFO
>field but I wonder how Ufology might change if more of the
>female focus were included. Would we take the same path, explore
>the same issues, align ourselves to the same "research" values,
>respond to the same influences? My observation is that UFO
>research today is lopsided and besides the complex nature of the
>phenomenon I feel it's also hindered by the male mindset and
>world view.

List,

I once did a gender study for one of the large UN agencies and found that the same 'boys with toys' attitude prevailed. Men were concerned with the logistics of aid delivery, trucks, airplanes etc, rather than how the aid changed the lives of people, which had become more of a concern as women became bosses in the organisation (1990s and after). so i don't think the phenomenon you identify is restricted to UFO studies... That said, as a woman, my interests are much more 'scientific' than 'new age-ish' so its not a hard-and-fast rule.....

Diana
Cape Town

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Owens

From: Steve Owens <p944dc.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:51:11 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:07:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Owens

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>Thanks Dave, and sorry for all the <snips>.

>I was just looking for votes yea or nay on Roswell.

As you are merely looking for votes "yea or nay" please put me
- a Roswell Native - Go Coyotes! - in the Nay leaning crowd.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:55:09 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:10:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - Lehmberg

>From: Sheryl Gottschall <gottscha.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 10:43:55 +1000
>Subject: Women In Ufology [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:03:27 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>There are thousands of women in "Ufology", actually probably
>>many more than men.

>>The only trouble is, they fall under the New Age banner and so
>>wouldn't last 3 minutes on this List.

>Without this getting into a gender difference issue (hopefully)
>I have to agree with Stuart.

We shouldn't be so weirded out by the concept though; it's a largely unexplored difference contributing to an efficacious synergy that is easily measured... just in the quality of additional human beings it can generate. Brand new individuals to be broken or nurtured, and having to endure more of the former than the latter.

>By nature females have a different focus to males so we tend to
>explore areas that males wouldn't. Often these other fields of
>interest are considered to have less impact on the UFO subject
>because females (generally) will focus on the more nebulous
>areas which are indeed thought to be anything but "scientific"
>and possibly New Age-ish.

Yeah, and out of that focus springs the primary impetus to attempt the initial internal examinations and explorations of a very real inner space. These were the pioneers of mystery religions of the Greeks and Romans that would lead to Christianity and Islam, forgetting that it makes them the more credible as anecdotal ufo witnesses, perhaps. All through history women have given birth to the current iteration of new age, it is co-opted by males it seems, and then it becomes the tradition of Old Ages.....

>To understand why, by nature the males of our species focus on
>things and objects while females focus on people and feelings,
>that's the way we are made for survival.

A synergy producing the civilization presently enjoyed, even.

>But it would not be
>untrue to say that in the past the male focus on objects has
>taken precedence in UFO research. Even the name change by many
>UFO organizations to include the term UFO rather than the word
>alien or extraterrestrial is a reflection of the turn away from
>the female focus on people or living beings.

I have to agree, ma'am.

>In truth, it may have served UFO research far better if UFO
>organisations had included "alien" or ET in their titles.

Especially given that it's such a short step on a path to
conclusion.

>At
>least this would not have caused the same depotentiating effect
>as the term UFO which now diffuses what the UFO subject is
>really about, that is, extraterrestrial life NOT unidentified
>flying objects!

What remains then is only the gods and angels of the old tedious
traditions.

>Traditionally, men have held the commanding influence in the UFO
>field but I wonder how Ufology might change if more of the
>female focus were included.

A lot less confrontational. A lot less non-constructiveness. A
lot less casual enmity. I suspect.

>Would we take the same path, explore
>the same issues, align ourselves to the same "research" values,
>respond to the same influences? My observation is that UFO
>research today is lopsided and besides the complex nature of the
>phenomenon I feel it's also hindered by the
>male mindset and world view.

Amen to that.

>Sorry guys. No offence but we need both.

If for no other reason than we men-folks could would be improved
with more access and exposure to your corpus collossums.

>To read more please go to my article
>Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus,
>So Where Does That Leave Ufology?

"To prove my point further and relate it to Ufology, one cannot
fail to notice the proportion of men to women who speak at UFO
conferences, author UFO research articles, chair or preside over
UFO organizations, or who simply do the chatting on UFO email
lists. To be fair, women have not been discouraged from
participating in these areas but they have not been encouraged
either. One cannot help but wonder what may happen if they were,
or where that may lead Ufology in the future. If men and women
combined their strengths in the UFO endeavour it may offer a
more balanced approach in researching this enigmatic
phenomenon."

>at www.uforg.asn.au/articles/marsvenus.html

Women are always a large part of honor societies, too; men
rather explicably take the top honors in a tie, and have to be
patted on the head more.

You know... forgetting the wonderful potentials of synergy that
can occur as a result of a proximity to the genitals of male and
female human beings...Unfortunately, you shouldn't really
believe anything we might tell you about UFOs, on account of the
strong potentiality we're just trying to get laid. [g].

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Evidence For Present Life On Mars

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 15:30:55 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 15:53:52 -0500
Subject: Evidence For Present Life On Mars

Source: Space.Com

http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/mars_life_050216.html

02-1-05
02:09 pm ET

Exclusive: NASA Researchers Claim Evidence of Present Life on Mars

By Brian Berger
Space News Staff Writer

WASHINGTON -- A pair of NASA scientists told a group of space officials at a private meeting here Sunday that they have found strong evidence that life may exist today on Mars, hidden away in caves and sustained by pockets of water.

The scientists, Carol Stoker and Larry Lemke of NASA's Ames Research Center in Silicon Valley, told the group that they have submitted their findings to the journal Nature for publication in May, and their paper currently is being peer reviewed.

What Stoker and Lemke have found, according to several attendees of the private meeting, is not direct proof of life on Mars, but methane signatures and other signs of possible biological activity remarkably similar to those recently discovered in caves here on Earth.

Stoker and other researchers have long theorized that the Martian subsurface could harbor biological organisms that have developed unusual strategies for existing in extreme environments. That suspicion led Stoker and a team of U.S. and Spanish researchers in 2003 to southwestern Spain to search for subsurface life near the Rio Tinto river - so-called because of its reddish tint - the product of iron being dissolved in its highly acidic water.

Stoker did not respond to messages left Tuesday on her voice mail at Ames.

Stoker told SPACE.com in 2003, weeks before leading the expedition to southwestern Spain, that by studying the very acidic Rio Tinto, she and other scientists hoped to characterize the potential for a "chemical bioreactor" in the subsurface - an underground microbial ecosystem of sorts that might well control the chemistry of the surface environment.

Making such a discovery at Rio Tinto, Stoker said in 2003, would mean uncovering a new, previously uncharacterized metabolic strategy for living in the subsurface. "For that reason, the search for life in the Rio Tinto is a good analog for searching for life on Mars," she said.

Stoker told her private audience Sunday evening that by comparing discoveries made at Rio Tinto with data collected by ground-based telescopes and orbiting spacecraft, including the European Space Agency's Mars Express, she and Lemke have made a

very a strong case that life exists below Mars' surface.

The two scientists, according to sources at the Sunday meeting, based their case in part on Mars' fluctuating methane signatures that could be a sign of an active underground biosphere and nearby surface concentrations of the sulfate jarosite, a mineral salt found on Earth in hot springs and other acidic bodies of water like Rio Tinto that have been found to harbor life despite their inhospitable environments.

One of NASA's Mars Exploration Rovers, Opportunity, bolstered the case for water on Mars when it discovered jarosite and other mineral salts on a rocky outcropping in Meridiani Planum, the intrepid rover's landing site chosen because scientists believe the area was once covered by salty sea.

Stoker and Lemke's research could lead the search for Martian biology underground, where standing water would help account for the curious methane signatures the two have been analyzing.

"They are desperate to find out what could be producing the methane," one attendee told Space News. "Their answer is drill, drill, drill."

NASA has no firm plans for sending a drill-equipped lander to Mars, but the agency is planning to launch a powerful new rover in 2009 that could help shed additional light on Stoker and Lemke's intriguing findings. Dubbed the Mars Science Laboratory, the nuclear-powered rover will range farther than any of its predecessors and will be carrying an advanced mass spectrometer to sniff out methane with greater sensitivity than any instrument flown to date.

In 1996 a team of NASA and Stanford University researchers created a stir when they published findings that meteorites recovered from the Allen Hills region of Antarctica contained evidence of possible past life on Mars. Those findings remain controversial, with many researchers unconvinced that those meteorites held even possible evidence that very primitive microbial life had once existed on Mars.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 16](#)

Re: Bennewitz-Related Questions - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skyman22.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:02:59 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 16:14:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Bennewitz-Related Questions - Hamilton

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 3:21:06 -1000
>Subject: Bennewitz-Related Questions

>Nick Redfern,

>I have gone through the posts by you, Bruce Maccabee, myself,
>and others in the December 2002 UFO UpDates archives. It is
>interesting to review the Bennewitz case and I have Greg
>Bishop's book on order.

<snip>

I just finished reading Bishop's book and it is quite well written - with some minor inaccuracies. I was surprised to find that he mentioned the "orbs" seen in Paul's house by Bill Moore and Rick Doty (and others).

He had no explanation for these. This book pretty much affirms what I learned about Paul years ago.

- Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Filer's Files #8 - 2005

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:25:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 08:59:18 -0500
Subject: Filer's Files #8 - 2005

Filer's Files #8 - 2005,
Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director MUFON Eastern
Vice President of Skywatch International
February 16, 2005, Web: www.georgefiler.com

Webmaster: C E Warren www.cewarren.com

Sightings Increase After Holidays

The purpose of these files is to report weekly the UFO eyewitness and photo/video evidence that occurs on a daily basis around the world and in space. Many people claim it is impossible for UFOs to visit Earth, I ask you only to keep an open mind and watch the evidence we accumulate each week. These Files make the assumption that extraterrestrial intelligent life not only exists, but my hypothesis is that of the over one hundred UFOs reported each week many represent a factual UFO sighting.

Mars - Possible fossil found and another pyramid found infers life.

UFOs were seen over Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin. Sightings were also reported in Australia, Belize, Canada, Chile, France, Iran, Ireland, and the United Kingdom.

Mars - Possible Fossil Found

Nick Balaskas writes, "Remember back in August 7, 1996 when President Clinton was forced to make the startling and unexpected disclosure that, after many years of analysis of a rock found in Antarctica believed to have originated Mars, we had finally found evidence of past life on Mars? Thanks to the highly successful Mars Landers Opportunity and Spirit, they have found other much more compelling evidence (eg. rotini fossils and lichen) of past - and present - life on actual Mars rocks.

If we also include some other very puzzling and still not easily explained pictures of what look like macro-organisms on Mars that have been imaged by the U.S. and European spacecrafts still orbiting this Earth like planet, I would not be surprised to hear President Bush soon make an official announcement of "bushes" or other such life on Mars. For researchers like George Filer, Mac Tonnies and many other UFO UpDates listers, this disclosure would not have come soon enough. Opportunity's Microscopic Imager found this intriguing object, looking more like Rotini pasta. Its odd shape has stirred up Mars researchers, both inside and outside of the NASA Mars Rover Exploration team. This object appears to be related to biology and likely represents life beyond Earth./has prompted a variety of views.

http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/mystery_monday_050214.html

Thanks to Nick Balaskas

Mars - Pyramids Are Not Natural Formations

Mountains rarely if ever are formed in the shaped of pyramids. However, on Mars many pyramids are apparent in the JPL/NASA photos indicating that they were built or formed in this shape. Various pyramids on Earth such as those in Egypt and Mexico are clearly built by intelligence. NASA/JP: photo thanks to Mac Tonnie's.[Unable to display image]

It is logical to assume that the pyramids on Mars were also built or formed by intelligence. Another triangular shape to the right also seems to be a topographic feature. These features look very similar to Earth satellite photos of Middle East ruins.

Arizona - Pyramid Lights

MESA - The observer was coming home from work when he saw a bright red light in the sky on February 2, 2005, at 12:50 AM. He kept following south on Ellsworth Highway and a bright blue light appeared right next to it going the same direction. He pulled over to the side of the road and noticed the blue light disappeared and then another red light appeared in front of the other red light. He states, "In my personal opinion I witnessed one of the triangle UFO's. I didn't see the shape of the craft but these lights were moving slow and didn't resemble any type of plane or helicopter. At 01:05 AM, the two red lights continued southeast. I felt this was not a normal airliner or helicopter cruising through the night sky. They were way too bright and moving much slower than a normal plane. THEY LOOKED LIKE POLICE LIGHTS IN THE SKY!" Thanks to Peter Davenport
Director www.nuforc.org

California - Huge Triangle and Donut

LOS ANGELES - The witness reports, "I was driving with my son, who is 12 years old in North Hollywood about 5 PM on January 29, 2005, when my child said, " Mom, look up, UFO!" "When I looked up, I saw an object moving in the sky straight above us that was size of a helicopter and the same height, but it was a strange shape. It was round with a hole in the middle like a donut, or disk with a hole. It was black and you could see sky through the hole. It looked like nothing else I ever seen before. I parked my car so we could see better. It was flying from North Hollywood towards West Hollywood. The movement was unusual, just like it was spinning or wobbling. The edges were going slightly up and down, like it was maneuvering in the air with it=92s own body and you could see it clearly. We watched for four minutes until it became a black dot." www.nuforc.org

BERKELEY -- I was in the shower and I looked out the window on February 2, 2005, at 7:30 AM, and saw an orange oval, it was fairly high in the sky. Once I saw it, it just hovered over a park and a few seconds later it started to fly off extremely fast. www.nuforc.org

PENN VALLEY -- At 6:15 PM the power went out at the observer=92s house that is located in the foothills around a lake. About 7 PM, he went outside and the wind was gusting to 60 mph+ when he saw an almost rectangular extremely large craft. It was slightly more narrow in the front. It was about half a football field or 150 feet long. A small box (6"x6") at arm=92s length wouldn=92t have covered the entire craft. It had four circular dim ambers/yellow lights on each corner of the craft that appeared to emit some sort of haze that had an amber color. It moved very slowly. Taking several seconds to come into complete view as it passed directly over my house. One look at it and I knew it wasn=92t normal. There were no wings, no blinking aircraft lights, and it was absolutely quiet.

I ran inside and got my girlfriend who became really frightened nearly in tears saying "oh my God oh my God, what is that thing?" The winds were very intense. The craft continued on its easterly course until it passed over the horizon. The bottom wasn=92t completely flat and had several ridges running from front to back. About five minutes later, to the northeast a very large dome shaped, deep blue flash went off. The flash was very odd. It appeared to explode then implode. The explosion expanded in a dome fashion and lit up the entire sky. About 20 minutes later the wind was back to being ABSOLUTELY DEAD CALM. We are located

not too far from Beale AFB. The paper said the cause of the power outage was that two - 60kv wires hit each other causing the blackout. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Connecticut - Two Sets of Blinking and Disk

NEW HARTFORD -- I have seen a blinking light in the sky during many nights. I have pointed it out to many of my friends and they all saw it too on February 2, 2005, at 8 PM. They blink rapidly red, white, and blue. Just recently I was able to see the lights very well with binoculars and was able to see it a little clearer. Thanks to Peter Davenport

WEST HAVEN- Seven friends were playing out side when they saw a UFO on February 7, 2005, at midnight. The disk shaped thing was red and yellow and flew really slow like it was watching us. It then flew up and did a flip and disappeared. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

District of Columbia - Webcam Photographs UFO

A webcam that sends images of the U.S. Capitol area over the Web reportedly photographed an UFO at about 3:15 AM on February 10, 2005. The webcam is reportedly operated by the National Park Service and is located bordering the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery and faces east. The image shows an apparently large, flat, metallic-appearing object with the Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial and U.S. Capitol building in the background.

A researcher with IntelDesk.com reported that he spotted the image on the webcam feed and posted the images on their site. Thanks to mediavillage.com, Skywatch International and National Park Service

Florida - Shiny Sphere

TALLAHASSEE - The witness noticed a flying jet way up leaving a vapor trail at 7:30 AM, and maybe a 1,000 feet above it was a round perfect sphere, silver, and very shiny. The reason it caught my eye was because it was leaving no vapor trail at all, and it wasn't flying formation with the jet, except it would move side to side a little. Then, all of a sudden it disappeared. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Georgia - Massive Lights

Ellersli -- Carolyn Linn/Cab reports, my family drove home on February 12, 2002, when they noticed a beam of light through the trees. He states, "I pulled my truck down the road and was amazed when the beam disappeared." Still watching, it came back, but this time with flashing lights of blue, white, and red. I turned the truck lights off and stopped. It was moving...toward us so, we drove south onto Highway 85 to follow it, then onto County Line Road and a back road. Driving north we came to the power lines and saw a large white light just above the treetops. The white light transformed into blinking lights of red, blue, white around this MASSIVE piece of equipment. This object made absolutely no sound and slowly moved right in front of us. I quickly turned the truck to keep up with it and suddenly it was gone. We notified the sheriff and local TV station but there were no other reports. It was truly amazing, there is no reasonable explanation for this sighting. It was much too large, too low, and no sound. We saw this thing up close, very close. Thanks to Carolyn Linn/Cab

Illinois - Bight Fireballs in the sky

NAPERVILLE - The witness stated, " I'm a 22 year old male, active sky watcher and I was admiring the strange, glittery really fine powder snow that was falling at a steady rate on January 27, 2005, at 4:15 PM. Looking up I saw a UFO, literally in the shape of a U that was 90% invisible with a distinct outline of the craft. It had three opaque whitish spots at the rear lights? It traveled fairly slow and it approached the moon. The light of the moon revealed the entire craft. The clouds were a dark purple hue above the craft. It was bigger than the full moon. The glow of the moon amplified the image of the craft and actually revealed its outline further to about 80% visible. It was about three inches from the moon and it took about 10 seconds for it to pass the moon, at which point I could no

longer see it. Thanks to Peter Davenport

NEWTON -- My children and I were on our way home, when we saw two large fireballs, that moved crisscross from each other, then disappeared on February 4, 2005, at 7:30 AM. We pulled over at the rest area and watched the lights in the sky that seemed to dance. Another fireball appeared and we got in the car and follows towards Olney. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

New Jersey - Fireball 5-10 Minutes

BROOKLYN - The witness reports, "I'm a 16 year old high school student and I was witness to a sighting, that appeared on ABC News, on February 2, 2005, at 2:30 PM. I looked out my window and saw what looked like vertical lines in the grayish-blue clouds with lines that were almost gold. Then one by one more ribs appeared. One was headed towards the Verazanno Bridge. There were two orbs near the bridge and one of the "lines" went from vertical to horizontal, and became fireballs, almost like jets. The jet-trail disappeared, almost like a comet. The one by the bridge slowly moved, and the two spheres disappeared, and that one line kind of just drifted, but eventually it went out of my line of sight, due to a tree, and that was it. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Indiana - UFO Hovers and Melts Frozen Pond

COLUMBIA CITY -- This was an evening of ice fishing I will never forget! Coming over the trees was an elongated triangular shaped "thing." It was hovering over the east end of the small farm pond I was fishing on January 31, 2005, at 10 PM. It moved over the frozen water and lowered slowly. It sat motionless without a sound for a minute or two. As it rose silently, "steam" rose from the lake. The object slipped quietly past the trees and floated out of sight (my line of sight was obscured by trees). We used our cell phone and called the local sheriff, but there was no answer, as our cell phones had both gone dead. This was strange. Also, our battery operated fish locator (Vexilar) was also affected, we believe. The area of the pond where the object hovered was melted into about two inches. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Editor's Note: Almost every year a report is received of UFOs melting ice or breaking through the ice.

Ohio - Formation of Five Disks

ADAMSVILLE -- Five shiny identical objects that at first resembled airplanes with short trails were observed on February 2, 2005, at 5:40 PM. They spread across the horizon moving very slow towards a large purple cloud. The objects were spotted while driving and it took a while to realize how slow the objects were moving along Route 93 coming from Otsego towards Adamsville. The witness pulled over to take pictures, and they observed five clearly visible objects along with a possible sixth. They watched for another ten to fifteen minutes. We examined photos this evening and saw a very odd crazy looking sphere in front of sun that we did not notice by eye. Those photos were taken approx. 25 miles north and about an hour before. We thought it was a blemish in photo, but examination of two photos taken at a 45 degree angle from one another show symmetrical sphere and the reflection of it is visible in the water. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

FOSTORIA -- George Ritter sends a VHS image of a UFO over frozen pond earlier this winter.[]

Pennsylvania - Triangle

CLARKS SUMMIT -- On February 1, 2005, at 7 PM, my daughter and I looked through the trees in our backyard and we saw bright white lights that looked like a triangle, with three distinct points. The object hovered over the trees for a second and then the three points seemed to break off and fly close together, extremely fast. We were getting in the car anyway and decided to follow them as best as we could. We noticed them only for a couple of minutes and then lost sight of them. This was the strangest thing I have ever seen! A craft that split up into three speeding crafts with white lights and little or no sound. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

MIDDLETOWN -- I was looking up, to the sky in the middle of the night looking at the stars on February 6, 2005, at 1:08 AM. As I looked up I saw an airplane flying from my left to the right. Just then I saw two orange lights moving in a circular motion glided from my right to my left. It lasted about 10 to 15 seconds. The lights were dim and then the lights faded away. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Rhode Island - Light

SCITUATE -- I have seen this light in the night sky since the summer of 2004. I see this light in the southeastern sky after dark on a very regular basis, and saw it again on February 2, 2005, at 8:30 PM. The light at first glance looks like any other star but if you fixate your eye to the other stars in the area, this one twinkles more AND it has motion up down and left right. The color is like a police car light bar red/white/blue at great distance. I do not think it is a planet, air craft or satellite. I do see aircraft in the sky occasionally when I see this object. It would seem that the object could be off the coast over the Atlantic Ocean. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Tennessee - Trucker Reports Hovering Triangle

MORRISTOWN -- MUFON reports, a tractor-trailer driver called to report that he was driving north on Interstate 81 at approx. 21:00 hours on January 26, 2005, when he saw three bright reddish lights ahead of him in the sky. He drove for several minutes noting that the object appeared to be hovering as it drew closer. He arrived at a point where he could safely pull off the interstate and did so, exited his truck and watched the strange object. He described the object as a dark triangular object, backlit by the bright nearly full moon with three large reddish orange lights affixed to each point. The object was hovering at some 45 degrees to his position and was the relative size of a golfball at arm's length. He described the object as slowly rotating but making no other discernible movements. After several more minutes, the object simply disappeared. The witness is an Air Force veteran, therefore a trained witness and quite adamant that this was no conventional aircraft. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Texas - Video of Strange Green Light

KAUFMAN COUNTY -- The observer took a video of green dancing lights on February 10, 2005, at about 7:30 PM. He states, "I was looking straight up when I saw this light moving due north and jumped out of my truck, turned the camcorder on but could see nothing, and thought the thing was broke. When I figured the dust caps were still on, I took them off and started taping. As I zoomed in on it, I saw it was green, first one of these I've seen. The clouds were still coming in from the west, but it was still kind of clear in that part of the sky. Lots of green things have seen here lately. I am glad I got this one."

Brilliant Green Light Filmed - Footage 1.45 mbs
<http://www.hbccufo.org/videos/GreenGlowingLight2005.wmv> Thanks to Brian Vike, Director HBCC UFO Research www.hbccufo.com

Utah - Light

RIVERDALE -- Not much to describe. I was outside, getting ready to take a drive up to the mountains, when I happened to look up, just in time to watch a light briefly streak across the sky on February 4, 2005, at 7:54 AM. At first I thought that it may have been a meteor, but then I realized that it didn't have a trail behind it. Usually, this is the case. But, there was no trail, or anything else! The light was moving WNW to SSE at about 40 degrees above the horizon. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

WASHINGTON - Disk and Triangle

ISSAQUAH --As I was driving north on February 7, 2005, at 6 PM., I saw four crafts with red and white lights hovering over Lake Sammamish. For a long time they did not move at all. I thought they must be helicopters but I have never seen helicopters with lights like that. There were about three red lights in a row and a white light that flashed. I cannot account for them other than

to think they were UFOs.

YELM -- My boyfriend Nathan and I were driving on Yelm Highway about 7 PM, on January 30, 2005, and the road is surrounded by forest. One side of the road is part of Fort Lewis when all of sudden we saw this aircraft hovering above the trees right beside the highway. The aircraft was triangular and had two square lights at the bottom and there was no cockpit in sight. It was thick and it had a light at every corner. We were driving by it slowly but another car was following too close and we almost got in an accident. We manage to recover and just drive away. The oddest thing was that it hovered and there was no sound. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Wisconsin - UFO Images

GREEN BAY - The observer was out taking a few sunset photos and noticed a bright spot within several photos. I looked down at the screen of my camera to make sure I was getting the image, when I looked up the object was gone. This all took about ten to fifteen seconds. Thanks to David and Skywatch International.
Australia - Videos

ATHERTON TABLELANDS -- Brian Vike reports on February 12, 2004, that Australian gentleman wrote that he and his partner have been witnessing and filming numerous objects in the night skies. Some are orbs, saucers, triangular craft and unusual lights. He has taken a stack of photos and a great deal of footage and I will be reporting on what the fellow sends along to me.

The Atherton Tablelands in north Queensland are 3,500 feet above sea level, tropical, with sunny days /clear nights. They are up the road from Tully a well know hotspot for UFO sightings. Thanks to Brian Vike and see video at:
<http://www.hbccufo.org/videos/25novufo.asx>

Belize - Saw UFO During Cruise

CARIBBEAN --On January 25, 2005, about ten at night the observers noticed bright lights that were very strange above their ship on a cruise. While sitting out on our balcony I notice an intense light flashing red green and white. I thought it was an airplane, but the light never got any closer or further away. We notice that the lights were extremely bright. As we kept watching it started darting around real fast and goes back to the same spot. My partner went to bed I kept watching it, it seem to be shooting or launching something from it. There would be a streak of light shoot in to space. I have short film footage of the object

Canada - Three Lights

OSHAWA, ONTARIO - Agnes Sroczyński reports "Between 3 and 5 AM, a large vertical row of three lights was observed on February 13, 2005, flying quickly over, and then hovered for a few minutes before going into the clouds." The object had a large vertical row of three lights. The bottom light was brightest and whitest, very large and flashing rapidly and somewhat erratically.

Middle light was closer to bottom light, about a fourth it's size, dimmer, and not flashing. Top light was a third the size of the bottom light, dimmer still, dark red, and flashing slowly and steadily. There was no sound.

The object glided across the sky quickly in one direction, changed directions a few times, then hovered for a few minutes before going into the clouds. In the clouds, which were misty, wispy and transparent, it had a disc-shaped halo, lighting up the mist enough to see the droplets in the air, and was much larger than any commercial aircraft. It disappeared for a few minutes, flashed the red light again once, and was gone.

About an hour later it reappeared much lower in the sky, drifting downwards, and disappearing over Lake Ontario. My friend and I were driving West on Regional Rd 22. The lights also moved from being lined up vertically to horizontally a few times, and the largest light dipped well below the others even when it was lined up horizontally. My friend noticed that the radio was distorted for a few minutes as it drifted over the

lake, and the intersection we were at was stuck at an all-way stop except for one pedestrian light that was stuck on go, [I didn't associate this with the object, but my friend totally did] until the object disappeared [maybe four minutes]. We both felt a distinct "tingling" and "hair-raising" sensation at our chest and crown, too! The object was moving west, then changing directions, then hovering, then down straight over or into the lake. Estimated height and speed of approach and departure: 3000 feet? then 1000 feet?

Moving very fast, again I can't be sure of how fast, then drifting down very slowly in almost totally straight down, but with a slight arc Thanks to Agnes Sroczyński

CHILE - Cylinder Shaped Craft

NOGALES - I saw a cylinder shaped object crossing the sky when I was swimming in my pool. It was flying really fast and it left a trail behind.

Iran - UFO Sightings are Likely US Drones

Apparently the US has been flying unmanned drones over Iran to look for evidence of nuclear weapons programs and to probe air defenses according the Washington Post. Iranian officials say Iran has decided not to engage the pilotless aircraft rather than tip off its air defense capabilities. Iranians who live along the Caspian Sea and on the Iraq border have reported sightings of red flashes in the sky, streaks of green and blue and low flying lights.

South Africa - Five Objects In a Straight Line

JOHANNESBURG -- Multiple witnesses report seeing five bright white lights in a straight line moving very slow from west to east at 9:07 PM. Photos were taken with a Nokia 5140 cell phone but the clearest one was a corrupt picture or format. At the same time my nephew and his girlfriend phoned me and told me that they were seeing these amazing five bright "green" lights and that people were actually pulling of the road looking and trying to take photos. I told him to try to video record as well from his phone "6600" and bring it to me as I cannot open my photos. He assured me they were green and he was taking as much as he could. I took three pictures in which you can see lights, but there were only four lights in the pictures.

France - Triangular UFOs Seen

PARIS - On February 9, 2005, a huge triangular object was observed by French observer Mathieu Cozanet at 9:50 PM, moving slowly through the night sky at almost rooftop altitude. The witness was in a small public park at the corner of Rue d'Alesia and Rue Vercingeton in the 1st Arrondissement when he looked up to see a huge triangular craft, just visible against the night sky disappearing over the roofs of buildings. Mr. Cozanet's made this drawing of what he witnessed. To read Mr. Cozanet's description of the recent Paris sighting and see his recreations, go to www.unknowncountry.com

UK/Ireland - Three Strong Lights

CASHEL - My friends are in a band and we were driving back from a gig and stopped the van just before 6 AM, north of the town of Cashel near Thurles, on February 5, 2005. They looked up to see three large bright lights, too bright and low to be stars. The lights were independent and lined up on top of each other with the top light slightly off to one side. Suddenly, fighter planes began approaching the lights from three different directions and at this point the middle light began to flash very quickly blinking on/off. All three lights simply faded out by the time the planes had reached the point in the sky where they were located.

UK/ENGLAND - BLACK TRIANGULAR CRAFT

NOTTINGHAM -- On February 2, 2005, at 11:40 AM, the observer was outside having a cigarette and looked up to see a triangular black object move across the sky very fast and I couldn't stop staring, then, it went vertically upwards and vanished.

Subscribe to Filer's Files to receive UFO CD

So you won't miss a single breaking news story or the increased evidence for UFO and life in the universe. Major George A. Filer (USAFretired) has been bringing you the latest in UFO news since 1995, on radio, television and the internet.

Your dollars do make a difference! We appreciate our loyal subscribers but expenses far exceed intake. Annual Membership is only \$25 for 52 weekly intelligence reports. Don't miss the latest images of UFOs from Earth and Mars. Subscribe today and receive a free UFO Photo CD. Send check or money order to:

George Filer
222 Jackson Road
Medford
NJ 08055

You can also Click:

<https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr>

for [majorstar.nul](#) You may use Paypal, Visa, American Express, or Master Charge.

"Life on Mars" UFOs over Mars

Your chance to get your (fingers) on the throttle of significant and up to-date UFO info as well as the real deal on the Mars expedition. Get your official and private DVD copy now for \$25. Send your contact info to: [jlpromo2001.nul](#) or mail your check to Fast Street Productions, 37 Surrey Lane, Willingboro, NJ 08046 or pay: "<https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr> for [majorstar.nul](#)

Free Relocation Information

Get your free report and learn how you can obtain the best real estate agent to help you relocate, buy or sell a home. To get a free copy of this report e-mail me at : [Majorstar.nul](#)

For data on the sun, earthquakes, and space go to Earth Change TV for the latest info on our changing earth.
"<http://www.earthchangestv.com>

MUFON UFO JOURNAL -- For more detailed monthly investigative reports subscribe to the MUFON JOURNAL. A MUFON membership includes the Journal and costs only \$45.00 per year. To join MUFON or to report a UFO go to "<http://www.mufon.com/>". To ask questions contact [MUFONHQ.nul](#) or HQ.nul

Filer's Files is copyrighted 2004 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post the COMPLETE files on their Web Sites if they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue. These reports and comments are not necessarily the OFFICIAL MUFON viewpoint. Send your letters to [Majorstar.nul](#) Sending mail automatically grants permission for us to publish and use your name. Please state if you wish to keep your name or e-mail confidential. CAUTION, MOST OF THESE ARE INITIAL REPORTS AND REQUIRE FURTHER INVESTIGATION.

God Bless Our Troops

George A. Filer Visit the www.nationalufocenter.com

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Big Doings On SDI Saturday Night

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:59:49 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 09:23:08 -0500
Subject: Big Doings On SDI Saturday Night

Greetings to the Listerons,

Big doings on Strange Days... Indeed - this week. Errol and I will be presenting new audio clips of importance to the field of Ufology.

For the first time since February 23, 1942 we will re-air the actual broadcast news report of the Battle of Los Angeles. This complements the FOIA acquisition of documents recently obtained by Jim Klotz at CUFON.

I first obtained a version of the recording late last summer, on a well-worn transcription. Then a few weeks ago I received a copy, in better condition, from non-ufological, historical researcher, Karl Rotstan, who should share as co-contributor on Saturday's SDI broadcast. His copy saved me many hours of work!

Later, we'll play Vickie Landrum's first call for assistance to Bob Gribble at NUFORC, about a month after she and Betty Cash became ill from the effects of a UFO they encountered near Dayton, TX. This is the first time this recording has been publicly aired and is unknown to the vast majority of researchers.

Then we'll hear Dr. Ivan T. Sanderson, away from the Long John Nebel radio show, as he smoozes with a Seattle, Washington-area flying saucer club, in 1959. A whole new side to Ivan than was previously, publicly, known. Jerry Clark did a recent review of the newly discovered recording in the current issue of CUFOS' International UFO Reporter (IUR), which you might enjoy.

Ufology's audio 'documents' are important tools for understanding case material and present the human side of the field. I have been attempting to make as many of these recordings available to the research community for the last few years. Written documentation is limited, but combined with the audio recordings, new avenues are open for exploration by researchers.

If you are getting a tad bit bored with the written record, maybe it's time to consider listening to the spoken word documentation. But, I do have to warn potential listeners that these recordings are addictive! <G> But, you certainly get a much broader view of cases and people than the written word presents.

Compilations of MP3 format recordings are available by donation. Please visit my website at:

www.fadeddiscs.com

for details on obtaining these compilations. Which should have some collectors value in the future, as I produce only a small quantity of each title.

Join Errol and I on Strange Days...Indeed Saturday night, at 10:00 p.m. Eastern, on NewsTalk CFRB 1010 in Toronto or CJAD 800 in Montreal. Both stations are available via the Web in streaming Winows Media Player format.

Visit:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.com/ufo/sdi/program/sdi2005.html>

for details and to listen online to the newest audio discoveries
in Ufology.

Thank you,

Wendy Connors

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hamilton

From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:22:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hamilton

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>Maybe a thousand years from now our spacecraft will be a million
>>times safer than they are now, and passenger space travel will
>>be as common as jet travel today. But even then there will be
>>the occasional crash. Pilots will still make mistakes, highly
>>advanced technology will still sometimes fail, and the
>>unexpected will still happen. Nothing is ever perfect.

>I was buying your arguments up until this point.

>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

I disagree with this. As our own aviation development advances toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our space shuttles did not fare well either.

Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien environment where an unanticipated source of interference could not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may have happened.

I believe there is no good reason to exclude the ETH as an explanation of the Roswell incident.

>No, if the alien race is far advanced then there are no limits
>to the safety or defense of their vehicles. There is not pilot
>error because the control would be handed over to automated
>intelligences which are constantly generating millions of
>scenarios every millisecond to assure the safety of the crew.
>Failure of hardware can obviously occur but are these aliens
>cheapskates who only have zero-fault tolerance? I doubt it. The
>most likely design of any spacecraft with beings would be two
>fault tolerance. And remember these beings should be able to
>afford it because they have already decided to invest vast sums
>of resources to get to Earth.

Yes, and our shuttle computers and yet things can go wrong. The Space Shuttle uses a complex set of software and hardware to

guide, navigate and control it through all phases of flight. Five IBM AP-101B flight computers host a set of highly critical and complex programs. The current man-machine interface consists of a series of dedicated electromechanical instruments and switches combined with specialized displays with limited function.

If an alien craft is on its first sortie to a planet, its advanced control system may not be programmed for all eventualities. We cannot presume to know what weaknesses exist in an alien society. It might even be presumed that one of the aliens could have sabotaged the ship because it was unhappy with the other crew members or its compensation or it could be the crew were biological machines that malfunctioned for spurious reasons. There are so many possibilities that cannot be ruled out.

The important thing is not the possibilities. The important thing is the evidence and whether those who examined the physical evidence found that it pointed to something that was out of this world.

-Bill H

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:24:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 22:32:37 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 14:30:04 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:20:52 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

Sigh, John,

I guess I've learned my lesson. Never attempt to engage a pelicanist in light-hearted banter.

>>>come along to a meeting of a splendid organisation known as
>>>"Sceptics in the Pub" he would find a fair sprinkling of females
>>>present. Fewer than the number of men, certainly, but then I
>>>think, despite the names he mentions, the number of women active
>>>in the UFO world is also significantly fewer than the men.

>>I presume you are referring to wives and girl friends, not to
>>active pelicanists. I offer no explanation for the reason this
>>is so. It's just an observation. One of those mysteries of
>>gender about which one speculates at one's peril.

>What a strangely chauvinistic response from someone I had always
>considered to be politically and socially progressive.

Jeez, the hand you're dealing must be even lousier than usual.
Having no argument to offer, you play - here's a shock - the
political- correctness card. At least you held off on the Canby
card, however momentarily (see below).

An actual response would have been to cite names and
publications by female pelicanists who have written for Magonia
and are visibly active in its campaign against UFO and related
heresies.

Since you fail to do so - cannot do so, I gather - I am forced to
conclude that you have made my case.

Unless, of course, you have defined "active pelicanist" downward
to denote persons whose sole activity consists of observing you
as you carry on in bars.

>Maybe in the staid bars of Canby, MN., which you have so vividly
>described to us, ladies need to be accompanied by husbands or
>gentlemen friends, lest they be considered flappers and
>flooies, but in the more cosmopolitan centres of both our great
>nations, young (and not so young) ladies are free to visit bars,
>pubs and other licensed premises without the necessity of
>chaperones; and I assure you this is that case with those who

>attend "Sceptics in the Pub" meetings.

Could it be that the flock can only squawk senselessly and shake off feathers frantically when I show up with a rhetorical shotgun? For an example of that in action, note the wholly predictable and irrelevant mention of my hometown - an object, as we have seen, of curious and even disturbing obsession within the feathered flock, aka the residence police, both on this List and in the pelicanist spiritual journal Magonia. I am sure there must be a psychosocial explanation for the anxiety betrayed thereby, but I confess that none comes immediately to mind. Maybe I should start attending those "Sceptics in Pub" meetings in whatever city or town or village or pastoral landscape claims Rimmer as resident.

Anyway, to the point, John, on the charitable assumption that you're attempting to make one:

Knowing nothing about something - in this case gender mores in Minnesota - and underscoring as much in your odd outburst above, you nonetheless bloviate bravely onward. How very pelicanist of you.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:27:40 -0500
Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's interview for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in the finished piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his death, and the only interview he'd granted for a major program in many years.

We are absolutely stunned by this information, and cannot conceive of how a documentary purporting to explore the subject of alien encounters could have been made without the views of the man who was arguably the world's leading authority on how these encounters affect people's lives. It is also deeply saddening news, since it was hoped that this program would in some ways serve as a farewell to a great man.

Mack's interview for "Peter Jennings Reports: The UFO Phenomenon: Seeing is Believing" was conducted at his home in Cambridge, MA, on August 19. It was Mack's only interview recorded in high definition widescreen, which, in addition to the reasons noted above, makes the footage exceptionally valuable for production companies. We are therefore currently seeking out information on whether the footage will be able to be licensed out, or if they have by their decision essentially eliminated John Mack's final words on the subject of alien encounters.

- Will Bueche

Writing on behalf of the John Mack Institute
www.johnemackinstitute.org

--

On a more personal/informal note: I have strong doubts that the quality of the interview had any bearing on the decision. I served as John's media co-ordinator since 1999, and in those early years (when Passport To The Cosmos had just been published and he was still giving interviews) I heard many interviews conducted, both good and poor.

Several of John's friends, including myself, were present at the ABC interview (listening, nearby) and as I noted at the time:

"in my jaded estimation the interview turned out excellently; I heard several answers that were not his standard interview answers, and that is pretty much how I define a successful interview (if the interviewers manage to elicit new answers from Dr Mack, they've succeeded. Good questions cause good answers)...I heard several paragraphs which I would select as 'outstanding'..."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:10:12 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:32:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - Ledger

>From: Sheryl Gottschall <gottscha.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 10:43:55 +1000
>Subject: Women In Ufology [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:03:27 +0000 (GMT)
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>Gentlemen,

>>There are thousands of women in "Ufology", actually probably
>>many more than men.

>>The only trouble is, they fall under the New Age banner and so
>>wouldn't last 3 minutes on this List.

>Without this getting into a gender difference issue (hopefully)
>I have to agree with Stuart.

>By nature females have a different focus to males so we tend to
>explore areas that males wouldn't. Often these other fields of
>interest are considered to have less impact on the UFO subject
>because females (generally) will focus on the more nebulous
>areas which are indeed thought to be anything but "scientific"
>and possibly New Age-ish.

>To understand why, by nature the males of our species focus on
>things and objects while females focus on people and feelings,
>that's the way we are made for survival. But it would not be
>untrue to say that in the past the male focus on objects has
>taken precedence in UFO research. Even the name change by many
>UFO organizations to include the term UFO rather than the word
>alien or extraterrestrial is a reflection of the turn away from
>the female focus on people or living beings.

>In truth, it may have served UFO research far better if UFO
>organisations had included "alien" or ET in their titles. At
>least this would not have caused the same depotentiating effect
>as the term UFO which now diffuses what the UFO subject is
>really about, that is, extraterrestrial life NOT unidentified
>flying objects!

>Traditionally, men have held the commanding influence in the
>UFO field but I wonder how Ufology might change if more of the
>female focus were included. Would we take the same path, explore
>the same issues, align ourselves to the same "research" values,
>respond to the same influences? My observation is that UFO
>research today is lopsided and besides the complex nature of the
>phenomenon I feel it's also hindered by the male mindset and
world view.

>Sorry guys. No offence but we need both.

>To read more please go to my article
>Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus, So Where Does That
>Leave Ufology?

>at www.uforg.asn.au/articles/marsvenus.html

Hi Sheryl,

This nails it for me. It's nice that we we get this viewpoint. It supports my suspicion and the hard data at the bookstore. Women read more than men with the numbers supporting a 90-10 split in non-fiction for the females and 60-40 fiction, again the females.

A week or so ago Paul Kimball noted that the 'New Age' section on the bookshelves at Chapter's [Canadian bookseller similar to Barnes and Noble] were dominated by subjects such as Tarot card reading, Wickens and Witches etc. - usually written by female authors - where once there would have been dozens of male written books on UFOs.

Now there are only a few UFO related books to be seen, usually Sight Unseen: Science, UFO Invisibility And Transgenic Beings - by Budd Hopkins, Carol Rainey [alien abduction driven-Sheryl hits the mark again] and often a lonely copy of Dark Object, but the latter is there only because the event happened in that province.

Thanks for the tip.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 17:29:39 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:34:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 11:52:41 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:36:37 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>Your observation that there is no reflected light in the water
>below this relatively bright UFO in the sky does not rule out
>the lens flare explanation. In fact, it further supports it.

>Of course, if this UFO was real object and it was radiating only
>polarized light perpendicular to the surface of the water, then
>it would be detected visually and recorded with a camera but
>there would be no reflection off the water making it what Bruce
>would call a TRUFO. Of course, the easiest way to test this is
>to use the same camera to take a picture of the same scene under
>similar conditions at night from exactly the same location. If
>the UFO appears, it is an IFO. If it does not, then it must be a
>TRUFO - which only raises even more questions, one of them being
>why didn't others observe and report such a bright and massive
>UFO?

Surely the reason why there is no reflected light in the water
is because the object - if such it be - is well back from the
waterfront, over the hill that the town is standing on. The only
lights in the water are those reflected from lamps or building
immediately along the waterfront. None of the houses or other
buildings further up the hill are reflected in the water either.

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 12:38:21 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:36:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become
>clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO
>researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO
>research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific
>methods for UFO research.

<snip>

Just let me say that I am a firm advocate of the former.

<snip>

>The basis of my argument is that there is a distorting factor in
>the investigative process of the UFO phenomenon. This distorting
>factor is primarily political and is related to national security,
>cultural and religious concerns over the ramifications of UFO
>research and the extraterrestrial hypothesis.

I would add a further distorting factor, which often seems lost
by the "believers" - not all (or, perhaps, even the majority) of
"whistleblowers" or "horn-tooters" or "Insiders" are going to be
telling the truth, and that the trick is to separate the wheat
from the chaff, as opposed to just harvesting everything
equally.

<snip>

>What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty Principle
>for UFO Research"

>"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less precisely
>the EVIDENCE is known"

>The application of the Uncertainty Principle to UFO research
>would make it legitimate to study and analyse the implications
>of testimonies of witnesses/whistleblowers to multiple aspects
>of the UFO phenomenon where evidentiary support is lacking or
>not compelling.

The more I hear about the need for various scientific method
approaches in ufology, the more I come to realise that science
has less to do with it than the law, particularly when
discussing "whistleblowers." They should be treated like
witnesses in a court of law - their evidence should be weighted
for its value, tested against other evidence, both pro and con,
and then either discarded or accepted (or, I suspect, in many
cases, put in Stan's grey basket). Part of that process is
checking on the background of the "whistleblowers" to determine
whether they are credible or not.

Without compelling supportive evidence, why should we just
accept the word of "whistleblowers"?

The "Ufology Principle [UFOP]" you outline above is the antithesis of what good research should be, and indicates that you are biased from the get go, in a way that compromises any truly objective study of the evidence as it is presented.

Silas Newton, however, would have loved the UFOP.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Bueche

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:45:19 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:38:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help - Bueche

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 22:09:21 -0600
>Subject: Re: Skeptibunkers Physical Proof & Help

>Man, you had me right up to...

>"...the action figure on my desk..."

>Yikes... couldn't you have used something, anything else as an
>example?

>But for the record, what particular action figure is it on
>your desk? If you don't mind the question. <LOL>

>But seriously, I agree with your point, and find it refreshing
>to read it here.

>Physical traces are surely suspect when caused by what could
>very well be a metaphysical or super-physical or
>alter-physical event.

If you must know, I've got an Aki Ross figure there, the brave
female scientist from the under-rated CGI film "Final Fantasy
the Spirits Within."

The best are works of art, like sculpture - except being
plastic and mass produced they're much more affordable. The
figures one displays are also symbolic representations of
aspects of one's inner self or ideals; similar to the way one
might display religious icons on a shelf. Those are are my
beliefs about the serious roots of an otherwise simple
hobby/bookshelf decoration.

But back on topic, everyone always uses the example of the desk
or table itself as an example of a physical object. I figured
I'd avoid that cliché.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran -

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:14:51 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:40:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 11:25:47 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>>Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

<snip>

>One thing bothers me about the (logical) drone explanation: why
>the H would the US gov't/intelligence be so stupid as to attach
>lights to the drones? Isn't this supposed to be a overt
>operation? Red, green, blue... why? To attract attention and
>make people think UFOs are flying over? Wouldn't it be better
>for secrecy to have no lights?

>And how about noise? Anyone ever report the sound of a small
>airplane?

I've never had anything to do with psychological warfare (thank goodness!) but one possible explanation might be that their purpose is not to gather intelligence, but to be seen to be gathering intelligence.

The basic principles of psychological warfare, counter-intelligence, propaganda, advertising, corporate management, stage magic and even good old dirty politics are all pretty much the same - the key ingredient is always misdirection. In this case, it may be that we're being misdirected to believe that the purpose of the operation is to gather intelligence, when its actual purpose is to create the impression that a technology exists which is capable of gathering intelligence, and which is therefore, by implication, potentially omniscient.

If that sounds a little bizarre, there is a story (which I believe is actually true) that UK intelligence during the war against Hitler, planted false intelligence on a cadaver which was then washed up in Nazi-occupied territory. You may recognize that the principle here is pretty much the same as an advertising technique known as viral marketing, in which consumers are manipulated into believing that they have arrived at the advertiser's desired conclusion by means of their own reasoning processes. (If that sounds unduly Machiavellian, I should add that the process is often nothing like as sophisticated as it sounds and is by no means guaranteed to work.)

A modern version of this technique is to leak information to the press, and then follow it up fairly quickly with an official denial. The purpose of the denial is to create the impression you really didn't want the information to get out, which tends to enhance its apparent credibility - naturally, if the enemy thinks you wanted the information to get out, then they're likely to treat it with much greater skepticism.

In the case of the current Iran crisis, the consensus among independent analysts (and I do stress the word independent) does seem to be that the West doesn't really have the capability to stop the Iranian nuclear program by force. On that premise,

one can construct a plausible, albeit speculative scenario that the second-best option would be to convince the Iranians that such a capability does exist, without appearing to make threats (which could be seen as a bluff). If the Iranians could be induced to believe that none of their secrets are secure and all of their installations are vulnerable to attack, then this might lead to greater compliance on their part.

The obvious danger with such a strategy is that if it fails and there is no follow-up, the result is not merely a loss of face but a loss of credibility. For that reason, Western governments would need to be careful not to commit themselves publicly to a course of aggressive action that would depend on a capability that they don't actually have. It's noticeable that the US government recently has been careful to emphasize that they are not making any such commitment.

One can take the argument further and suspect that the "UFOs" are not actually drones at all, but some completely unrelated phenomenon, perhaps even misperceptions of completely natural objects, which are being exploited by means of viral marketing for some purposes described above. It all depends on whether you see things in terms of Batman or the Wizard of Oz.

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:17:48 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:53:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle for Quantum Physics is
>expressed as follows:

>"The more precisely the POSITION is determined, the less
>precisely the MOMENTUM is known"

>What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty Principle
>for UFO Research"

>"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less precisely
>the EVIDENCE is known"

>The application of the Uncertainty Principle to UFO research
>would make it legitimate to study and analyze the implications
>of testimonies of witnesses/whistleblowers to multiple aspects
>of the UFO phenomenon where evidentiary support is lacking or
>not compelling. The Uncertainty Principle gives support to a
>systematic analysis of wide-ranging testimonies that reveal a
>complex relationship between Truth and Evidence that emerges
>due
>to a distorting medium in UFO research. I look forward to
>hearing the forum's views on the systematic application of an
>Uncertainty principle in UFO research.

Michael

Since there can be no evidence for your proposition, if it is
to prove itself true, it is a masterpiece of exopolitical spin.
A bit wordy for a campaign button, but I wish you joy of it
nevertheless.

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:34:16 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reason

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 17:45:36 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

Hello Stuart

>Your question is open to interpretation but either way, I'm
>quite sure about the entire statement.

><http://www.hamptonroadspub.com/bookstore/index.php?cPath=72>

>If you follow the above link, just for example, you will find 5
>books related to the ET/Alien phenomenon. Of those five, 3 are
>authored by women. Search around elsewhere. You'll find similar
>percentages etc. The New Age market is undoubtedly female led.

Well 3 out of 5 isn't exactly a statistically significant
majority, but I take your point.

I had been wondering if you were trying to suggest that the
general environment of intellectual rigor, critical thinking and
the judicious application of Occam's razor which obtains on
Updates would be such that woolly and unscientific New Age
notions couldn't possibly survive here, but it seems you
weren't.

<snip>

>We've been here before Cathy, a few times. You can hold your own
>here and generally run rings round most on this List but in
>part, its because you use words of more than three syllables,
>you aren't flakey and you lean the right way philosophically.
>While you're not "nuts and bolts", you are social sciences led,
>so you're "OK".

It probably also has something to do with the fact that I'm used
to academic politics and familiar with many of its tricks, and
I'm therefore not so easy to intimidate.

>I am not griping about the lack of New Age related posts on this
>List, far from it, but once again I am moaning about the level
>of intolerance demonstrated here to virtually anything that
>crosses a very narrow boundary line.

I wonder if this might be a manifestation of the sort of
posturing that goes on all the time in academia, whereby people
near the bottom of the hierarchy will try to enhance their
position by trying to sound more "scientific" than people below
them?

>But, it's funny how things run. Exopolitics for example hadn't
>seriously dented my personal radar before. I was aware of it but
>not particularly interested, principally because of the heavy
>negativity towards it here and elsewhere. Josh Goldstein's
>recent run in with Dr. Michael Salla and in particular Dr.
>Salla's initial response I thought was magnificent. He laid out
>the Exopolitical philosophy perfectly and made me want to learn
>more (thanks Josh!).

>Trouble is, if I keep going that way, I'll end up wearing a
>dress and living in Sedona. Where do you shop for clothing
>Cathy? You're not a "catalogue girl" are you?

My Mum used to be an agent for a catalog and I'm afraid that put
me off catalogs for life - you can only see so many cardigans
and sackcloth tops before you want to scream.

But you know, we have this little place near us called Lucy's
Dreamcatcher where they do these really wonderful ethnic prints.
And of course I get all my incense and scented tealights there,
plus, they have channeling every Thursday evening. You'd love
it.

>Stuart (aka "butch" but not for very much longer)

Ooh, I'm sure a good session of Reiki would soon sort you out.

Cathy

PS - You wouldn't have known the "Queen of Clancarty", would
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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Secrecy News -- 02/16/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:36:14 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:57:24 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 02/16/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 18
February 16, 2005

** CORNYN, LEAHY INTRODUCE "OPEN GOVERNMENT" ACT
** ANNUAL SSCI WORLDWIDE THREAT BRIEFING
** IRAQ CULTURE SMART CARD
** FBIS GRAPPLES WITH KOREAN ORTHOGRAPHY
** EVEN MORE FROM CRS

CORNYN, LEAHY INTRODUCE "OPEN GOVERNMENT" ACT

In a legislative initiative that heralds the arrival of a new bipartisan congressional coalition in support of public access to government information, Sen. John Cornyn (R-TX) and Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT) today introduced legislation to strengthen the Freedom of Information Act.

"Open government is one of the most basic requirements of any healthy democracy," said Sen. Cornyn in a news release. "It allows for taxpayers to see where their money is going; it permits the honest exchange of information that ensures government accountability; and it upholds the ideal that government never rules without the consent of the governed."

"Access to public information in a timely and effective manner is a vital piece of our democratic system of checks and balances that promotes accountability and imbues trust," concurred Sen. Leahy. "FOIA represents the foundation of our modern open government laws and this bill builds on that by updating its protections to include new technologies and refining the process to reduce delays and encourage accessibility."

The new legislation would make a series of changes to the Freedom of Information Act that would bolster requesters' claims to fee waivers, strengthen the position of those who litigate FOIA requests, improve the timeliness and of FOIA processing, and impose disciplinary penalties for arbitrary withholding, among several other provisions.

The text of the legislation, to be known as the "Openness Promotes Effectiveness in our National Government Act of 2005", or the OPEN Government Act, along with fact sheets and related materials may be found on Sen. Cornyn's web site here:

<http://cornyn.senate.gov/FOIA/>

Additional information may also be found on Sen. Leahy's web site here:

<http://leahy.senate.gov/press/200502/021605.html>

ANNUAL SSCI WORLDWIDE THREAT BRIEFING

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence held its annual open

hearing today on "Current and Projected National Security Threats to the United States."

Witnesses included DCI Porter Goss, FBI Director Robert S. Mueller, DIA Director Adm. Lowell Jacoby, and State INR director Thomas Fingar.

Their prepared statements, which did not immediately yield any surprises, are posted here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_hr/index.html

IRAQ CULTURE SMART CARD

U.S. military personnel in Iraq are presented with a laminated card that summarizes the rudiments of Iraqi culture, as refracted through the understanding of the Marine Corps Intelligence Activity.

"The 16-panel, folded card includes information on religion, religious holidays, clothes and gestures, ethnic groups, cultural groups, customs and history, social structure and Arabic names. Also included are 'Do This' and 'Don't Do This', commands, numbers, questions, and helpful words and phrases."

A copy of the Iraq Culture Smart Card, newly updated in November 2004, is available here (in a very large 6.5 MB PDF file):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/usmc/iraqsmart-1104.pdf>

An earlier edition from February 2004 may be found here (in a lower resolution 1.0 MB PDF file):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/usmc/iraqsmart-0204.pdf>

The blog "Baghdad Dweller" last month reflected on the contents of a similar smart card that might be used to introduce American culture to a foreign visitor. See:

<http://tinyurl.com/59pqs>

FBIS GRAPPLES WITH KOREAN ORTHOGRAPHY

The CIA's Foreign Broadcast Information Service, which collects and translates news reports and other publications abroad, continues to wrestle with how to best transliterate Korean words and names into English. (See "A Lesson in Korean Linguistics," Secrecy News, 07/19/04).

This month FBIS announced the adoption of a series of new standard transliterations of Korean terms, which mostly seem to involve a strategically placed apostrophe or two.

Thus, for example, the North Korean publication previously known as "Kyonggongop" will henceforth be rendered "Kyo'nggongo'p."

See "FBIS To Modify DPRK, ROK Source Names," February 11, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2005/02/fbiskorean.html>

South Korea recently asked China to stop referring to its capital city Seoul as "hancheng," computational linguist Tom Emerson informs Secrecy News.

Instead, the Koreans asked China to use the characters "shou" and "er," which together sound roughly like "Seoul."

As it happens, Mr. Emerson explains, "these characters, in Chinese, mean 'capital.' So you'll see articles like, "The South Korean capital Capital had a protest today..."

EVEN MORE FROM CRS

With some frequency, the Congressional Research Service puts out fine products that sparkle with insight and new information.

More often, CRS reports are syntheses of previously published news accounts and other studies. Occasionally, CRS analysts will introduce new errors all of their own.

But even when they are perfunctory or mediocre, CRS reports have a unique importance precisely because they are used to inform the legislative process. As a result, there is a public interest in gaining access even to second-rate publications.

But for now, direct public access to CRS reports remains wishful thinking.

Here are some more new and newly updated CRS reports obtained by Secrecy News.

"Al Qaeda: Profile and Threat Assessment," February 10, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS22049.pdf>

"Proliferation Control Regimes: Background and Status," updated February 10, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/crs/RL31559.pdf>

"The Department of Defense Rules for Military Commissions: Analysis of Procedural Rules and Comparison with Proposed Legislation and the Uniform Code of Military Justice," updated January 18, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL31600.pdf>

"Treatment of 'Battlefield Detainees' in the War on Terrorism," January 13, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL31367.pdf>

"Mandatory Vaccinations: Precedent and Current Laws," updated January 18, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/RS21414.pdf>

"Federal and State Isolation and Quarantine Authority," updated January 18, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/RL31333.pdf>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to secrecy_news-request.nul with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:42:52 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:59:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 15:18:06 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:18:32 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>Martin Try as you might you can't get round the fact that the
>>statement:

>>"UFOs are the product of unknown intelligences possessing
>>unknown powers and motivations"

>>is a contentless, infinitely elastic hypothesis; what couldn't
>>you explain by it. Scientific hypotheses must surely be testable
>>against nature, even if, at first, its only a case of ensuring
>>that the hypothesis has mathematical consistency. Hypotheses
>>which can explain anything and everything actually explain
>>nothing.

>Peter, can you think of any hypothesis to explain the UFO
>phenomenon of which this could not be said?

I would have thought that the explanation that a particular UFO
report was produced by the planet Venus would be pretty
conclusively disproved if it was completely overcast at the
time, or if Venus was not visible from that location at that
date.

An explanation involving hallucination would be pretty lame for
a case involving multiple independent witnesses at different
locations and half a dozen separate vide/CCTV images.

Cheers

Peter

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:05:35 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 11:01:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 14:58:48 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:39:13 EST
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 13:18:28 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>Again, the same applies to Roswell. As I have said there does
>>seem to be some evidence of a top secret policy response to
>>Roswell. I'm still working out the full dimensions of it all. I
>>still think it should just resolve into a big MOGUL balloon but
>>it has absolutely no apparent connection, the policy response is
>>quite obviously not to "one of ours" as such a defense policy
>>would be unnecessary by definition.

>Any chance of helping on this? Several times, Brad, you have
>claimed to have break through information, but it seems to
>dissipate.

No one else is even close to being on the trail of either the TS
or the SECRET policy responses of July-August 1947, i.e., the
Roswell and the non-Roswell parallel tracks, so no one else is
contributing to the research effort. Nothing is dissipating on
my end. My research material continues to grow. But it goes
slowly because of lack of time and money and historical records
that could help fill in more of the blanks.

>One of the impacts (we seem to have squishy definitions of what
>impact means) was that the military and intelligence communities
>instituted a major policy of covering up information about
>important sightings of flying discs.

<snip>

Coverup is not unique to UFO's or Roswell, so it must be
carefully distinguished from coverup for other reasons. A
coverup of UFOs/flying disks could incorporate Roswell
without having the slightest thing to do with what uniquely
defines Roswell, i.e., Roswell could be covered up just like any
other UFO case as if nothing different from any other UFO case.
Whereas the TS policy response to Roswell was abrupt and
definitely uniquely a response to Roswell or a Roswell-type
event.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 11:05:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Rudiak

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>Maybe a thousand years from now our spacecraft will be a million
>>times safer than they are now, and passenger space travel will
>>be as common as jet travel today. But even then there will be
>>the occasional crash. Pilots will still make mistakes, highly
>>advanced technology will still sometimes fail, and the
>>unexpected will still happen. Nothing is ever perfect.

>I was buying your arguments up until this point.

>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

James,

First, since none of us has access to alien physics books, alien engineering schematics, or alien FAA safety records, we are, of course, only speculating one way or another.

What any of us thinks likely or probable depends on our assumptions, explicit or implicit. I'm assuming that technology has its ultimate limits while you do not. You are assuming the craft we see are their ultimate 'A' technology and they would place very high priority in keeping it out of our hands. I'm assuming that's not necessarily the case. You are assuming that they would place a very high premium on the lives of their pilots. I'm again assuming that's not necessarily the case. We could go on and on enumerating such assumptions, but you get the point.

I could, e.g., envision the following scenario (all speculative again). The craft we see and the one's that crash are their smaller scout craft using principles and technology different from their mothership interstellar craft. Thus the helicopter on the atomic aircraft carrier does not work in the same way as the aircraft carrier. We may not care if the other side gets our lower tech helos armed with conventional bullets and rockets, but would care a great deal if they seized the aircraft carrier with its atomic reactor and arsenal of atomic weapons and missiles to carry them.

For all the lip service we pay about how we value human life, the leaders who start the wars don't seem to care much at all. Why would aliens necessarily be different? Conceivably the alien

pilots could be some genetically engineered drones, a lower form of life designed for only one function, and considered to be completely expendable by the alien aristocracy, as they dab their three upper lips with their hankies. There are certainly some crashed saucer stories out there where the crews are claimed to be exactly this, genetically identical, biologically degenerate drones, hardly "perfect" biological beings at all.

Or even if their scout craft are sufficiently advanced, they also may not care because it would take us too long to back-engineer them to pose any short-term threat to them. Imagine if the first 747 from 1969 was suddenly hurdled only 100 years back in time and landed on the White House lawn. How fast could it be back-engineered and replicated? 19th and early 20th Century scientists and engineers would have a helluva time figuring the thing out and reproducing it, from the electronics and metallurgy to the plastics, tires, instruments, and basic principles of operation. When you think about all the problems they would encounter, it probably wouldn't speeded up introduction of the first 747 much at all, maybe a few years at most.

>No, if the alien race is far advanced then there are no limits
>to the safety or defense of their vehicles. There is not pilot
>error because the control would be handed over to automated
>intelligences which are constantly generating millions of
>scenarios every milisecond to assure the safety of the crew.

Even without pilot or engineering error, there is still always the unexpected. E.g., one of the more credible eyewitness reports concerning a crashed saucer came from Capt. V. A. Postlethwaite, an intelligence officer, who told Leonard Stringfield that back in 1948 he received a top secret telex directed to the commanding general of White Sands Proving Grounds. The message described a 100 foot saucer with a paper-thin hull impenetrable by conventional tools. The craft was brought down by a blown portal window from a small meteorite strike, causing the death of its alien crew. Presumably the craft landed by automated control. Postlethwaite's story is usually associated with the 1948 Aztec, N.M. crash.

The point is that sushi always happens. All the presumably highly advanced supertechnology and super beings can't necessarily stop it.

Without knowing the engineering specs on these devices, nobody can say with 100% assurance that something else, like a lightning strike, might have also brought these things down. Saying that's impossible is basically saying one knows exactly how these things work, and who can honestly say that?

>Failure of hardware can obviously occur

Right. Things like energy sources can overload; even supermaterials can fail if stressed enough.

>but are these aliens
>cheapskates who only have zero-fault tolerance? I doubt it. The
>most likely design of any spacecraft with beings would be two
>fault tolerance.

We design backup systems into our aircraft and they still crash. Jetliners have multiple hydraulic systems, the theory being that that the odds of all of them failing simultaneously is virtually zero. Yet there are two crashes I'm aware of where structural failure severed all hydraulics simultaneously where they came together, the pilots couldn't control the planes, and the planes crashed.

One of our nuclear reactors (I think in Tennessee) almost melted down several decades back when they lost control of the reactor for a few hours. Lack of backup systems? No. They had three "independent" electronic control systems in case one of them failed. The problem was, just like for the jetliner hydraulics, was that there was a choke point and the systems were no longer truly independent. A fire broke out in a room through which all the electrical cabling ran.

>And remember these beings should be able to
>afford it because they have already decided to invest vast sums
>of resources to get to Earth.

Again, they may not give a damn about the crews or the craft for various reasons, any more than our military or political leaders care that much when a plane and crew perish in Iraq. We have an inexhaustible supply of planes and pilots waiting to take their place.

>The design method of making an alien spacecraft is not going to
>be a fashion show. It will involve vast computer simulation
>models which we can only marvel at. Plus they will have had
>millenia of test models and operational experience to revise and
>improve these vehicles to make them able to handle any
>situation.

Or they might be cheapskates with throwaway craft and crews that can easily be replaced. How can anybody know for sure?

>So I doubt very much that the Roswell event was the one set of
>dumb aliens driving their beater spaceship that they bought
>second hand from a guy named Nick who accidently hit the
>accelerator instead of the brakes.

>The only possibilities

The "only" possibilities? Come on.

Those are those hidden assumptions I was talking about. Nobody knows for sure how these things are bolted together, so sweeping statements like yours are just more speculation.

How about a missile with a nuke blown high in the atmosphere near one of these things? Think that might be capable of bringing one of these things down? I do. Let's not automatically assume magical sci-fi movie properties to these things that make them absolutely invulnerable to anything that could conceivably happen or anything we might throw at them.

>for "crashed" alien ships are 1) the
>vehicles were attacked and destroyed by other hostile (or
>friendly to us) aliens with even more advanced or at least
>different technology,

In the right circumstances, a thrown rock by a Neanderthal can kill you just as sure as a advanced tech phaser blast by a Trifamalgorean.

Bullets and explosives might be crude, weapons by , but they sure can be effective for destroying things. A fighter jet intercepting one of these craft might just get lucky and hit one.

An example of such a "crashed saucer" story was told by Canadian radio engineer Wilbert Smith, who said in an interview that some high-level, supersecret U.S. government organization had passed on to him a piece of metal he was told was shot off a small flying saucer as it overflew Washington, D.C. back in 1952.

Vice-Admiral Herbert Knowles confirmed that Smith had shown him the piece during a visit, plus hearing the story of the piece being shot off.

>2) they wanted to crash because they are
>suicidal or maybe wanted to help our race by giving it their
>technology,

With expendable, manufactured, cloned crews it's certainly a possibility. Whitley Strieber used that premise in his fictionalized account about Roswell called "Majestic," that he claimed in his preface was based on information provided by a government insider.

The deliberately crashed technology could be their lower end stuff. It might still take us 100 or 200 years to back-engineer it (like the time-traveling 747). Even when we finally replicated it, it would pose no great danger to them. The Indians could have our rifles in exchange for favors, but damned if they were going to get our Gatling guns or cannons. And the Indians sure weren't going to learn to make their own rifles and bullets any time soon, so their supply was going to be limited.

>3) some weird unpredictable highly improbable
>spacetime muck up happened and blasted them either from the past

>or future to 1947 or across space.

OK, that's certainly not one possibility I would have dreamed up since I consider it enormously improbable to the point of ridiculous. Of course this is all speculation anyway, but I like to stick to at least slightly plausible speculation.

>Only the first one seems likely if you want to believe in UFO
>crashes in general.

Again with the "only."

Reasoning like this reminds me of many silly engineering assumptions I've seen being made on a variety of projects. Remember how NASA shuttle engineers initially calculated catastrophic failure on a shuttle as a one in a million because of all the backup systems? They assumed absurdly low probabilities of failure on a number of systems and further compounded their flawed thinking by failing to realize that the net probability of failure was additive. Lots of systems with lots of things that can go wrong add up to much higher probabilities of failure, just like lots of very rare fatal diseases or "fluke accidents" adds up to lots of people dying of rare diseases or fluke accidents.

During the Challenger disaster hearings, physicist Richard Feynman pointed out the absurdity of such assumptions, saying if that if their estimates of failure were accurate, then there would have been only one shuttle disaster every 100,000 years.

No shuttle engineer could imagine that a chunk of insulating foam hitting a wing could ever bring down a shuttle either. But it did, didn't it? Just because something is "unimaginable" or extremely unlikely doesn't mean that it can't happen.

Closer to home, engineers sold the San Francisco Bay Area public on the BART system as a futuristic subway system where a new train would arrive every two minutes because the trains would never break down and the central computer would know exactly where the trains were at every instant and would be able to keep them close, but safely spaced.

When they built the system, reality set in. The track sensors that were supposed to flawlessly tell the computer exactly the position of each train failed when it rained. Why didn't they design sensors that worked in the rain? Because it wasn't in the engineering specs. I guess the guy who wrote the specs couldn't imagine the engineers being so dumb as to not take the obvious into consideration. But he was wrong.

As a "fix" to keep the trains from colliding, they went to the old-time, low-tech method of having a station agent call the previous station saying that the train had just left. To keep the trains safely spaced, trains every 2 minutes turned into trains every 20 minutes.

As for the no-breakdown train assumption, they break down all the time. Electric motors often burn out, sometimes catching fire. Imagine that? One train caught fire in the trans-bay tube and shut the whole thing down for days.

Because they built the system with no way to sidetrack crippled trains because they weren't supposed to break down, the whole system can come grinding to a screeching halt, as any Bay Area commuter can tell you happens all the time.

>No way does our technology have a chance to bring one of them
>down.

Not even a nuke or even a lucky shot at close range?

Remember, there are lots of ways that even unlikely things can happen, which makes the net probability of an unlikely event getting you much higher than simple statistical arguments might make you think. People die from "fluke accidents" all the time.

>The dumb alien scenario doesn't work because they would have
>been eliminated by now by our friend Darwin from the universe by
>blundering way before they got to us.

Are you sure about that? How does one make a "perfect"

biological being? What exactly is "perfect" anyway? Sure, maybe one can devise a being that is much more intelligent than us, free from disease and self-destructive tendencies, etc. But can one make a being that can anticipate every possible eventuality?

How can one know a priori that what we encounter is somehow the ultimate in alien evolution? Isn't it at least conceivable we are seeing the expendable, cloned aliens who might be considered lower forms of life by their masters? Meanwhile the elite, "perfect" aliens are back on the mothership or on Trifamalogor, letting the serfs handle the more dangerous and dirty work, just like generals and politicians hide behind the lines, while ordering some poor farm boys to charge into battle.

Perfect aliens and perfect technology that can handle any possible situation? Other scenarios being literally inconceivable? Sorry, I don't buy 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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:12:16 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:10:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hatch

>From: Steve Owens <p944dc.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:51:11 -0600
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>Thanks Dave, and sorry for all the <snips>.
>>I was just looking for votes yea or nay on Roswell.

>As you are merely looking for votes "yea or nay" please put me
>- a Roswell Native - Go Coyotes! - in the Nay leaning crowd.

Thanks Steve:

Of those very few responding, it looks evenly divided. Beware
the statistics of small numbers though.

I suppose many or most are on the fence pending better
information, or else just want to avoid the flak. I can't blame
them much.

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:25:02 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:12:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Rudiak

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

Larry,

>Thanks Dave, and sorry for all the <snips>.

No problem. <snip>

>I was just looking for votes yea or nay on Roswell.

>I presume I can count you along with Stan on the Yea side, and
>yes there are bound to be others.

>The implication that most of serious Ufology still takes Roswell
>as ET, and that it is therefore insular if not dotty; that's
>what inspired me to say anything at all.

>I usually avoid Roswell for very predictable reasons, rancor and
>endless bush-beating high among them.

>Do you feel that most serious ufologists

Allow me my definition of a serious ufologist first. That is somebody who is very well informed on the subject, is reasonably intelligent, reasonably well-educated, not overly gullible one way or the other, and capable of analyzing evidence and forming logical conclusions.

Of course this excludes the many dumbbells who think of themselves as serious Ufologists but who know next to nothing and obviously can't think critically. Why take what they think seriously?

>still take Roswell as
>the crash of an alien craft, or do you consider yourself (along
>with Stan and others) in a minority position?

I honestly don't know. There are obviously people on both sides of the question. I don't know what the percentages are and don't much care. The fact that serious, well-informed people can arrive at different conclusions from the same data is to be expected and happens all the time in any discipline, because people interpret things different ways based on their experience.

My impression is that most are probably fence-sitters, if anything, just as I think most serious Ufologists are. Each has their favorite cases which they consider to be strongly evidentiary and may devote a great deal of time thinking about

and digging into them. Others disagree and spend their energies elsewhere.

People like Jerry Clark and Dick Hall indicate they are in the fence-sitting category on Roswell. They are not proponents, but they are not debunkers either. I remember Dick Hall once making the comment that there seems to be a lot of smoke with Roswell which may indicate a conflagration behind it, but he is not absolutely convinced.

>I'm willing to accept other views on Roswell itself, even if I
>don't agree with them.

In other words, you are basically a skeptical fence-sitter, as I am, e.g., on the "alien autopsy" footage. I lean towards fake, but don't know. Nobody can prove it fake and there is some evidence that might point to authenticity. I am more interested in who made it and why. Is it the real thing, or a fake made by a film producer wanting to make money, or is it a "real fake" made by a government agency? I actually lean toward the last one, which has it's own interesting set of implications.

My point was that there are many people who I consider "serious Ufologists" who believe that Roswell was probably an alien crash. One of them emailed me yesterday after my post saying he reads Updates but never posts, not wanting to be dragged into the cat fights that occur.

Stan Friedman is far from alone, which was being insinuated here. I also outlined some of the better evidence which makes me believe Roswell an ET event as well. And based on what some high-level witnesses are saying, we aren't alone in that belief. It is shared in the military and government as well and may extend beyond belief to actually knowing for sure from direct knowledge. Some like Gen. Exon just came right out and said it was a crashed alien spacecraft. That's a very powerful statement of authenticity.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Santiago Yturria <syturria.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 16:44:06 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:17:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 00:27:21 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

<snip>

>Now, does anyone have the image from Iqueque?

The UFO photo by Mr. Bruna:

<http://tinyurl.com/48b8u>

Santiago

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

AUFORN Meeting In Brisbane Friday Night

From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 09:44:16 +1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:00:03 -0500
Subject: AUFORN Meeting In Brisbane Friday Night

AUFORN is having a public meeting tomorrow night at the Springwood Community Centre, corner of Cinderella Drive and Vanessa Blvd, in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

Be there at 7 pm for a 7.30 pm start.

\$6.00 entree fee, \$4.00 for members.

Latest news/sightings will be discussed.

Refreshments provided.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 19:42:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:05:17 -0500
Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

Not a good idea as proposed!

>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become
>clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO
>researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO
>research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific
>methods for UFO research. As an advocate of the latter approach,
>I believe it important to justify why this should be done in a
>systematic way. The basis of my argument is that there is a
>distorting factor in the investigative process of the UFO
>phenomenon. This distorting factor is primarily political and is
>related to national security, cultural and religious concerns
>over the ramifications of UFO research and the extraterrestrial
>hypothesis. This distorting factor needs to be systematically
>factored in to UFO research in order to properly deal with the
>rowing volume of whistleblowers and others coming forward with
>first hand testimony of classified UFO research and sightings,
>and of working with alleged extraterrestrial related
>technologies and beings.

>The distorting factor in UFO research requires a systematic
>application of the principle of Uncertainty in the investigation
>and analysis of such whistleblower testimonies which highlight a
>significant inverse relationship between the Truth of
>whistleblower/witness testimony, and Evidence supporting such
>testimony. I am therefore advocating that UFO researchers apply
>to their investigations what I will henceforth describe as a
>variation of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle. Just as an
>Uncertainty principle is systematically applied to quantum
>theory research on the 'Position' and 'Momentum' of quantum
>particles, I advocate an Uncertainty Principle needs to be
>systematically applied to UFO research in terms of Truth and
>Evidence concerning witness/whistleblower testimonies, UFO
>sightings and other UFO related phenomena.

>The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle for Quantum Physics is
>expressed as follows:

>"The more precisely the POSITION is determined, the less
>precisely the MOMENTUM is known"

>What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty Principle
>for UFO Research"

>"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less precisely
>the EVIDENCE is known"

Gag!

The more precisely the _truth_ is determined, the more likely it
is that the _evidence_, whatever form it takes, is true. The

precision of the evidence would, presumably, also be better.
(But "precision" and "truth" are rather orthogonal concepts...
something can be very precise and very wrong or imprecise but
correct. Or course , precise and correct is the best.)

I have no problem with 'exopolitics' as an academic activity,
but I think it should be based on the most verifiable evidence
without diluting the veracity of the evidence by including 'wild
stories'.

Imagine that someone goes through a rigorous analysis and
devises an exopolitics (how to interact with the aliens) based
on Adamski's stories. Will the political recommendations or
understanding based on his stories tell us anything about how we
should react to the _actual_ ETs? Only the Adamski supporters
would say yes.

To base exopolitical analysis on hoax claims about ETs (e.g.
'Dr.' Reed) would be a waste of time.

I think a valuable exopolitical study could be presented in the
following very general, highly simplified, form:

'If the aliens/Et's behave in (some particular) manner, then we
should react (in the following manner).'

For example, if the ETs are really nice guys and gals, then we
should welcome them and have a good time.

Or, If the ETs are mean and nasty we should avoid them as much
as possible.

Or, if they hate our guts then we should bend WAYYY over, put
our heads between our legs and kiss our buttocks goodbye.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 22:37:25 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:07:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - Balaskas

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 15:30:55 EST
>Subject: Evidence For Present Life On Mars

>Source: Space.Com

>http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/mars_life_050216.html

>02-16-05
>02:09 pm ET

>Exclusive: NASA Researchers Claim Evidence of Present Life on
>Mars

>By Brian Berger
>Space News Staff Writer

>WASHINGTON -- A pair of NASA scientists told a group of space
>officials at a private meeting here Sunday that they have found
>strong evidence that life may exist today on Mars, hidden away
>in caves and sustained by pockets of water.

>The scientists, Carol Stoker and Larry Lemke of NASA's Ames
>Research Center in Silicon Valley, told the group that they have
>submitted their findings to the journal Nature for publication
>in May, and their paper currently is being peer reviewed.

>What Stoker and Lemke have found, according to several attendees
>of the private meeting, is not direct proof of life on Mars, but
>methane signatures and other signs of possible biological
>activity remarkably similar to those recently discovered in
>caves here on Earth.

<snip>

>Stoker did not respond to messages left Tuesday on her voice
>mail at Ames.

<snip>

>NASA has no firm plans for sending a drill-equipped lander to
>Mars, but the agency is planning to launch a powerful new rover
>in 2009 that could help shed additional light on Stoker and
>Lemke's intriguing findings. Dubbed the Mars Science Laboratory,
>the nuclear-powered rover will range farther than any of its
>predecessors and will be carrying an advanced mass spectrometer
>to sniff out methane with greater sensitivity than any
>instrument flown to date.

Hi Everyone!

Remember back in August 7, 1996 when President Clinton was
forced to make the startling and unexpected disclosure that,
after many years of analysis of a rock found in Antarctica
believed to have originated Mars, we had finally found evidence
of past life there?

Thanks to the highly successful Mars landers Opportunity and Spirit, we now have found other more compelling direct evidence (eg. rotini fossils and lichen) of past and possibly present life on actual Mars rocks (see another space.com story below and also click on the side pictures).

If we also include some other very puzzling and still not easily explained pictures of what look like macro-organisms on Mars that have been imaged by the U.S. and European spacecrafts still orbiting this Earthlike planet, I would not be surprised to hear President Bush soon make a similar official announcement of "bushes" or other such life on Mars. For researchers like George Filer, Mac Tonnie and many other UFO UpDates Listers, this disclosure would not have come soon enough.

http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/mystery_monday_050214.html

Phoenix, the spacecraft set for launch to Mars in 2007, was to be a drill-equipped lander which could have proved that methane gas producing organisms do indeed exist just below the water moist Martian soil but.....

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

British MoD Comes Clean Over Little Green Men

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 20:55:10 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:11:28 -0500
Subject: British MoD Comes Clean Over Little Green Men

Source: The Daily Telegraph - London, UK

<http://connected.telegraph.co.uk/connected/main.jhtml?xml=/connected/2005/02/16/ecrqed14.xml>

02-16-05

QED: MoD Comes Clean At Last Over Those Little Green Men

Robert Matthews

While the world celebrates the apparent rapprochement between Israel and the Palestinians, a glimmer of hope can be detected in the long-running dispute between another two factions: the scientific community and believers in UFOs.

For more than half a century, the debate over UFOs and whether they really are alien spacecraft has been characterised by wild-eyed zealotry and a refusal to listen to reasonable argument - and that's just the scientists. Those who believe that UFOs really are alien spacecraft show a preference for conspiracy theories over critical reasoning.

Part of the problem has been the official attitude towards reports of UFOs, which has been decidedly sniffy. It is now clear that this has been a bit of a pose. Following a request made under the Freedom of Information Act, the Ministry of Defence last week released the details of more than 80 UFO reports made by military personnel and members of the public in the last year.

The MoD pointed out that it has thousands more reports on file - thus confirming the long-standing claims by UFO buffs that "the authorities" knew far more than they let on. It has to be said that the reports are risibly mundane: "strange lights in the sky" over Whitstable, a saucer-like object over Stoke on Trent, a "bright light" over Barry, South Wales. Indeed, some UFO enthusiasts now claim there is a new conspiracy in which only the ho-hum sightings are released, while the MoD keeps the juicy stuff to itself. Rather more interesting, however, was the official statement accompanying the release of the documents, in which the MoD declared that it remained "totally open-minded" towards the issue of aliens and UFOs.

This seems a long way from attitude of the Government working party which in 1951 dismissed the idea of taking UFOs seriously as "a singularly profitless enterprise". The new receptive attitude is in line with that taken by the authorities in a growing number of countries, including Belgium, Chile and France.

There are signs that the scientific community might also be getting over its aversion to the notion of aliens visiting Earth. In recent years, a number of academics have made public their frustration with the dismal level of debate on the subject, and have sought to rectify it. An independent group of American scientists is responsible for the first paper arguing for the existence of UFOs to appear in a serious academic journal in 25 years.

Writing in the Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, the group claims that advances in scientific knowledge have made the case for alien visitation stronger than many might think.

For example, sceptics have argued that while life may well exist elsewhere in the universe, the probability that it is both intelligent and relatively close to Earth is extremely low.

Yet as the authors of the paper point out, since the mid-1990s, several methods for faster-than-light travel have been put forward in serious physics journals, thus undermining the argument that the sheer size of the universe makes alien visitation implausible. The authors concede that while possible in principle, no practical scheme for faster-than-light travel has yet been put forward.

Even so, some advanced civilisation could have succeeded, which prompts the authors to point out another recent discovery. Last year a team of astronomers showed that stars capable of supporting life in our galaxy are typically a billion years older than the Sun. If so, this could mean that aliens may be as far ahead of us as we are compared to primordial bacteria.

None of this proves that UFOs are real, of course, but it does show that some of the standard arguments used by sceptics do need sprucing up. Even so, for those of us taking a broadly agnostic stance, the fact remains that there is still no compelling evidence that UFOs are alien craft.

Yet in the most disconcerting of all their arguments, the authors of the JBIS paper claim that all those dodgy photographs and spooky encounters may be yet further evidence for the reality of aliens. They argue that all those brief encounters of the third kind may be part of a deliberate long-term strategy by the aliens to ease us all into accepting that we are not alone. Some scientists have argued that the proof of the existence of aliens could be very traumatic for human society.

Frankly, it is not half as worrying as discovering we are the target of a cosmic campaign run by little green spin doctors.

c. Copyright of Telegraph Group Limited 2005.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -

From: Erik Landahl <landahl1.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 21:25:19 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:13:39 -0500
Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 23:58:27 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>Source: NBC Nightly News via MSNBC,

>Could 'Star Trek' technology help transport troops?

>By Tom Costello
>Correspondent
>NBC News

<snip>

>The study's author thinks so, too. He recommends in the report
>spending \$7 million a year to see if it might be possible. NBC
>News tried to contact Warp Drive Metrics, but the calls were not
>returned. The Air Force says the program will now disappear.

>"The Air Force has made a decision not to invest in that
>anymore," says Heil.

When them thar military folk sez they ain't a-innerested in or
ain't a-workin' on some high falutin' teknologicky projeckt, you
kin bet yer F-117 that they be a-workin' their bee-hinds off to
unnerstans and perfekts it.

Now when they tells y'all "yup we loves this teknologicky and we
be goin' with it jes' wait and see" - then mah frend you done be
barkin' up a tree that ain't got no varmint.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - Gottschall

From: Sheryl Gottschall <gottscha.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:26:33 +1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:17:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - Gottschall

>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 15:31:12 +0200
>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

>>From: Sheryl Gottschall <gottscha.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 10:43:55 +1000
>>Subject: Women In Ufology [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>Traditionally, men have held the commanding influence in the UFO
>>field but I wonder how Ufology might change if more of the
>>female focus were included. Would we take the same path, explore
>>the same issues, align ourselves to the same "research" values,
>>respond to the same influences? My observation is that UFO
>>research today is lopsided and besides the complex nature of the
>>phenomenon I feel it's also hindered by the male mindset and
>>world view.

>I once did a gender study for one of the large UN agencies and
>found that the same 'boys with toys' attitude prevailed. Men
>were concerned with the logistics of aid delivery, trucks,
>airplanes etc, rather than how the aid changed the lives of
>people, which had become more of a concern as women became
>bosses in the organisation (1990s and after). so i don't think
>the phenomenon you identify is restricted to UFO studies...

<snip>

I agree. From a female perspective I think there is far too
little discussion in this field about the implications of
extraterrestrial life for our civilization. I am constantly
amazed this is not the hot-topic in this field. It's one thing
to call for disclosure and uncover the coverup etc, but what
happens after that? We haven't even begun to prepare for that!

And putting the abduction issue aside for a moment what about
open contact and questions like, What do we want from alien
contact? What's the human role in the UFO phenomenon? Are we
ready for open contact? How would open contact change our
society, if at all? Or me! And a myriad of other questions we
haven't even begun to dig into.

As we become a space faring society, it's inevitable that we
will make contact with other cultures but we must do the work
and be prepared for that contact. Even if we are not the
individuals making open contact directly, our children,
grandchildren or great grandchildren might be.

Those questions have to be asked sooner or later. I say - the
sooner the better for all of us.

Sheryl Gottschall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 00:36:46 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:21:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - Gates

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
To: <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 21:32:06 -0600
Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 13:17:19 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>Source: Fox News

><http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,147469,00.html>

>02-14-05

>Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>WASHINGTON =E2=80=94 Senior Defense Department officials said Monday
>they have no knowledge of any U.S. drone flights over Iran, and
>U.S. intelligence officials would not comment on any such flights.

<snip>

Hi Stig,

What is interesting about this post is that the story nowhere states what the headline states.

Senior Defense Dept. officials say they are not aware, and the CIA has no comment. How does this in any way constitute a denial?

Kyle and Listers

So called denials depends on what question is asked and what person the question is directed to. If the drone flights over Iran are/were highly classified and part of some compartmentalized program, then many so called "Senior Defense Dept..officials" wouldn't have a clue as to what is going on because they are not cleared for the information, nor do they have "a need to know." They can honestly and publicly say they are not aware and be telling the truth in so far as they know it.

For years the Stealth Fighter was compartmentalized and highly classified. According to accounts, as I recall, the chain of command from the Skunk works went to a Air Force One Star General, who reported directly to the Secretary of Defense, who directly reported to the President. Supposedly many people including three and four star generals were cut out of the chain because they didn't have clearance for the information, nor did they have a "need to know."

Years ago I used to think that three and four star Generals probably knew everything - so to speak. When I was working on Cold War history, I found out that they are governed by clearances, special access, need to know and alot of things go on that they don't know about. I also learned that they very

rarely question things like that because if they do, it usually leads to them having problems and or being put in command of the proverbial outhouse on Greenland so to speak.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: hat's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth

From: Don Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 21:40:22 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:24:51 -0500
Subject: Re: hat's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 16:59:36 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: What's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth About UFOs

>Source: The Seattle Post-Intelligencer - Seattle Washington

>http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/tv/211976_tv15.html

>02-15-5

>What's On Peter Jennings' Radar? The Truth About UFOs

>By Melanie Mcfarland
>Seattle Post-Intelligencer Television Critic

>In the span of more than 40 years with ABC News, Peter Jennings
>has built one of the most respected reputations in television
>journalism.

<snip>

>It probably will come as a surprise, then, to hear that urbane,
>sophisticated Jennings' next documentary chases down the truth
>about UFOs. As in, flying saucers and little green men.

>Seriously.

>"UFOs -- Seeing Is Believing," airing Feb. 24 from 8 to 10 p.m.
>on KOMO/4, is the latest entry in the "Peter Jennings Reporting"
>series. His goal is to take a serious look at a subject most
>scientists, the government and the media tend to brush off as
>lunacy. When some 80 million Americans claim to have seen a UFO,
>he explained, it's worth an investigation.

<snip>

>"I feel the same way about reporting about UFOs as I feel about
>reporting on Iraq," Jennings said. "The great joy we have in our
>business... is the opportunity to learn new stuff every day,
>and to write about it."

This was a well written article from the Seattle P-I!

I am sorry that I won't be able to watch the TV special over here in Thailand.

But I remember a comment that Dr. David Saunders once made to me about a TV documentary made about UFOs by NBC in the mid 1970s. They had come to film us at the University of Colorado, back when UFOCAT was on a huge multi-platter disk storage device at CLIPR, the Computer Laboratory for Psychological Research, and their film crew had spent the day filming for over 8 hours. It looked like they were doing a serious job, and we were looking forward to seeing what the final result would be. It was supposed to be an NBC White Paper, but was downgraded by the corporate execs into something like, "UFOs -- Do you believe?"

David said to me the morning after, "During the first ten minutes of the show I was hoping I would be on, after that I was hoping I wouldn't."

He got his wish, because they didn't use any of the footage they shot in Boulder. But Hynek wasn't so lucky, and he was shown sitting on a front porch stoop, with a teenage boy who had obviously taken a hoaxed UFO photo. Saunders felt it was degrading to Hynek's scientific reputation to put him in the role of some gumshoe, on the same level as the kid, spending his valuable time trying to pin the boy down to a confession that the photo was a hoax. Hynek was too polite to come right out and say the photo was a fake, and it made him look, well, credulous, as if he wasted his time running around the country talking to people who had nothing better to do than make up flying saucer stories.

Don 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Johnson

From: Don Johnson <donjohnson.nul>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 21:46:04 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:26:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Johnson

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 15:18:06 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 19:18:32 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>Martin Try as you might you can't get round the fact that the
>>statement:

>>"UFOs are the product of unknown intelligences possessing
>>unknown powers and motivations"

>>is a contentless, infinitely elastic hypothesis; what couldn't
>>you explain by it. Scientific hypotheses must surely be testable
>>against nature, even if, at first, its only a case of ensuring
>>that the hypothesis has mathematical consistency. Hypotheses
>>which can explain anything and everything actually explain
>>nothing.

>Peter, can you think of any hypothesis to explain the UFO
>phenomenon of which this could not be said?

I can think of one hypothesis that is falsifiable: UFOs come
from beneath the surface of our oceans. They reside, both
temporarily and permanently, in our bodies of water: lakes,
rivers, seas, and oceans.

- Don 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 02:19:51 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:51:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:32:06 -1000
>Subject: Re: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

>>From: Greg Bishop <exclmid.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:37:56 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Highlights From & Philosophy Behind Bennewitz Book

>>I am the author of the new, Project Beta, book that was
>>mentioned on the List last week.

<snip>

>Now there are a number of independent sources confirming
>different aspects of what Bennewitz claimed was happening at
>Dulce. One was an alleged security guard at Dulce, Thomas
>Castello who claims to have led a revolt there in 1979, and got
>information out in the form of his testimony and some photos and
>a video. Bill Hamilton did an investigation on Castello's
>information and certainly didn't dismiss it as disinformation.
>Bill thought Castello's story was possible and was something
>that needed more investigation (perhaps Bill can better clarify
>his position on this). Another whistleblower who confirmed part
>of the Dulce underground base story was Dan Burisch. Burisch
>claimed to have been interviewed at Dulce and heard humans
>screaming and was threatened with indefinite detention for
>turning down a job at Dulce which he declined (Bill Hamilton
>might like to clarify this further). Another alleged
>whistleblower is Phil Schneider who talked about a firefight at
>Dulce with ETs he was involved in during 1979. Bob Lazar also
>claimed to have read of a firefight between ETs and humans at a
>secret underground location in 1979. I've included many of these
>stories in a report I did on Dulce which you can find at:

<snip>

Michael, Listers,

Doubtlessly you are not aware of the issues surrounding the Dan Burisch story. Early on many people thought the story was good, Linda Howe even put parts of her interview with him up on the net and so forth. As I recall last spring, or early summer a journalist who heard the story on Art Bell or something like that started checking into Burisch and uncovered a number of issues with his story. Bottom line was he told an incredible story, and many people believed him without checking out his background.

Schneider and Castello had some issues as well.

So what is the element of truth here? Dulce is questionable and some have even suggested evidence that a underground facility at Los Alamos is called "Dulce."

All we know is that then member of, Bill Richardson (now NM gov) got in trouble for mentioning the existance of a "classified facility" on the border of New Mexico and Colorado. Now whether

that facility is on a mountain top, in a canyon, or underground, nobody knows. During an interview a researcher had with a former Cold Warrior, he mentioned the existance of a facility, where classified research was done, south of Trinidad Colorado near a place called Wootton Colorado right on the border of Co/NM. At the time it was an interesting piece of information, but the government has a number of underground facilities, from Mount Weather, to Raven Rock, to NORAD, and so forth.

>Now I want to say a couple of things about your second thesis of
>Dulce disinformation being the source of subsequent stories of
>ET-government underground bases. First, the idea of secret
>underground bases with humans being abducted by aliens, etc., is
>not something that can be traced to the alleged disinformation
>fed to Bennewitz. The 1978 book, Alternative 3 by Leslie
>Watkins, discussed similar ideas in terms of civilians secretly
>being abducted and taken to underground bases whether on Earth
As many people know Alternative 3 is fiction, and admitted as such, much like the so called Iron Mountain report of the mid/late 60s fame which turned out to be fiction as well.

If you fully check out the various storys as I once did years ago, you find that Lear's source for his information was Bennowitz. Supposedly Cooper heard Lear speak and borrowed the information, added to it then promoted it as his own. It was from Lear's and Coopers accounts and stories that the underground base/Dulce theory sprung to life at least in ufological circles. It was during the late 80s that the Dark side theory floated in UFO circles, not to mention the book, The Matrix, which promoted this even more.

The point is, and always was, that some individual comes out of the woodwork and unloads some incredible story about something that tickles the ears of ufologists. Some ufologists usually inhale the story hook, line and sinker and then began to promote it all over the Internet and talk radio... say Art Bell/Noory. Usually said ufologists don't bother to investigate the background of the person that gave them the story, before they start promoting it on air, for various reasons such as "he sounded sincere" and others.

Usually somebody else, takes the next logical step and investigates the background of the originator of the story. In many instances the background of the person can't be verified. When that information is presented to the ufologist who is promoting the story all over creation they usually dismiss it and any other inconsistencies as part of some evil government plot to cleanse the background of people who work on these, so-called highly classified projects and so forth. When in fact its just another charlatan telling another story and gullible people buy into it.

The truth simply is that the government doesn't go to colleges and purge records off microfilm, erase photographs in year books, erase the memories of teachers and people who were in the same classes and so on.

Now that we are in the early years of the 21st century Dulce has pretty much faded away, underground bases have pretty much faded away, but alas, we are in the same position we were when the stories first floated. No verifiable evidence that a base exists at Dulce. I suspect we will be at this same point 15 years from now.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Astrobiology A Principal Motivator For NASA Now

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 03:04:04 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:55:11 -0500
Subject: Astrobiology A Principal Motivator For NASA Now

Source: Astrobiology Magazine via RedNova,
<http://www.rednova.com/news/display/?id=128207>

02-16-05-

Astrobiology: Moved By Science In Motion

Al Diaz is the Associate Administrator for the Science Mission Directorate of NASA - meaning the highest official solely focused on science at NASA. On the day after the successful landing of the Huygens probe on Saturn's moon Titan, Diaz talked about astrobiology's central role within NASA.

Astrobiology Magazine -- The successful arrival of the European Space Agency's Huygens atmospheric probe on the distant Saturnian moon of Titan in mid-January was a moving event. Many in the multinational contingent of scientists, engineers and administrators that had gathered at ESA's control facility in Darmstadt, Germany had worked on the mission for a decade or more.

Once it was clear that the probe was working as planned, a palpable euphoria -- a compound of relief and pride -- pervaded the proceedings. One of ESA's high-ranking NASA visitors was Al Diaz, director of the agency's new science organization, the Science Mission Directorate.

Although the Huygens part of Cassini-Huygens was designed and built in Europe and led by ESA, the mission was conducted in close collaboration with NASA. Huygens itself had been brought to Saturn by Cassini.

The interview took place at ESA Headquarters in Darmstadt on January 15th, the day after Huygens's pictures of smoggy Titan revealed an icy orange-tinged topography sculpted by liquid ethane rivers and lakes - a place of shorelines, creeks and fog that's utterly alien, and yet also fascinatingly Earth-like in many respects.

Michael Benson (MB): Let's talk about Huygens. The probe landed successfully on Saturn's moon Titan yesterday, and you looked quite moved at the press conference. Tell me about your own personal feelings.

Al Diaz (AD): My reaction had less to do with the science - although I was moved by the science- than it did to the fact that there are so few opportunities to be involved in historic events. And here's one where, as I looked around the room, I could identify a hundred people I've worked with in the past 25 years. You see something like this happen, and you recognize how much it's meant to everybody that you've worked with, and it just is a moving thing.

MB: Do you see an increased future for European-NASA

collaboration after this?

AD: Oh, absolutely.

You know, there's always been collaboration between us. But this is one of the first times where there's a major accomplishment where the Europeans can claim a first -- where they were the leader and the US was the supporter. I think that will motivate them to press forward and take on some responsibilities that they might not have done in the past. We can now depend on them to lead some things that are technologically more challenging than they might have done ten years ago.

MB: To what extent is astrobiology a motor for what NASA's doing? How much of this is a quest to find conditions that may now be suitable for life, or conditions that might be precursors for life?

AD: Up until a year ago, it was a motivator for some of our science. Now, it's a principal motivator for almost everything that NASA does.

What happened a year ago was the articulation of a vision by the President -- which has a very strong flavor in it that NASA is about the search for life, and understanding the origin and evolution of life in the universe. So I think astrobiology will now become a lot more dominant.

I'm pleased to see that, because it's been through a bit of a hiatus. Astrobiology is a term that was coined maybe 8 or 9 years ago. Before that, biology in NASA had grown to a peak around the time of the Viking project (the robotic landings on Mars in 1976). So in the mid-seventies, there was a substantial presence of biology in NASA, but then it dissipated.

What's happened now is that biology has broadened, in the sense that what was biology has become astrobiology. It's spread to earth science as well as biological and physical research, which was principally associated with human activity. I anticipate that over the course of the next decade, astrobiology will grow, largely driven by the search for life on Mars.

MB: Do you think the reason that the emphasis on astrobiology waned after Viking was because there wasn't any positive sign of life resulting from those two landers? And so would it be possible to say that the reason the current two Mars rovers don't have any dedicated experiments to try to discover if there's biological activity - although they are looking for water - would be because there was a fear in NASA that if they came up short, like the Vikings, then that could cut public interest in Mars exploration?

AD: No, I don't think there was that motivation. The search for life takes a lot more competent kinds of payloads and instruments than we can accommodate in this era where we're trying to get back onto Mars. I think the past 20 years were an effort to recover some capability to land on Mars. We've done it quicker, better, cheaper, and we've done it now, finally, in a much more painstaking and traditional mode. It won't be until the next lander payload, which will not be the scout, but the next...

MB: The big heavy rover? With the biological lab on it.

AD: Right, exactly. With the chemical lab on it, that will ultimately, I think, become, in its successor forms, a biological laboratory. Then we will be where we wanted to be immediately after Viking. We wanted to take the lander, and put wheels on it, and roll it around the planet. We're now back on the planet. When we land the Mars Science Lander, we will be ahead of where we were. We'll have a competent scientific laboratory on wheels.

MB: Would it be accurate to say that the Mars Science Lander is probably the most exciting single robotic mission on the boards right now?

AD: It's the most challenging, that's for sure.

MB: It's very large, right?

AD: It's two and a half tons. It's big. It's another generation beyond the Opportunity and Spirit rovers.

MB: The two leading contenders for potential hosts for extraterrestrial life are Mars and Europa. Europa almost certainly has a vast ocean with a surface ice crust. Rick Greenberg, who has a team at the University of Arizona, at the Lunar and Planetary Science lab, just released a book called "Europa: Ocean Moon," where he makes a persuasive case that the ice shell is comparatively thin, and that there's substantial interaction between the ocean and the surface because of all of the cracks in the ice. It means that surface chemistry can get into the water, creating conditions for life. So I'm wondering why it is that NASA doesn't have a mission on the boards right now to go to Europa.

AD: We do. It's called the Jupiter Icy Moons Orbiter. The Europa mission is the highest priority in the outer planets, as outlined by the decadal plan from the National Academy of Sciences. We recognize Europa as being the "sweet spot" of the outer planets, if you will. So we're anxious to do it. Right now, we're focusing on JIMO as the solution.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Jennings' Documentary Treats St. Clair County

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 03:24:33 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:58:45 -0500
Subject: Jennings' Documentary Treats St. Clair County

Source: Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colorado,

<http://tinyurl.com/55dpd>

02-17-05

Saunders: Jennings Lands 'UFO' Promo

Dan Rather is going.

Tom Brokaw is gone.

For a generation of network evening news watchers, Peter Jennings is the last anchor standing.

But Jennings does more than just stand. Or stand around.

The peripatetic newsman was in Houston Monday, conducting a lengthy public town meeting.

In Denver on Tuesday he interviewed Peter Coors and charmed a luncheon gathering of civic leaders.

Next stop was Seattle on Wednesday and a session with Bill Gates.

As part of the job, he anchored the ABC Evening News from each city, with the Denver telecast on 7News, produced outdoors in the chilly Civic Center.

And in all three cities he managed to trumpet his two-hour Feb. 24 network special, Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - Seeing is Believing.

Notice I said trumpet rather than promote.

Jennings has hoisted promotion to a much higher level.

He's adept at discussing, in subtle terms, his career, the ABC newscast and his documentary work while boosting the profile of local network affiliates.

So it's easy to forget Jennings' news tours contain a heavy dose of promotion because they come across in such a seamless professional manner.

Jennings' luncheon meeting and question-and-answer session with chamber of commerce and metro Denver leaders covered everything from his longtime association with Rather and Brokaw ("we've been rivals in the daytime and buddies at night") to the tinder box in the Middle East, after Monday's assassination of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri - a leader Jennings knew well from his lengthy reporting stints in that part of the world.

Regarding Iraq, Jennings said he was impressed, during a recent trip, with the "optimism and enthusiasm" of the U.S. troops,

while adding "they won't be leaving for any time soon." However, he decried the lack of media coverage regarding the growing number of troops seriously wounded in combat there.

Jennings' numerous overseas assignments gave him an opportunity to provide humorous tales about his longtime relationship with Jesuits - certainly appropriate since the Rev. Michael J. Sheeran, president of Regis University, was part of the program.

And Jennings "localized" his visit telling luncheon guests it's important for him to regularly leave the insular media world of New York and Washington, D.C., to get a feel for what's happening in other parts of the country.

In an earlier interview, Jennings noted "it's business as usual for ABC News."

"We don't react to what NBC and CBS are doing," Jennings said, regarding changes in the dinnertime newscasts. "They're competitive professionals doing excellent work."

Like many in the network news business, Jennings pooh-poohs those who constantly add the dinosaur tag to the three newscasts.

"All three remain a vital news source to millions of viewers. It's not just habit. Concise information is provided. The newscasts will be around for a long time."

Regarding his upcoming UFO special, Jennings notes that nearly 50 percent of Americans along with millions around the world believe UFOs are real.

"Too often the mainstream media holds those who claim to have seen UFOs up to ridicule.

"I approached this project as a skeptic. And I still am.

"But as a reporter it would be foolish of me to simply dismiss these mysteries as something perpetrated by a bunch of kooks."

The special will look at the spectrum of the UFO experience, beginning with the first "sighting" in 1947 to today, while featuring interviews with police officers, pilots, military personnel and scientists.

One of the more detailed UFO cases recently reported (January 2000) came from St. Clair County, Ill., where police officers in five adjoining towns independently reported witnessing a giant craft with multiple bright lights moving silently across the sky at a low altitude.

Jennings is critical of how our government has handled reports of sightings.

"There's been an ongoing policy for leaders to say there is no scientific proof about UFOs.

"We hear reports that a 22-year-long investigation ended in 1969 with the conclusion UFOs are not a threat to national security.

"Meanwhile, scientists and physicists say we shouldn't simply dismiss such sightings."

Jennings is proud that his quarterly documentaries - almost a lost art on network television - deal with a wide variety of subjects.

He recently took on the tobacco industry and provided a you-are-there report on crime in Los Angeles.

Future subjects: health care in America and a look at Iran.

Saunders.nul or 303-892-5137

Copyright 2005, Rocky Mountain News. All Rights Reserved.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Iran Confirms Reports Of US Drones

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 03:51:23 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:01:51 -0500
Subject: Iran Confirms Reports Of US Drones

Source: Chicago Tribune,

<http://tinyurl.com/48b8u>

02-17-05

Iran says U.S. drones seen at nuclear sites, vows to shoot them down

By Nazila Fathi
New York Times News Service

TEHRAN -- Iran said Wednesday for the first time that pilotless U.S. spy planes had been seen over Iran's nuclear sites and threatened to shoot them down if they came within close range.

Iran's Foreign Ministry spokesman refused to comment earlier this week about a report by The Washington Post that American drones had been flying over Iran for nearly a year looking for evidence on Iran's nuclear program.

"I cannot make comments about it," spokesman Hamid Reza Assefi said Sunday. "The subject is related to the security and information apparatus."

Information Minister Ali Yunessi said Wednesday that U.S. spying activities over Iranian airspace had been going on for a long time.

"Most of the shining objects that our people see in Iran's airspace are American spying equipment used to spy on Iran's nuclear and military facilities," he said.

"If any of the bright objects come close, they will definitely meet our fire and will be shot down," Yunessi said. "We possess the necessary equipment to confront them."

There were news media reports Wednesday that one of the planes was fired upon, causing a loud explosion in southern Iran. One government official said the noise was a fuel tank falling off an airplane. The Iranian Revolutionary Guards said the blast occurred during dam construction, but another government official, in a statement that added to the confusion, later said there had been a large bang but no explosion.

The various reports on the cause of the blast, or whether one even occurred, could not be reconciled by midday Wednesday.

The issue of the drones has come up at a time when Iranian authorities are sensitive toward news about U.S. surveillance operations inside Iran. A report last month in The New Yorker, which said American commandos had been operating inside Iran since last summer, was rejected by the authorities and called part of "psychological warfare against Iran."

Newspapers reported last year that UFOs had been seen by people in several parts of the country, mostly in northern and northwestern regions where Iran's nuclear sites are.

The state television showed pictures of a sparkling white disk in April and said the object was filmed over Tehran. A reporter for the state-run news agency IRNA said he observed a similar object for 90 minutes in the northern city of Bilesavar.

The press, however, reported that military and civilian radar did not register any violations into Iran's air space. The Defense and Foreign Ministries both dismissed assertions that U.S. spy drones had entered the country last year every time journalists called, emphasizing that no flying object could penetrate Iranian skies without being identified.

However, Iran's air force was ordered to shoot down any suspicious flying object near nuclear facilities, the newspaper Ressalat reported in December.

Copyright 2005, Chicago Tribune

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Jennings Explores Roswell, Minot, Phoenix, St.Clair

From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 04:08:47 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:04:03 -0500
Subject: Jennings Explores Roswell, Minot, Phoenix, St.Clair

Source: The Denver Post, Colorado,

<http://tinyurl.com/48b8u>

Jennings asks: What about Iraq?

By Joanne Ostrow
Denver Post TV Critic

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Peter Jennings touched down here this week as part of a Seattle-Houston-Denver trip to greet affiliates.

At a luncheon, he talked about being the last of the era's Big Three anchormen.

"Ted (Koppel) and I were the youngest hires at ABC News, and now he's the oldest," Jennings said, joking. "Actually, that's a lie." (Koppel is 65; Jennings is 67.)

While he's relieved his pal Tom Brokaw has stepped down at NBC ("I am sick to death of saying nice things about him at parties"), Jennings claimed to be "very surprised" by the announcement of Dan Rather's retirement.

Later, he declined to discuss the CBS News malfunction, except to say, "I find it very sad that at the end of a long career, people are judging Dan on one circumstance. It pains me." He claims exhaustive vetting would have made such a mistake unlikely at ABC News.

Jennings confirms ABC is experimenting with trying the venerable "Nightline" in a new format. "Ted is talking to management about working on the Sunday show ('This Week')." It's possible George Stephanopoulos could switch places with Koppel. "It would be really tough if we lost either one of them." He vowed to fight hard against putting a comedian or chat show in the "Nightline" slot, although ABC executives previously offered David Letterman the spot.

And what about the lack of focus by the nation's local TV news on matters pertaining to Iraq?

"I personally regret the country is not more acquainted with the wounded from Iraq, part of that surely a function of local television. With 10,000 injured, communities all over the country are affected. That's a big story. It would be shameful if local television stations were ignoring that."

They are. A new report sums up the tragic tendencies of local TV news. Whatever happened to the role of the media as serious watchdogs on government? That was then, this is now.

Last fall, local TV news stations averaged 25 seconds of Iraq war coverage per evening newscast. That distressing finding is

based on a study of 44 network affiliates in 11 markets, including Denver.

Iraq was treated as an afterthought in pre-election coverage, according to a study by the Norman Lear Center at the University of Southern California, the NewsLab at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and the Center for Public Service at Seton Hall. Iraq was given less time than sports, weather, health, crime, injury, economy and even bumpers, teases and intro music. Even "other" got more time.

When an impending war is considered so unworthy of attention on the local news that it can't compete with "other," we're in trouble. Sports and weather together accounted for an average of six minutes, compared with Iraq's 25 seconds. The largest chunk of time was devoted to advertising, an average eight minutes.

ABC evidently believes that seeing is believing or, at least, that believers are worth seeing. Next Thursday, the network turns over two hours in primetime to the burning topic: "Peter Jennings Reporting, UFOs - Seeing is Believing" (7-9 p.m. on KMGH-Channel 7).

Jennings is unrepentant, having done a host of harder-edged topics in recent months. He just spent 10 days in Iraq. So there.

The UFO story evolved after his reporting on the Kennedy conspiracy theories. "So much of the Kennedy conspiracies might not have taken root if the government had been more open with the public."

He argues it's worth two hours. "If that many people believe this, I want to know what's going on."

The program explores four major incidents - in Roswell, N.M.; Minot, N.D.; Phoenix; and western Illinois.

"I don't want to sound like a believer here, I'm just impressed on a lot of levels. We have done exactly the right thing in taking the subject seriously."

At a time when Patricia Arquette's paranormally gifted "Medium" is heating up the ratings for NBC and when ghosts and sixth senses are easier to contemplate than, say, car bombings and body bags, the unexplained and extrasensory seem a good bet.

TV critic Joanne Ostrow can be reached at 303-820-1830 or jostrow.nul

All contents Copyright 2005 The Denver Post

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:13:35 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:09:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Friedman

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 20:55:09 EST
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:33:24 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:39:13 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>We still don't "know" anything from MJ-12 because it is a hoax,
>a fraud, disinformation.

>>So, there have been 'leaks'. The question then is, do the leaks
>>refer to a true event or are they part of disinformation,
>>possibly to cover up something else?

>Well you are already succumbing to disinformation by accepting
>MJ-12.

Brad,

Would you please stop making unsubstantiated proclamations and
provide some evidence?

I know you are very knowledgeable about history and the CIA and
UFOs. That is no excuse for making claims without any evidence
being provided.

The comment about higher than the H-Bomb wasn't related to the
CIA. You are talking riddles.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Medieval Media

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 09:12:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:12:17 -0500
Subject: Medieval Media

We found another instance of Dark Ages journalism in our local newspaper.

We've put the editorial blurb online at:

<http://www.tvbe.com>

Or you can link to it from our UFO blog:

<http://rrrgroup.blogspot.com>

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

File On UFO At Airbase Opened

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:14:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:14:51 -0500
Subject: File On UFO At Airbase Opened

Source: The Shropshire Star - UK

http://www.shropshirestar.com/show_article.php?aID=29701

02-17-05

File On UFO At Airbase Opened

A real-life Fox Mulder who spent years looking into UFO sightings across the country has revealed one of the most sensational cases he ever investigated was in Shropshire.

Nick Pope, who was a UFO desk officer for the Ministry of Defence from 1991 to 1994, said an incident at RAF Shawbury was one of the most important.

On his website:

www.nickpope.net

he says: "One of the most sensational cases I ever investigated related to an incident that occurred in the early hours of March 31, 1993."

He said the UFO was described to him as a "vast, triangular craft only marginally smaller than a jumbo jet."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Blind 'Abductee'

From: Luis R. Gonzalez <lrgm.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:47:39 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:17:13 -0500
Subject: Blind 'Abductee'

I have just come across a narrative that fulfill all Thomas Bullard's episodes of an abduction:

1. Capture: As the protagonist has been blinded (Note: the description, "my right eye intact, looking forward; meanwhile, my left eye, swinging and hanging upon my cheek, looking downwards" reminds me of John Velez's), he cannot describe this part.
2. Examination: He found himself on a metallic platform with only one feet, where he is examined and had several tubes inserted. There are several types of beings: giants, women, and also a small being like an 5-years-old child but with a enormous head, small mouth, and almost no nose. They gave him some kind of artificial sight.
3. Conference: He is given several explanations and instructions
4. Tour: He described different rooms and also a subterranean base.
- 5 Otherworldly Journey: He astrally visits several worlds
6. Theophany: He accessed the Akasic Records and is given a vision about the evolution of life on Earth, assisted by The Gardeners
7. Return: He is returned to Earth and given a mission, but cannot conserve his sight.
8. Aftermath

The story was published in 1971 and surely obtained a great diffusion. The title?

"The hermit", by T(uesday) Lobsang Rampa a.k.a. Cyril Henry Hoskins

Luis R. Gonz=Ellez Manso

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:18:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC Special

>We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's
>interview for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in
>the finished piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his
>death, and the only interview he'd granted for a major program
>in many years.

What!?

If that's true, and I don't doubt you, Will Bueche, then we can see where this special is headed in a handbasket.

Ya think maybe somebody got to Jennings and his crew?

Dr. Mack hit a bullseye with his reports on the abductees. How can one of the most esteemed men in his field suddenly become uninteresting???

Bullwaffles I say! This is indeed getting scary.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:21:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Reynolds

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Knowing nothing about something - in this case gender mores in
>Minnesota - and underscoring as much in your odd outburst above,
>you nonetheless bloviate bravely onward. How very pelicanist of
>you.

Jerry...

In the past two weeks I've had to explain what "pelicanist"
means to three different journalists whom I directed to UFO
UpDates in anticipation of the ABC/Jennings UFO broadcast.

The "joke" has worn thin and only beclouds a serious issue, one
that is seen as monumental by some.

The word is coined, but like "flying saucers" has outlived its
usefulness, if there ever was a usefulness for its use.

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:04:16 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:22:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC Special

>We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's
>interview for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in
>the finished piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his
>death, and the only interview he'd granted for a major program
>in many years.

>We are absolutely stunned by this information, and cannot
>conceive of how a documentary purporting to explore the subject
>of alien encounters could have been made without the views of
>the man who was arguably the world's leading authority on how
>these encounters affect people's lives. It is also deeply
>saddening news, since it was hoped that this program would in
>some ways serve as a farewell to a great man.

It almost goes without saying that any treatment of the
abduction phenomenon would necessarily have to pay attention to
the late Dr. Mack's research, experience, and views in this
area. The only explanation I can think of is that the show will
give little coverage to the abduction aspect of the UFO
controversy. I guess we'll find out soon.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 06:49:39 -1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:23:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 12:38:21 EST
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become
>>clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO
>>researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO
>>research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific
>>methods for UFO research.

><snip>

><snip>Without compelling supportive evidence, why should we just
>accept the word of "whistleblowers"?

>The "Ufology Principle [UFOP]" you outline above is the
>antithesis of what good research should be, and indicates that
>you are biased from the get go, in a way that compromises any
>truly objective study of the evidence as it is presented.

<snip>

Aloha Paul,

I think that many of those on this List would agree that there is a conspiracy of silence on the part of the government concerning the object of UFO research. Donald Keyhoe for example persuasively argued that such a conspiracy existed at the highest level and has been secretly enforced through legislation such as JANAP 146. Evidence for such a conspiracy I contend even goes back to the rejection of the original Estimate of the Situation offered to General Vandenberg by the Project Sign team in 1948. This conspiracy of silence by the government, military, etc., continues to be accepted by many researchers as a fact of life in UFO research.

Now this is where many UFO researchers and I part company. The UFO researchers do something quite strange from a political science perspective. They argue that yes, the government does conspire to keep this all secret, withhold evidence, fabricate disinformation, yet they don't distort the evidence, intimidate witnesses into silence, discredit witnesses, etc. It's this latter process which is most pertinent to whistleblower testimonies. If national security agencies have a policy of discrediting witnesses by altering records, removing corroborating evidence, silencing corroborating witnesses, then I argue that this 'distorting factor' needs to be systematically included into UFO research in the form of the Uncertainty Principle I'm advocating for whistleblowers and other 'truth tellers'.

As far as I can see it, most UFO researchers are arguing that the government/military are kind of like honest crooks. Yes, they withhold evidence, maintain silence and fabricate disinformation, yet they would never discredit witnesses by removing/altering public records that support their testimonies or intimidating/silencing potential corroborating witnesses. So who is presenting the more credible research methodology here? Those such as yourself arguing that whistleblowers need to be treated like anyone else before a court of law in terms of corroborating 'hard evidence', or those such as myself arguing that these 'evidentiary standards' are not possible due to the distorting factor of government interference. I believe that the closer a whistleblower gets to revealing the truth, the less likely there will be hard evidence to support that testimony. This is the key aspect of what I'm arguing about an Uncertainty Principle and needs to be factored into the analysis of available whistleblower testimonies.

Rather than putting whistleblower testimonies into the 'gray box' as Stan recommends, we need to be able to use other criteria such as coherence, consistency, credibility, clarity, etc., in determining the acceptability of such testimony in the absence of conclusive hard evidence so that we can analyze it. That means we need to introduce an Uncertainty Principle into the analysis of whistleblower testimony so we can work with it and develop a better understanding of what's happening. That means building on the available whistleblower testimonies in the absence of conclusive hard evidence. Putting such whistleblower testimony into a gray box for filing purposes seems to me to be part of a poorly thought through methodology. I don't think the logic of those arguing that a government conspiracy exists yet simultaneously contending that we need conclusive hard evidence to accept whistleblower testimony is at all very consistent or persuasive.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:44:30 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:27:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:05:35 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 14:58:48 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

>>>Again, the same applies to Roswell. As I have said there does
>>>seem to be some evidence of a top secret policy response to
>>>Roswell. I'm still working out the full dimensions of it all. I
>>>still think it should just resolve into a big MOGUL balloon but
>>>it has absolutely no apparent connection, the policy response is
>>>quite obviously not to "one of ours" as such a defense policy
>>>would be unnecessary by definition.

>>Any chance of helping on this? Several times, Brad, you have
>>claimed to have break through information, but it seems to
>>dissipate.

>No one else is even close to being on the trail of either the TS
>or the SECRET policy responses of July-August 1947, i.e., the
>Roswell and the non-Roswell parallel tracks, so no one else is
>contributing to the research effort. Nothing is dissipating on
>my end. My research material continues to grow. But it goes
>slowly because of lack of time and money and historical records
>that could help fill in more of the blanks.

>>One of the impacts (we seem to have squishy definitions of what
>>impact means) was that the military and intelligence communities
>>instituted a major policy of covering up information about
>>important sightings of flying discs.

>><snip>

>Coverup is not unique to UFOs or Roswell, so it must be
>carefully distinguished from coverup for other reasons. A
>coverup of UFOs/flying disks could incorporate Roswell
>without having the slightest thing to do with what uniquely
>defines Roswell, i.e., Roswell could be covered up just like any
>other UFO case as if nothing different from any other UFO case.
>Whereas the TS policy response to Roswell was abrupt and
>definitely uniquely a response to Roswell or a Roswell-type
>event.

Surely the recovery of a crashed vehicle and alien bodies is
very different from the transient observation of something
strange in the sky. If you have limited time and resources,
wouldn't it make sense to have some help? Nobody can search all
the files by himself.

For example, Barry Greenwood with his huge collection of
clippings has been very helpful in digging out items re the UFO
observations (so-called 'meteors') of Sept. 12, 1952, and also more

items about Air Force interceptors shooting down, or trying to, UFOs, to go with the clip provided by David Rudiak from the Seattle Post Intelligencer about USAF pilots being ordered to shoot down UFOs - July 29, 1952.

If you get hit by a truck, Brad, who will know about your fascinating sounding discovery?

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:47:18 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:40:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 17:29:39 +0000
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 11:52:41 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 12:36:37 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

><snip>

>>Your observation that there is no reflected light in the water
>>below this relatively bright UFO in the sky does not rule out
>>the lens flare explanation. In fact, it further supports it.

>>Of course, if this UFO was real object and it was radiating only
>>polarized light perpendicular to the surface of the water, then
>>it would be detected visually and recorded with a camera but
>>there would be no reflection off the water making it what Bruce
>>would call a TRUFO. Of course, the easiest way to test this is
>>to use the same camera to take a picture of the same scene under
>>similar conditions at night from exactly the same location. If
>>the UFO appears, it is an IFO. If it does not, then it must be a
>>TRUFO - which only raises even more questions, one of them being
>>why didn't others observe and report such a bright and massive
>>UFO?

>Surely the reason why there is no reflected light in the water
>is because the object - if such it be - is well back from the
>waterfront, over the hill that the town is standing on. The only
>lights in the water are those reflected from lamps or building
>immediately along the waterfront. None of the houses or other
>buildings further up the hill are reflected in the water either.

Hi John!

Following your reasoning, then the Moon which is even more
further back from the waterfront over the hill that the town is
standing should also not produce a reflection in the water. For
those who have seen and photographed the Moon at night over some
distant hills across a large body of water, the reflected light
from the Moon is definitely there. If the surface of this body
of water is rough, it would not produce a roundish reflected
image of the Moon but a vertical column of light instead which
would span the entire length of the body of water.

Also, as we have seen in the Gulf Breeze pictures of the glowing
"UFO" directly above a road, there is reflected light off the
road surface which is a much less smooth surface than water. If
this glowing UFO was indeed a "TRUFO", one would also expect to
see strong reflected light on the road surface halfway between
the "UFO" and the photographer just like the light of the Moon
reflecting off water.

If you do not think so, try looking for the reflected light off the top of your wooden desk from an overhead lamp. You won't notice the reflected light from this source. Now place this same lamp just above one end of your wooden desk and look for the reflection of this light from the other end of your desk. If both your light source and eye are just above the wooden desk so that the angle the light reflects off it is very small (close to a grazing angle), then you will not only see the reflected light but may even see the image of the lamp itself as if the wooden desk had become a mirror! (We do not see this effect with the Gulf Breeze UFO.)

Thanks to the web site below which was brought to our attention by Kyle King in a recent post to UFO UpDates, I think we can now safely conclude that this very interesting structured UFO in the picture(s) was simply an honest misrepresentation of an IFO. To continue to promote this UFO in public as a TRUFO would not only be dishonest but it would do damage to the credibility of all of us who study UFOs (or more accurately, UFO reports).

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/sightings/chile/041000.shtml>

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:10:13 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:46:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Gehrman

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:25:02 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>In other words, you are basically a skeptical fence-sitter, as I
>am, e.g., on the "alien autopsy" footage. I lean towards fake,
>but don't know. Nobody can prove it fake and there is some
>evidence that might point to authenticity.

David,

There is much more than "some" evidence. What about the
crash site that can't be explained by any known causes and
matches the cameraman's description down to minute details?

Why do you and others on this List continually ignore that fact?

Hundreds of square yards of cristobalite covered rhyolite and
burned rocks and vegetation should at least cause you to want to
investigate.

I don't get it.

If the AA is a hoax, then you should be able to make a case for
this belief, with some evidence.

If you're unable to find these faults, why not try to
extrapolate information from the footage to begin to explain the
nature of the dissected creature and the craft it was flying.

That's what I've tried to do, and I think, with some success.
I've come to the conclusion that creature isn't an ET; it's one
of the invisible residents that Ivan Sanderson speculated we'd
bump into, sooner or later.

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:48:58 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:49:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Santiago Yturria <syturria.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 16:44:06 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 00:27:21 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

><snip>

>>Now, does anyone have the image from Iqueque?

>The UFO photo by Mr. Bruna:

><http://tinyurl.com/48b8u>

Hi Santiago,

Speaking as one who always tries to eliminate the mundane explanations first, I must say that this image appears to be a bird in profile flight somewhere between the camera and the hilltop in the distance. It appears to be moving left to right in the image, and the bright area would correspond to the near wing, while the darker area would represent the body.

I have seen many images like this, and have suggested similar explanations before.

While I could accept a hypothesis that alien craft, secret drones, or interdimensional visitors might camouflage themselves as birds in flight (a pretty clever idea if detection is not desired), I'd need much more than such images alone to be convinced of this.

When creating a list of reported UFO shapes, like disks, orbs, triangles, etc., is there a category for "bird-like" shapes?

Perhaps the volume of such photographs justifies such a category.

I simply don't think so at this point.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:49:20 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:51:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:42:52 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>I would have thought that the explanation that a particular UFO
>report was produced by the planet Venus would be pretty
>conclusively disproved if it was completely overcast at the
>time, or if Venus was not visible from that location at that
>date.

It might, unless of course one were to argue that the witness was mistaken about the time and date, or that they were mistaken about the weather (and the available weather reports didn't take adequate account of local microclimates). Or unless the deus ex machina of "radical misperception" were to be invoked so that any difference whatever between the witness report and the Venus hypothesis were to be attributed to some generic and undefinable process of "observer error".

>An explanation involving hallucination would be pretty lame for
>a case involving multiple independent witnesses at different
>locations and half a dozen separate vide/CCTV images.

And similarly the ETH (any version of it) or the TSH, or the zerographic hypomollification hypothesis, or any other hypothesis you care to name, would be falsified if the multiple independent witnesses were subsequently shown to be members of the same extended family and the computer which had been used to manipulate the video images were to come to light after it went into a repair shop for servicing.

Of course, you're partly right - there is a null hypothesis for UFO studies, which is that every UFO report can be explained using only known entities. And that null hypothesis certainly can be falsified, and frequently is, or we would have no UFO reports to begin with (if we disregard the CSICOPian position, which is in fact completely unfalsifiable).

But isn't the null hypothesis we're interested in, it's the explanatory hypotheses which are put forward to account for those reports where the null hypothesis has already been rejected. And for these, your definition of falsification is completely trivial, for three reasons. Firstly, because we have to deal with the report we have, not the report we would like to have - if we don't have multiple witnesses and video images, then we don't have multiple witnesses and video images, and you cannot use this **post hoc** as a falsification condition. Secondly, because while your Venus explanation may be falsifiable under the specific conditions you mention, the hypothesis belongs to a set of similar hypotheses which is indefinitely large, and one cannot falsify indefinitely large sets by sequentially eliminating their individual members. Unless there is a falsification condition for the entire set, the set itself is indefinitely elastic and hence unfalsifiable. And thirdly, because falsification (unlike testability) is supposed to be a definitive criterion, in that the falsification condition will always hold if the hypothesis itself is untrue.

If I've lost a book and I hypothesize that it's on the coffee-

table downstairs, and I go downstairs to check and it isn't there, then my hypothesis is definitively falsified - there is no realistic set of conditions under which it could still hold.

This is admittedly a very stringent criterion, which in practice is seldom met - but at the very least, a falsification criterion should be capable of partitioning the set of conditions under which the hypothesis can hold in some non-trivial way.

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:06:20 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:52:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - King

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 22:37:25 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 15:30:55 EST
>>Subject: Evidence For Present Life On Mars

><snip>

>For researchers like George Filer, Mac Tonnies and many other
>UFO UpDates Listers, this disclosure would not have come soon
>enough.

>http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/mystery_monday_050214.html

>Phoenix, the spacecraft set for launch to Mars in 2007, was to
>be a drill-equipped lander which could have proved that methane
>gas producing organisms do indeed exist just below the water
>moist Martian soil but.....

Hi Nick, Greg and List,

So, Formisano's paper on the possibility of extant life on Mars
now appears to be supported.

Too bad his paper got watered down before presentation.

What is odd is that this report seems to imply that this is new
news... Formisano came to the same conclusions months ago, based
on the same data.

Is it not "real" science until NASA, or the POTUS says so?

The real shame is that as we will likely be engaged in military
conflict for at least the next 3 years or so, in at least 3 or 4
regional "hotspots" around the globe, at immense financial and
human cost, the US will probably find good reasons not to pursue
expensive space missions.

I sincerely hope that as the US becomes more marginalized in
such matters, the space programs of those states less encumbered
will forge ahead, and get some real answers.

In fact, I think it would be quite appropriate for the ESA or
even the Chinese to be the ones that find actual extant life on
Mars.

It just doesn't mesh with the apparent desire of our current
regime to roll back the clock to a "simpler time", and our
current leaders stated disdain for intellectuals and their
pursuits.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:15:00 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:53:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran - King

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 00:36:46 EST
>Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 21:32:06 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 13:17:19 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>>Source: Fox News

>><http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,147469,00.html>

>02-14-05

>>Pentagon Denies Flying Drones Over Iran

>>WASHINGTON =E2=80=94 Senior Defense Department officials
>said Monday
>>they have no knowledge of any U.S. drone flights
>over Iran, and
>>U.S. intelligence officials would not comment on any
>such flights.

><snip>

>So called denials depends on what question is asked and what
>person the question is directed to. If the drone flights over
>Iran are/were highly classified and part of some
>compartmentalized program, then many so called
>"Senior Defense
>Dept..officials" wouldn't have a clue as to what is going on
>because they are not cleared for the information, nor do they
>have "a need to know." They can honestly and publicly
>say they
>are not aware and be telling the truth in so far as they know
>it.

<snip>

Hi Robert,

My point exactly. Compartmentalization serves not just to keep
secret data secret, it also allows plausible deniability by even
senior officials. The problem is that reporters aren't asking
those who know, and those that don't know aren't telling
reporters who does.

Stating that one has no knowledge is not the same as a denial.

It is our naive assumption that if HE doesn't know, it must not
be so. A clever trick used every day in politics.

Best ,
Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:28:22 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:55:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Clark

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>The "joke" has worn thin and only beclouds a serious issue,
>one that is seen as monumental by some.

>The word is coined, but like "flying saucers" has outlived its
>usefulness, if there ever was a usefulness for its use.

The word is spelled "usefulness."

As for the rest, forget it, guy. I don't take advice from you,
though - if we may judge from the volume of it you offer the
rest of us - you apparently are full of it. "It" can be
defined as you wish.

This is the last message from you to which I will respond.
Others will be deleted unread.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:43:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:57:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>Knowing nothing about something - in this case gender mores in
>>Minnesota - and underscoring as much in your odd outburst above,
>>you nonetheless bloviate bravely onward. How very pelicanist of
>>you.

>In the past two weeks I've had to explain what "pelicanist"
>means to three different journalists whom I directed to UFO
>UpDates in anticipation of the ABC/Jennings UFO broadcast.

>The "joke" has worn thin and only beclouds a serious
>issue, one that is seen as monumental by some.

>The word is coined, but like "flying saucers" has outlived its
>usefullness, if there ever was a usefullness for its use.

Hey Rich,

Instead of explaining the term, why not point them to the
Updates archive and having them... gasp... investigate for
themselves. You did say these were journalists, no?

Or, even better, tell them that "pelicanist" is out of vogue,
and that the new term is "Klasskurtzian" and leave it at that.
Should keep them occupied for a bit. <g>

As to your comment that such terms are not useful, what is your
suggestion? Skeptic? Nope. I'm a skeptic, and yet I often find
myself much at odds with the pelicanist view.

You seem to be implying that if a journalist doesn't know the
terms in use, the terms should change to suit the journalist.

If so, how do you justify such a ridiculous implication?

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:47:04 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:26:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

><snip>

>>OK Larry. Here's my lengthy two cents.

>>Almost the entire Mogul balloon scenario depends on the
>>memories of only one man, former Mogul engineer Charles Moore,
>>who claimed his lost Flight #4 from June 4, 1947, probably
>>accounted for the crash at the Brazel Ranch.

>>Flight #4 was a convenient fall guy, because the Mogul Project
>>was operating in New Mexico at that time. But better still for
>>debunkers like the Air Force counterintelligence squad, #4 has
>>zero documentation to prove what happened to it or that it even
>>existed. (All that exists is a hole in the Mogul records between
>>Flight #3 and Flight #5, plus a diary of one of the Mogul
>>scientists indicating an unnumbered flight attempt in that gap
>>being attempted but cancelled on account of cloudy weather, with
>>a balloon cluster, not necessarily an actual fully configured
>>Mogul later being released. There is nothing in the official
>>flight summaries mentioning an actual flight, no balloon
>>schematics, and no data on flight trajectory or tracking, even
>>though Moore claims they tracked it.)

><snip>

>>Glad you realize it's half-baked, since there is even less
>>evidence for this than a Mogul balloon, zero in fact.

>>Metallic and other debris was scattered over a very large,
>>linear area, very easy to spot from the air. Something large
>>crashed at the Brazel ranch, not some tiny instrument, and it
>>was traveling at high speed to create the linear path, according
>>to first investigator, Roswell intel chief Jesse Marcel. Some
>>small atomic or other device would not have created such a
>>debris field. According to Leonard Stringfield, Marcel also told
>>him they used a geiger counter to check for radioactivity and
>>found none.

>Thanks Dave, and sorry for all the <snips>.

>I was just looking for votes yea or nay on Roswell.

>I presume I can count you along with Stan on the Yea side, and
>yes there are bound to be others.

>The implication that most of serious Ufology still takes Roswell
>as ET, and that it is therefore insular if not dotty; that's
>what inspired me to say anything at all.

>I usually avoid Roswell for very predictable reasons, rancor and
>endless bush-beating high among them.

>Do you feel that most serious ufologists still take Roswell as
>the crash of an alien craft, or do you consider yourself (along
>with Stan and others) in a minority position?

>I'm willing to accept other views on Roswell itself, even if I
>don't agree with them.

I think we can guarantee that even if Stan Friedman is not the only 'serious ufologist' to take Roswell as the crash of an alien space craft, he is certainly the only such ufologist to go along with there being two, yes two, crashes on that same day, i.e. one at a site (one of four postulated in the literature) near Roswell, and another on the Plains of San Augustin.

Why not ask for a show of 'hands' on those who believe there were two UFO crashes within 100 miles of each other on the same day?

By the way, there is not one shred of documentation of any kind to indicate a second such crash. Not even a press report. Merely a person who spoke to Stan in 1978 following a lecture he gave. This guy did not recall the date, and only heard the story from a third party (Barney Barnett), nearly 30 years earlier. Even Barnett had no memory of the date. Yet Stan has built a totally fanciful case for a July 1947 occurrence for this event, when there is nothing to show it happened then, or at any other time.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:48:09 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:27:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Lehmborg

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>Knowing nothing about something - in this case gender mores in
>>Minnesota - and underscoring as much in your odd outburst above,
>>you nonetheless bloviate bravely onward. How very pelicanist of
>>you.

>In the past two weeks I've had to explain what "pelicanist"
>means to three different journalists whom I directed to UFO
>UpDates in anticipation of the ABC/Jennings UFO broadcast.

>The "joke" has worn thin and only beclouds a serious issue, one
>that is seen as monumental by some.

>The word is coined, but like "flying saucers" has outlived its
>usefulness, if there ever was a usefulness for its use.

I disagree, Sir. Pelicanists perform a unique and specific
disservice to aggregate humanity and so must endure a unique and
specific identifier. That word should be descriptive of the
behavior displayed and not be insulting in the same manner that
the words "pisswit" and "sh_thead" are, by way of example...
"Pelicanist" is the preternatural, profound, and perfect
proposal for such an expression. I offer "klasskurtzian," for a
little variety. Please pass this on to the different
journalists.

Moreover, the expression "flying saucer" still reaches the vast
majority and has outlived its usefulness in no discernable
way.....

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:29:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 15:59:29 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54
>OK Larry. Here's my lengthy two cents.

>It's not just a few "Ufologists" who consider Roswell to be an
>alien space crash. How about astronaut Edgar Mitchell's many
>statements about high-level generals and government officials
>telling him off-the-record that Roswell was indeed a real ET
>event?

Who were these government officials? And why should Mitchell be
privy to such a secret?

>Or remember Senator Barry Goldwater's many public statements
>about wanting to get access to the alien artifacts he heard
>were held at Wright-Patterson and being cussed out by his good
>friend Gen. Curtis LeMay, who told him that even he didn't
>have access and to never bring up the subject again?

>(Among other things, Goldwater had been Republican Presidential
>nominee in 1964 and would have been briefed on matters of
>national security, was a Brig. Gen. in the AF reserve, a right-
>wing hawk, and well-connected to the military establishment, and
>had been Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and
>Select Committee on Intelligence, all rich potential sources of
>high-level, insider information on UFOs.)

Barry Goldwater, a long-standing UFO believer, had given written
replies to a few individuals who made enquiries about Air Force
secrecy on UFOs. These are detailed in Tim Good's "Above Top
Secret". At no point does Goldwater say he was looking for, or
had even heard of, "alien artefacts". This phrase was inserted
by Good, who said he had heard it from an informant.

It is clear from this correspondence that Goldwater was trying to
locate documents and to see any AF papers relating
to UFOs. He simply refers to "information that has been collected
by the Air Force". It had nothing to do with Roswell
or crashed saucers.

Two of the said letters were written before Roswell became
publicised as a crashed saucer. The third was written in Oct.
1981 but even this says nothing about crashed saucers or alien
artifacts. He does refer to a "blue room" at Wright Patterson,
which can mean anything you like.

The rebuff from LeMay was during the period LeMay was USAF Chief
of Staff, i.e. 1961-65. The idea that "even he did not have
access" is absurd.

The 'Roswell connection' is, quite simply, non-existent.

>Disclosure witness Brig. Gen. Steven Lovekin (Army National
>Guard) has also discussed the subject. His story was being
>briefed about a 1947 New Mexico alien crash around 1960 when he
>was a young lieutenant in the Army Signal Corp and stationed at
>the Eisenhower and Kennedy White House. He said the Pentagon
>briefings including being shown actual debris, such as an I-beam
>covered with symbols, and being told that bodies were recovered.
>He also claimed he was told that some people had been "erased"
>as examples to others and that such terrorism had been a big
>factor in maintaining the coverup. (Of course, he hasn't been
>the only person to mention this. Several Roswell witnesses, e.g.
>the family of Roswell Sheriff Wilcox, have also mentioned death
>threats against Wilcox and his family to keep Sheriff Wilcox in
>line.)

>Last October I had a chance meeting with Gen. Wesley Clark when
>he was campaigning for John Kerry. The year before in the
>primaries, Clark had stated his belief that mankind would
>eventually travel faster than light and go wherever they liked.
>He outlined a 100 year program in fundamental research to make
>this a reality, a remarkably ambitious and radical proposal for
>a Presidential candidate to make for something that is
>supposedly impossible to achieve. When I brought up Clark's
>previous statements about FTL travel and then asked him if he
>had ever been briefed on the subject of UFOs while in the
>military, Clark coyly dropped a number of broad hints indicating
>that he had. He said that he had "heard a bit," that there were
>indeed "things going on," but that we would have to "work out
>our own mathematics," a statement he also made when he outlined
>his FTL research plan. And, oh yes, he dropped another broad
>hint by spontaneously bringing up the subject of Roswell, saying
>he was going to be there that night.

No real Roswell connection established. Just a bit about 'faster
than light' travel.

>Other Generals and Admirals have also made public statements,
>not about UFO crashes, but about UFOs being very real physical
>craft, like Gen. Nathan Twining (USAF Chief of Staff and
>Chairman of Joint Chiefs), Admiral Delmar Fahrney (former head
>of the Navy's guided missile program), Admiral Roscoe
>Hillenkoetter (alleged MJ-12 member, first CIA director, board
>member of NICAP), and a number of others. Gen. Douglas MacArthur
>also dropped hints. On at least two occasions he made statements
>that the nations of the world might have to unite in the future
>to fight an interplanetary war.

On the contrary, Gen Twining's famous Sept 23, 1947 memo makes
it abundantly clear that no, repeat no, physical evidence had
been found. So do other classified papers of the late 1940s
Twining certainly wrote that UFOs were real, but this was in a
document of the early UFO era when it was feared the discs were
possibly an experimental Russian device.

Likewise Hillenkoetter never made any reference to physical
evidence, unless of course you accept the MJ-12 papers as
authentic.

MacArthur, I am very certain, had never even heard of Roswell
when he died in 1964. I wonder if his two alleged statements
about "interplanetary war" can be documented (time & place
etc.).

>I presume you mean the sniping from one side or another that
>often occurs on this List. But again what does that have to do
>with whether Roswell was a real ET event or not? Not many
>generals or admirals or astronauts put up their hands either,
>perhaps partly because of lack of knowledge or fear of the
>consequences, but occasionally some do.

>>What I don't want to see is the implication that "serious
>>ufology" takes Roswell uncritically as space-alien craft, >and
>is therefore rather dotty and insular overall. That >seems
>unfair.

>Hey, even I, and I bet Stan, are more than willing to consider a
>_serious_, actually _documented_ conventional explanation where
>a primary witness doesn't need to resort to hoaxing to try to
>bolster the claim and where the advocates can actually produce
>something of substance and not just conjecture.

>But to the question as to whether Stan Friedman is alone in the
>UFO community - of course not! He has a lot of company, even if
>they don't necessarily put up their hands when skeptics demand a
>show of hands on UFO Updates. Many simply don't want to be
>bothered by such baiting.

He is certainly alone when he asserts that two saucers crashed
in New Mexico on the same day. (The other being on the Plains of
San Augustin). Does anyone else go along with this?

>And the company isn't just limited to dumb Ufologists, but seems
>to also extend into the upper reaches of government and the
>military. Besides the examples I've already cited, some
>Presidents like Jimmie Carter and Bill Clinton were "believers"
>and wanted answers as well (Clinton specifically wanted to know
>about Roswell) and were largely thwarted in their attempts to
>get at the information.

Clinton's actual words, from something he said in response to a
child's question whilst on a visit to Northern Ireland, are in
dispute. And Jimmy Carter had never heard of Roswell either, at
least not while he was president.

>Remember recent statements by Clinton's Chief of Staff, John
>Podestras, and Energy Secretary, Bill Richardson, now governor of
>New Mexico? They dropped broad hints as well, saying UFOs and/or
>Roswell should be taken very seriously. Podestras added there was
>only so much he could reveal. I'm sure much more would come out
>if security oaths on the subject were
>completely lifted.

It is easy to find top military people who believe in UFOs as
alien spacecraft. Air Chief Marshal Lord Dowding was a believer
in Adamski. People like Lord Mountbatten, Prince Philip, Sir
Peter Horsley, Admiral of the Fleet Lord Hill-Norton (a believer
in MJ-12) are or were prominent in the UK. General L.M. Chassin
of NATO was a staunch UFO devotee in France (with a prediction
in 1960 that the 'truth' would soon be revealed). None of their
views have the slightest bearing on whether Roswell was a UFO
crash, nor can such opinions be used in support of this idea.

The most important question of all remains unanswered:

Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
evidence?

If it did indeed happen, there must be literally tons of research papers
on this. Scientists of many disciplines would have been involved in
the ensuing analysis and discussion, perhaps from several countries.
Yet we have heard from precisely none of them.

Not one written word from anyone directly involved.

The whole Roswell myth is built on the principle that the
'truth' can never be revealed because of the need for one country
to maintain tight secrecy on it. Even when scientists are constantly
searching for evidence of alien life (as they have been for at least
50 years), the greatest scientific discovery of all time still has
to be kept under wraps. And this after six decades.

I submit that such an idea is utterly incredible

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:49:03 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:31:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 06:49:39 -1000
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 12:38:21 EST
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

><snip>

><<snip>Without compelling supportive evidence, why should we just
>>accept the word of "whistleblowers"?

>>The "Ufology Principle [UFOP]" you outline above is the
>>antithesis of what good research should be, and indicates that
>>you are biased from the get go, in a way that compromises any
>>truly objective study of the evidence as it is presented.

<snip>

>As far as I can see it, most UFO researchers are arguing that
>the government/military are kind of like honest crooks. Yes,
>they withhold evidence, maintain silence and fabricate
>disinformation, yet they would never discredit witnesses by
>removing/altering public records that support their testimonies
>or intimidating/silencing potential corroborating witnesses. So
>who is presenting the more credible research methodology here?

Michael:

They are. The government is simply not capable of altering records to the degree you suggest.

Take, for example, the matter of Hypothetical Witness A. Now, "A" claims to have doctoral degrees in physics from the University of X and Law from the University of Y. He also claims that he served in the USAF for six years, and was posted at Base W, where he saw alien bodies.

Now, for the sake of argument, I'll concede that the government could alter his military records to show that, instead of serving at Base W, he actually served at Base Q. However, Witness "A" should be able to provide names of the people he worked with at Base W, names of people in the community whom he knew, receipts from local businesses where he purchased goods or did business, etc.

Also, when it comes time to judge his credibility, he should be able to produce his doctoral degrees (and his undergrad ones as well), yearbooks, similar personal records as to his time in university, etc., names of friends who knew him at school, etc. If he cannot do any of this, then his credibility is zilch, zip, zero and nada. His "testimony" doesn't belong in the "grey" basket - it belongs in the trash-can.

Alas, all too often amongst the more credulous in ufology, these background checks are not performed and, if the results prove

that Witness A has been less than forthcoming about his background, the conspiracy theorists will simply say - "well, the government erased his records."

I kept my law degree - it's hanging on my office wall. I have my law school yearbook, my transcripts, etc. How is the government supposed to erase all of that? How will they be able to track down all of my friends from all my years (10) at various universities?

Answer? They can't.

Fortunately, there are people who do check on the backgrounds of "witnesses" and ferret out the liars. For every Frank Scully, who simply accepts the word of any "witness" whom he meets, there's a J. P. Cahn, who does his homework.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:59:10 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:34:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:17:48 -0000
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

<snip>

>Michael

>Since there can be no evidence for your proposition, if it is
>to prove itself true, it is a masterpiece of exopolitical spin.
>A bit wordy for a campaign button, but I wish you joy of it
>nevertheless.

Hi Martin, and Michael

Forgive the levity, but I can only think to say "Shough 'nuff".

If the govt. has the power to silence corroborating witnesses,
why would it not silence the whistleblower in the first place.

If a whistleblower is revealing top secret government
information they were sworn not to reveal, why were the
Disclosure Conference members not herded up in one fell swoop
and jailed for doing so? And if those speaking are not
encumbered by security oaths, why should we accept their
testimony when they weren't privy to any secrets anyway?

I don't advocate throwing out the baby with the bathwater, but I
think it prudent to pour out sufficient bathwater to determine
whether there is in fact a baby in it at all.

Uncertainty is already a major ingredient in the study of UFOs.
It is not a Principle, but a fact.

Pseudo-scientific adoption of a serious-sounding principle does
nothing to legitimize the fact that whistleblower testimony as a
rule is tacit proof that the testimony is of no concern to the
status quo.

I mean, do these folks travel in secret or disguise themselves
to avoid prosecution for violating their security oaths? If not,
why would they be allowed to speak by the omnipotent powers that
be... the ones that silence corroborating witnesses, etc, etc.?

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>>Maybe a thousand years from now our spacecraft will be a million
>>>times safer than they are now, and passenger space travel will
>>>be as common as jet travel today. But even then there will be
>>>the occasional crash. Pilots will still make mistakes, highly
>>>advanced technology will still sometimes fail, and the
>>>unexpected will still happen. Nothing is ever perfect.

>>I was buying your arguments up until this point.

>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

>I disagree with this. As our own aviation developement advances
>toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced
>airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems
>have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have
>experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their
>electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes
>occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our
>space shuttles did not fare well either.

>Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien
>environment where an unanticipated source of interference could
>not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may
>have happened.

<snip>

I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:42:38 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:41:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 EST
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC Special

>>We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's
>>interview for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in
>>the finished piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his
>>death, and the only interview he'd granted for a major program
>>in many years.

>What!?

>Ya think maybe somebody got to Jennings and his crew?

>Dr. Mack hit a bullseye with his reports on the abductees. How
>can one of the most esteemed men in his field suddenly become
>uninteresting???

>Bullwaffles I say! This is indeed getting scary.

No, it isn't.

This is the sort of thing, frankly, that drives me nuts. With no evidence at all, Greg, you take the very worst possible - actually, wildly paranoid - interpretation, and then you run with it as if its truth were so apparent that we all should immediately start shaking in our footwear. It's this kind of silliness that makes all of us look bad and that fuels popular stereotypes about flying-saucer nuts.

There is no reason to believe that "somebody got to Jennings and his crew." Nor, I suspect, will reason for such belief ever emerge.

The UFO subject is a complicated one, with all sorts of aspects, and in two hours it simply can't be done justice. Decisions of editing and emphasis must be made. From my reading of various items about Peter Jennings and his show today, I have the impression that the documentary will focus on a handful of hard-evidence cases, involving multiple witnesses and documentation by tracking instruments. Agree or disagree with that approach (I happen to agree with it and would have done the same, given, for one thing, the time constraints), it is a perfectly defensible one - even a potentially positive one for those advocating the need for scientific UFO study - and requires no alarmist reading whatever.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:50:03 -0500
Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:43:27 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

Hi, Kyle,

>Instead of explaining the term [pelicanist], why not point
>them to the Updates archive and having them... gasp...
>investigate for themselves. You did say these were
>journalists, no?

In my book *Strange Skies* (2003, p. 35) I define "pelicanist" as "one who proposes hard-to-believe solutions to puzzling UFO sightings." It is not synonymous with skeptic; in other words, skepticism about UFOs need not be unreasonable in principle, even if it sometimes is so in practice. A skeptic becomes a pelicanist only in the latter instance.

I think of pelicanists not as casual dismissers (as, for example, most skeptical scientists and journalists are) but as persons who know the subject and are active within the UFO community. The original pelicanist was James Easton, who proposed, then fiercely defended, the scientifically unsustainable idea that Kenneth Arnold observed not aircraft of some sort but pelicans. Pelicanist interpretations tend to be extraordinary claims masquerading as prosaic explanations.

Even the Magonians, many of whom I think of as pelicanists, have taken the term as it was intended, knowing that my intention was to put a bit of humor into the longstanding, never-ending debate between proponents and debunkers. One Magonia columnist uses the pseudonym "The Pelican." I approve, and I chuckle every time I see it. If the pseudonymous columnist and I agree on nothing else (besides, that is, our taste in music), we do share the same sense of humor.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:20:24 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:52:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars - Lehmborg

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:06:20 -0600
>Subject: Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 22:37:25 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: Evidence For Present Life On Mars

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 15:30:55 EST
>>>Subject: Evidence For Present Life On Mars

>><snip>

>>For researchers like George Filer, Mac Tonnies and many other
>>UFO UpDates Listers, this disclosure would not have come soon
>>enough.

>>http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/mystery_monday_050214.html

>>Phoenix, the spacecraft set for launch to Mars in 2007, was to
>>be a drill-equipped lander which could have proved that methane
>>gas producing organisms do indeed exist just below the water
>>moist Martian soil but.....

>Hi Nick, Greg and List,

>So, Formisano's paper on the possibility of extant life on Mars
>now appears to be supported.

And, I suspect they wouldn't be doing that but there is
somewhere else they had to go and this is a short step to a rock
across the pond.

>Too bad his paper got watered down before presentation.

Which kind of speaks volumes all by itself, doesn't it?

>What is odd is that this report seems to imply that this is new
>news... Formisano came to the same conclusions months ago, based
>on the same data.

We see this kind of thing all the time, and all through history,
don't we.

>Is it not "real" science until NASA, or the POTUS says so?

Yes! Absolutely! And given a track record of crass duplicity,
abject obfuscation, and maddening schadenfreude... isn't the
irony exquisite?

>The real shame is that as we will likely be engaged in military
>conflict for at least the next 3 years or so, in at least 3 or 4
>regional "hotspots" around the globe, at immense financial and
>human cost, the US will probably find good reasons not to pursue
>expensive space missions.

Likely part of the overall strategy for trying to avoid the whole issue altogether, don't you think?

>I sincerely hope that as the US becomes more marginalized in
>such matters, the space programs of those states less encumbered
>will forge ahead, and get some real answers.

We may have already missed the opportunity to be at the cutting edge of this thing.

>In fact, I think it would be quite appropriate for the ESA or
>even the Chinese to be the ones that find actual extant life on
>Mars.

That's some bitter smoke and a real buzz harsher for your garden variety chest-thumper, I say unto ye, bruh...

>It just doesn't mesh with the apparent desire of our current
>regime to roll back the clock to a "simpler time", and our
>current leaders stated disdain for intellectuals and their
>pursuits.

...And what a choice... pre-rock and roll in the case of the Christians or pre "truth be told" in the case of the Moslems, roughly 1930 and 1390 respectively... which would be ok... if they wanted to start over and move forward more intelligently... but the bastards want to go back and _stay_...

...Ummmmmmno... I didn't sign on for that, and _this_ Homey ain't playin'.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54] -

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:20:07 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:55:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54] -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:43:27 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>You seem to be implying that if a journalist doesn't know the
>terms in use, the terms should change to suit the journalist.

>If so, how do you justify such a ridiculous implication?

Kyle:

My point, was that to keep prodding the issue with the term
"pelicanist" makes a mockery of the argument.

When I typed in "usefullness" but thought better of it, the e-
mail had already gone, but Jerry made sure to point out my faux
pas.

This is what he does with the "pelicanist" bit. It derides the
person to whom he applies it, but doesn't really answer
anything. It's a kind of cute ad hominem.

The reporters, as I indicated, wanted to know what the heck the
term meant because they kept seeing it.

I tried to explain it, according to what Jerry told me a few
weeks back when I asked him about it (and he was still
communicating with me, ahem).

But it only diverted the reporters from the substance of UFOs to
a side issue which was lost on them.

Journalists, real ones, don't like tags or name-calling. They
want the information, not the irrelevant stuff. That was also a
point I was trying to make.

Jerry likes the term. He told me he coined it. (There's some
dispute about that according to an off-list e-mail I got). But
he's destroyed the word's cachet by overusing it. That's all.

And now I've mad him mad. It had to happen sooner or later.

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:30:52 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:56:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - Rimmer

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:10:12 -0400
>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

<snip>

>This nails it for me. It's nice that we we get this viewpoint.
>It supports my suspicion and the hard data at the bookstore.
>Women read more than men with the numbers supporting a 90-10
>split in non-fiction for the females and 60-40 fiction, again
>the females.

Working in a public library, I can confirm there is a considerable difference in the reading habits of men and women, however, I'm a little puzzled in the 90-10 split on non-fiction reading. Do you mean men 90%, women 10%? My opinion is that men read more non-fiction than women, although not by such an extreme amount. I would give the split as about 60-40, with, as you say, about the opposite proportions for fiction.

I emphasise that this is borrowing from a library, the split in book purchasing may be different, but I'd be surprised if it actually reversed the proportions.

>A week or so ago Paul Kimball noted that the 'New Age' section
>on the bookshelves at Chapter's [Canadian bookseller similar to
>Barnes and Noble] were dominated by subjects such as Tarot card
>reading, Wickens and Witches etc. - usually written by female
>authors - where once there would have been dozens of male
>written books on UFOs.

I think this is more the result of a general decline of interest in the subject, than a feminine 'take-over' of the New Age shelves. It's always puzzle me why UFOs should be in the 'New Age' section anyway. Incidentally, one big British bookshop chain has renamed its 'new age' or 'mind-body-spirit' section as the 'Me Zone'.

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54] -

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:14:22 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:59:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54] -

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 22:32:37 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Sigh, John,

>I guess I've learned my lesson. Never attempt to engage a
>pelicanist in light-hearted banter.

>>>>come along to a meeting of a splendid organisation known as
>>>>"Sceptics in the Pub" he would find a fair sprinkling of females
>>>>present. Fewer than the number of men, certainly, but then I
>>>>think, despite the names he mentions, the number of women active
>>>>in the UFO world is also significantly fewer than the men.

>>>I presume you are referring to wives and girl friends, not to
>>>active pelicanists. I offer no explanation for the reason this
>>>is so. It's just an observation. One of those mysteries of
>>>gender about which one speculates at one's peril.

>>What a strangely chauvinistic response from someone I had always
>>considered to be politically and socially progressive.

Sigh, Jerry. I must learn that what is light hearted banter from
Mr Clark is deadly serious "playing the political correctness
card" from me.

>Jeez, the hand you're dealing must be even lousier than usual.
>Having no argument to offer, you play - here's a shock - the
>political- correctness card. At least you held off on the Canby
>card, however momentarily (see below).

>An actual response would have been to cite names and
>publications by female pelicanists who have written for Magonia
>and are visibly active in its campaign against UFO and related
>heresies.

I though I'd try the same experiment on International UFO
Reporter. List members might be interested in the names of
contributors in a few recent issues of Jerry's august
publication:

Michael Hall
Michael Swords
Mark Rodeghier
Donald Burleson
Edward Zeller
Herbert Taylor
Robert Durant

Anyone notice a pattern emerging here?

Fred Merritt

Craig Lang
Bill Chalker
Dennis Anderson
Don Johnson
Raymond Fowler
Jerry Clark
Chris Rutkowski

Oh, and Jenny Randles, who, as it happens, has also penned the occasional contribution to Magonia.

>Since you fail to do so - cannot do so, I gather - I am forced to
>conclude that you have made my case.

What case would that be, Jerry?

I do not doubt for one moment that the world of the sceptical movement and the world of ufology are dominated by men. I am just rather curious as to why you think that there is some peculiarly feminine quality which makes women less likely to adopt a sceptical attitude to unconventional scientific claims.

>Unless, of course, you have defined "active pelicanist" downward
>to denote persons whose sole activity consists of observing you
>as you carry on in bars.

Anyone watching me "carry on" in a bar is in for a dull evening.

>>Maybe in the staid bars of Canby, MN., which you have so vividly
>>described to us, ladies need to be accompanied by husbands or
>>gentlemen friends, lest they be considered flappers and
>>floozies, but in the more cosmopolitan centres of both our great
>>nations, young (and not so young) ladies are free to visit bars,
>>pubs and other licensed premises without the necessity of
>>chaperones; and I assure you this is that case with those who
>>attend "Sceptics in the Pub" meetings.

>Could it be that the flock can only squawk senselessly and shake
>off feathers frantically when I show up with a rhetorical
>shotgun? For an example of that in action, note the wholly
>predictable and irrelevant mention of my hometown - an object,
>as we have seen, of curious and even disturbing obsession within
>the feathered flock, aka the residence police, both on this List
>and in the pelicanist spiritual journal Magonia. I am sure there
>must be a psychosocial explanation for the anxiety betrayed
>thereby, but I confess that none comes immediately to mind.
>Maybe I should start attending those "Sceptics in Pub" meetings
>in whatever city or town or village or pastoral landscape claims
>Rimmer as resident.

I guess I've learned my lesson. Never attempt to engage Jerry Clark in light-hearted banter.

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 20:32:38 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:01:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - Rimmer

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>Knowing nothing about something - in this case gender mores in
>>Minnesota - and underscoring as much in your odd outburst above,
>>you nonetheless bloviate bravely onward. How very pelicanist of
>>you.

>Jerry...

>In the past two weeks I've had to explain what "pelicanist"
>means to three different journalists whom I directed to UFO
>UpDates in anticipation of the ABC/Jennings UFO broadcast.

>The "joke" has worn thin and only beclouds a serious issue, one
>that is seen as monumental by some.

Thank goodness for some sense. Maybe next we can get rid of
"skeptibunkers" and "klasskurtzians" and start talking like
grown-ups.

--

John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54] -

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:03:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54] -

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:48:09 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Sir. Pelicanists perform a unique and specific
>disservice to aggregate humanity and so must endure a unique and
>specific identifier. That word should be descriptive of the
>behavior displayed and not be insulting in the same manner that
>the words "pisswit" and "sh_thead" are, by way of example...
>"Pelicanist" is the preternatural, profound, and perfect
>proposal for such an expression. I offer "klasskurtzian," for a
>little variety. Please pass this on to the different
>journalists.

Alfred:

The term "pelicanist" is fine... just overworked, and diverting
from the arguments at hand.

Richard Hall, who won't enter this fray I bet, knows that it is
an ad hominem, and not worthy of logical discourse.

But I have been chastised, and take the sally in stride. At
least you and Jerry didn't call me a pelicanist. Whew.

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:52:40 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:05:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:42:38 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 EST
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
>>>Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC Special

>>>We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's
>>>interview for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in
>>>the finished piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his
>>>death, and the only interview he'd granted for a major program
>>>in many years.

>>What!?

>>Ya think maybe somebody got to Jennings and his crew?

>>Dr. Mack hit a bullseye with his reports on the abductees. How
>>can one of the most esteemed men in his field suddenly become
>>uninteresting???

>>Bullwaffles I say! This is indeed getting scary.

>No, it isn't.

>This is the sort of thing, frankly, that drives me nuts. With no
>evidence at all, Greg, you take the very worst possible -
>actually, wildly paranoid - interpretation, and then you run
>with it as if its truth were so apparent that we all should
>immediately start shaking in our footwear. It's this kind of
>silliness that makes all of us look bad and that fuels popular
>stereotypes about flying-saucer nuts.

>There is no reason to believe that "somebody got to Jennings and
>his crew." Nor, I suspect, will reason for such belief ever
>emerge.

>The UFO subject is a complicated one, with all sorts of aspects,
>and in two hours it simply can't be done justice. Decisions of
>editing and emphasis must be made. From my reading of various
>items about Peter Jennings and his show today, I have the
>impression that the documentary will focus on a handful of hard-
>evidence cases, involving multiple witnesses and documentation
>by tracking instruments. Agree or disagree with that approach (I
>happen to agree with it and would have done the same, given, for
>one thing, the time constraints), it is a perfectly defensible
>one - even a potentially positive one for those advocating the
>need for scientific UFO study - and requires no alarmist reading
>whatever.

Gee Jerry Clark, I for one would rather have one of the top psychiatrists on Earth get on television and say that witnesses, abductees, whistleblowers aren't nuts than to not address the issue at all.

The man stuck his neck out for everyone and because his conclusion didn't fit the social norm he got raked over the coals and came out shining nevertheless.

Oh, and about that crack about making 'us' look bad there's no way I could contribute to it anymore than it is. Credibility and integrity aren't something you strive for or wait for someone to give to you. like the Tin Man, you've already got it. If others don't buy it, tough.

Everybody thought Noah was an oddball too. Look where that got them.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:07:32 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:08:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

Hi Brad,

I generally agree, but there is an alternative view...

If a technology is far in advance of our own, the owners of that tech might realize that we would be utterly unable to make heads or tails of it until some much later date.

Like leaving a coke bottle on an island inhabited by aboriginal natives...what's the harm? Are they going to be able to divine its composition, function, or the writing on it? Highly unlikely. More likely that they will worship it as a token from the Gods. Hmmm...sounds somewhat familiar.

To a truly ultra-advanced civilization, we are no more than aboriginals. Who cares if they leave their high-tech detritus behind on occasion.

I can in fact see a utility to intentionally leaving such tidbits, a reasonable gauge of the tech level of the finders. If we were to get "too close" to figuring it out of course, such a civilization could presumably retrieve their stuff any time they wanted, and we'd be hard pressed to stop them.

Besides all this, I think it is unwise to apply a "Prime Directive" style motive to non-humans. We ourselves don't even observe such a thing. Hence the coke bottles and Walmart shirts on Masai and aboriginal peoples. While it might be a noble ideal, in practice I am not convinced that it is something that can be shown to be a part of the "alien agenda", whatever that might be.

Again however, I do agree that any craft that utilizes aerodynamic forces, and presumably can be adversely affected by them, is not likely to be from an ultra-advanced technological civilization. Much more likely that the alien "boyz in the 'hood" are closer to our tech level. Even alien beings reported are not far removed from our own physiology in terms of shape, size and function.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:09:09 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:26:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 19:42:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>Not a good idea as proposed!

>>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become
>>clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO
>>researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO
>>research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific
>>methods for UFO research.

<snip>

>>The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle for Quantum Physics is
>>expressed as follows:

>>"The more precisely the POSITION is determined, the less
>>precisely the MOMENTUM is known"

>>What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty
>>Principle for UFO Research"

>>"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less
>>precisely the EVIDENCE is known"

>Gag!

Hi Bruce: Gag seconded!

>The more precisely the truth is determined, the more likely
>it is that the evidence, whatever form it takes, is true. The
>precision of the evidence would, presumably, also be better.
>(But "precision" and "truth" are rather orthogonal concepts...
>something can be very precise and very wrong or imprecise but
>correct. Or course , precise and correct is the best.)

>I have no problem with 'exopolitics' as an academic activity,
>but I think it should be based on the most verifiable evidence
>without diluting the veracity of the evidence by including 'wild
>stories'.

>Imagine that someone goes through a rigorous analysis and
>devises an exopolitics (how to interact with the aliens) based
>on Adamski's stories. Will the political recommendations or
>understanding based on his stories tell us anything about how we
>should react to the actual ETs? Only the Adamski supporters
>would say yes.

>To base exopolitical analysis on hoax claims about ETs (e.g.
>'Dr.' Reed) would be a waste of time.

>I think a valuable exopolitical study could be presented in the
>following very general, highly simplified, form:

>'If the aliens/Et's behave in (some particular) manner, then we
>should react (in the following manner).'

>For example, if the ETs are really nice guys and gals, then we
>should welcome them and have a good time.

>Or, If the ETs are mean and nasty we should avoid them as much
>as possible.

>Or, if they hate our guts then we should bend WAYYY over, put
>our heads between our legs and kiss our buttocks goodbye.

Writers are forever perverting the principles of quantum
mechanics, trying to apply them to the macro world we see as
"reality". That never works. Neither do the common-sense
principles of classical physics apply to the realm of the
terribly small, subatomic particles etc.

Those who do the former, as often as not, are trying to deny
that common-sense reality applies to the macro world we live in.
Those who do the latter have yet to come to grips with 20th
century physics .. not an easy thing to learn.

Neither applies to ufology. I would no sooner apply the
uncertainty principle to ufology, than I would apply calorimetry
to the teachings of Confucius.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Frola

From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:08:49 +1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:29:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Frola

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>It is easy to find top military people who believe in UFOs as
>alien spacecraft. Air Chief Marshal Lord Dowding was a believer
>in Adamski. People like Lord Mountbatten, Prince Philip, Sir
>Peter Horsley, Admiral of the Fleet Lord Hill-Norton (a believer
>in MJ-12) are or were prominent in the UK. General L.M. Chassin
>of NATO was a staunch UFO devotee in France (with a prediction
>in 1960 that the 'truth' would soon be revealed). None of their
>views have the slightest bearing on whether Roswell was a UFO
>crash, nor can such opinions be used in support of this idea.

>The most important question of all remains unanswered:

>Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
>landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
>recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
>evidence?

>If it did indeed happen, there must be literally tons of research papers
>on this. Scientists of many disciplines would have been involved in
>the ensuing analysis and discussion, perhaps from several countries.
>Yet we have heard from precisely none of them.

>Not one written word from anyone directly involved.

>The whole Roswell myth is built on the principle that the
>'truth' can never be revealed because of the need for one country
>to maintain tight secrecy on it. Even when scientists are constantly
>searching for evidence of alien life (as they have been for at least
>50 years),. the greatest scientific discovery of all time still has
>to be kept under wraps. And this after six decades.

>I submit that such an idea is utterly incredible

>CDA

CDA, you appear to put great faith and belief that Government Bodies are not capable of bending or even saying out-right lies. If the CIA, NSA or other intelligent organisations cannot get it right about weapons of mass destruction (a deliberate lie, I believe) and the subsequent attempted coverup of prisoner mistreatment in Iraq, you are backing the wrong side. Military intelligence is an oxy-moron and their attempts to explain away the incident somewhat comical.

Too many witnesses have come forward over the years regarding the Roswell Crash. It is indeed the coverup of the century, and one where details of the find, I feel, will never come to light. There will be documents missing or accidentally destroyed, or perhaps they'll say the documents never existed. In other words, "These documents will never see the light of day!" If I have to put faith and trust on someone, it'll be Stanton Friedman. He approaches the subject with vigor while remaining objective. He

collects the facts, interview the witnesses and puts its all together so that we can follow the events of what happened back in 1947.

And make no mistake of this, I am not a believer that a lot of the technology we have today was back engineered from this crashed saucer.

I think that is fantasy. We seem to give away too much credit to aliens over our capabilities as a race to evolve technologically. The gulf between their technology and ours will never be breached. My favourite saying is send a laptop computer back in time to the cavemen of Africa and see if they can pull it apart, study the components and replicate it? I don't think so!

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:09:28 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:54:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:42:38 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 EST
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
>>>Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC Special

>>>We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's
>>>interview for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in
>>>the finished piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his
>>>death, and the only interview he'd granted for a major program
>>>in many years.

>>What!?

>>Ya think maybe somebody got to Jennings and his crew?

>>Dr. Mack hit a bullseye with his reports on the abductees. How
>>can one of the most esteemed men in his field suddenly become
>>uninteresting???

>>Bullwaffles I say! This is indeed getting scary.

>No, it isn't.

>This is the sort of thing, frankly, that drives me nuts. With no
>evidence at all, Greg, you take the very worst possible -
> actually, wildly paranoid - interpretation, and then you run
>with it as if its truth were so apparent that we all should
>immediately start shaking in our footwear. It's this kind of
>silliness that makes all of us look bad and that fuels popular
>stereotypes about flying-saucer nuts.

>There is no reason to believe that "somebody got to Jennings and
>his crew." Nor, I suspect, will reason for such belief ever
>emerge.

>The UFO subject is a complicated one, with all sorts of aspects,
>and in two hours it simply can't be done justice. Decisions of
>editing and emphasis must be made. From my reading of various
>items about Peter Jennings and his show today, I have the
>impression that the documentary will focus on a handful of hard-
>evidence cases, involving multiple witnesses and documentation
>by tracking instruments. Agree or disagree with that approach (I
>happen to agree with it and would have done the same, given, for
>one thing, the time constraints), it is a perfectly defensible
>one - even a potentially positive one for those advocating the
>need for scientific UFO study - and requires no alarmist reading
>whatever.

I absolutely, unequivocally agree with Jerry on this. But what do we old farts know? Look in the mirror, folks, and you will see some pretty pitiful non-scientific and anti-scientific baloney that tends to dominate what people like Peter Jennings, members of Congress, etc., see when they examine the subject, and no wonder that most of them are turned off. So far I am favorably impressed and somewhat encouraged by his interview comments about the Feb. 24 special. I spilled my guts to them and cooperated fully, gave them lots of good documents, information, and leads. So if it all goes south, no one will be more disappointed than me. We will all have to watch and see, but to suggest that 'evil forces' have influenced the program is a total crock (unless the pro-UFO paranoids recognize their own negative influences on the whole affair).

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Frola

From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:28:21 +1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:56:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Frola

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:07:32 -0600
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

><snip>

>>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

>I generally agree, but there is an alternative view...

>If a technology is far in advance of our own, the owners of that
>tech might realize that we would be utterly unable to make heads
>or tails of it until some much later date.

>Like leaving a coke bottle on an island inhabited by aboriginal
>natives...what's the harm? Are they going to be able to divine
>its composition, function, or the writing on it? Highly
>unlikely. More likely that they will worship it as a token from
>the Gods. Hmmm...sounds somewhat familiar.

>To a truly ultra-advanced civilization, we are no more than
>aboriginals. Who cares if they leave their high-tech detritus
>behind on occasion.

>I can in fact see a utility to intentionally leaving such
>tidbits, a reasonable gauge of the tech level of the finders. If
>we were to get "too close" to figuring it out of course, such a
>civilization could presumably retrieve their stuff any time they
>>wanted, and we'd be hard pressed to stop them.

>Besides all this, I think it is unwise to apply a "Prime
>Directive" style motive to non-humans. We ourselves don't even
>observe such a thing. Hence the coke bottles and Walmart shirts
>on Masai and aboriginal peoples. While it might be a noble
>ideal, in practice I am not convinced that it is something that
>can be shown to be a part of the "alien agenda", whatever that
>might be.

>Again however, I do agree that any craft that utilizes
>aerodynamic forces, and presumably can be adversely affected by
>them, is not likely to be from an ultra-advanced technological
>civilization. Much more likely that the alien "boyz in the
>'hood" are closer to our tech level. Even alien beings reported
>are not far removed from our own physiology in terms of shape,

>size and function.

Ditto! But am I the only one on this List who feels that aliens who frequent our planet are not interested in our well being? Where is the proof? All this hocus pocus, new age thinking, that they're here to save our world and to lead us into the fourth or fifth dimension is rubbish.

They are an advanced race, intent on studying a violent and highly dangerous evolving human race. We kill on the spur of the moment for sport, for politics, for material things and in the name of GOD! So much for the 'Thou shall not kill' commandment!

If I was this intelligent race, I wouldn't interfere but observe this planet, collect gene samples from human abductions and animal mutilations have a front seat view to our predictable end. And God help us (and he won't) when we, as a race make it out to the stars. If we can't live on this planet as one race, what likelihood is their exploring space peacefully?

If we do, sometime in the future break the technology gap, then this technology will disappear off this planet. Imagine, having the equivalent power to that of our space brothers? Do we, as a race, have the intelligence not to use it?

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:40:03 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:58:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:07:32 -0600
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

>Hi Brad,

>I generally agree, but there is an alternative view...

>If a technology is far in advance of our own, the owners of that
>tech might realize that we would be utterly unable to make heads
>or tails of it until some much later date.

>Like leaving a coke bottle on an island inhabited by aboriginal
>natives... what's the harm?

<snip>

Environmental harm, physical harm, mental harm. Dangerous hazardous materials, possibly explosive or dangerous in a way we can't even imagine if they are so "advanced." Coke bottles don't fly on their own power and crash. All good and compelling reasons why aliens would not leave behind crashed spaceship wreckage, besides the reason of not wanting others to get their hands on the technology (doesn't have to be "us" either, but to prevent other alleged ET races getting their hands or tentacles on 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:48:06 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:59:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:49:20 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>And thirdly, because falsification (unlike testability) is
>supposed to be a definitive criterion, in that the falsification
>condition will always hold if the hypothesis itself is untrue.
>If I've lost a book and I hypothesize that it's on the coffee-
>table downstairs, and I go downstairs to check and it isn't
>there, then my hypothesis is definitively falsified - there is
>no realistic set of conditions under which it could still hold.

Sorry, that isn't at all clear - that's what happens when you
try to write emails in between cooking supper.

The way I phrased that made it sound back-to-front - the
falsification criterion needs to be definitive in the sense that
there should be no way, if the hypothesis is itself false, that
the falsification criterion could also be false. If I go
downstairs and find the book on the coffee table, then there is
no way in which this is consistent with a state of affairs in
which the book is not actually on the coffee table.

There are a couple of other points I should make also - the
first is that tests of hypotheses should always be replicable,
and hypotheses need to be formulated in terms which render them
susceptible to repeated testing. In that respect Peter's Venus
hypothesis is not well-formulated, in that it refers to a single
observation - or at least to a subset of observations which can
only be demarcated on an ad hoc basis (no-one is suggesting that
Venus is a viable explanation, for all sightings, and the
selection of the subset for which it is viable is necessarily ad
hoc) and one cannot test a hypothesis with a single observation
unless that test is definitive (in the sense described above).
The same applies to subsets defined by ad hoc selection, since
ad hoc selection automatically produces a biased sample. The
Venus explanation may however belong to a set of hypotheses which
is repeatedly testable (such as the general null hypothesis for
the UFO phenomenon which I referred to previously). In this case
it is the set which needs to be tested, as I alluded to earlier,
and not the individual hypothesis.

The second point is that, for hypotheses which are subject to
repeated testing and for which no definitive falsification
criterion exists, the falsification criterion adopted must
possess discrimination - that is, if X is the falsification test
for proposition P, then there should not be some proposition Q
which could also be true if X is false. For example, if I have
lost a book, I may hypothesize that I may have left it at a
friend's house, in which case I may predict that I will not find
the book on the coffee table. However if I don't find the book
on my coffee table, I can't therefore conclude that I must have
left it at a friend's house.

Lack of discrimination is often a serious problem in the social
sciences, and I think it's clear that it's likely to be a major

problem in UFology too.

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 17](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:51:06 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:01:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:14:22 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 22:32:37 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

Sigh, John,

>I though I'd try the same experiment [concerning women
>contributors] on International UFO Reporter [as opposed to
>Magonia]. List members might be interested in the names of
>contributors in a few recent issues of Jerry's august
>publication:

>Michael Hall
>Michael Swords
>Mark Rodeghier
>Donald Burleson
>Edward Zeller
>Herbert Taylor
>Robert Durant

>Anyone notice a pattern emerging here?

I do, in fact. It's this: You're trying to change the subject. That is, of course, exactly what I would do if I were in your shoes and couldn't supply the names of female pelicanists who have written for Magonia. But since you're determined to detract attention from the curious absence of such women from Magonia's pages, I'll cheerfully indulge you -- in, of course, the spirit of light-hearted banter:

Over the years IUR - which is, by the way, not "my" publication but CUFOS', with Mark Rodeghier and George Eberhart being the real editors these days - has published a fair number of articles by women, and women have been active in the organization.

Contributors have included Wendy Connors, Jennie Zeidman, Ann Druffel, Linda Kerth, Jenny Randles (not, by the way, in any sense a pelicanist), Barbara Becker, the late Cynthia Hind, "Lisa Oakman" (pseud. of social worker/experiencer), Eileen Fletcher, Eloise Watson, and Joan Woodward (and no doubt others whose names don't turn up in a quick survey of back issues). Mary Castner runs the CUFOS website and is otherwise quite active within CUFOS itself. As with all ufology, more men (by a large proportion) are represented in IUR's pages than women, but unlike Magonia, IUR has regularly carried material written by non-males.

>>Unless, of course, you have defined "active pelicanist" downward
>>to denote persons whose sole activity consists of observing you
>>as you carry on in bars.

>Anyone watching me "carry on" in a bar is in for a dull evening.

That's not for you to decide. Those watching you closely may detect all sorts of psychosocial clues to your behavior, needs, and innermost secrets, which then can be employed to prove whatever point the observer wants to prove. On the other hand, since I feel no such inclination or ambition, all I can tell you is that the one evening I spent in your company, I actually enjoyed myself. I recall that you, I, and our little dinner group (comprising Loren Coleman, Peter Rogerson, Peter Brookesmith, Bill Ellis, and Bob Rickard, if memory serves; I may be missing somebody - Steve Moore?) spent a whole lot of time laughing and engaging in light-hearted banter, fueled by that great English beer. To be honest, I didn't find you dull at all. But then maybe that's just me. I tend to like people, even people I disagree with.

Anyway, in your weirdly defensive response to what was simply an observation, not a criticism, you've managed to confirm what I said to start with: there seem to be no active female pelicanists. I don't hold you personally responsible for that, John, and I'm sure there are larger reasons over which you have no control, and about which it is probably futile (and certainly dangerous) to speculate, that this should be so.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:59:11 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 05:32:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:52:40 EST
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:42:38 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
>>>>Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC Special

>Gee Jerry Clark, I for one would rather have one of the top
>psychiatrists on Earth get on television and say that witnesses,
>abductees, whistleblowers aren't nuts than to not address the
>issue at all.

That, Greg, is not my decision to make. In any event, I admired
Dr. Mack's huge courage, but I had many reservations about the
particular approach he took and the conclusions he drew from
them. Years ago I wrote an article for IUR outlining my
criticisms. History will judge, of course, whether this good and
courageous man was right or wrong.

In the meantime, as one makes a case for UFOs as genuine
anomalies, hard-evidence cases are, I think, the place to
start. Even ufologists disagree on the ontological status of
abduction experiences. The issue isn't whether these people are
"nuts" - most don't appear to be, and psychological studies seem
to testify to their fundamental sanity - but whether their
experiences occur in what we laughingly call event-level
reality.

That question has not been settled, nor is it likely to be
settled in our lifetimes, I suspect.

Meantime, get a handle on that paranoid streak, and remember,
lots of stuff just happens and is not generated in somebody's
sinister plot.

Cordially,

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Introduction & Information On Events In Phoenix

From: **Rob Kritkauský** <robkrit.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:55 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 05:43:44 -0500
Subject: Introduction & Information On Events In Phoenix

Please allow me to introduce myself, my name is Rob Kritkauský and I live in Phoenix, Arizona. In the past, my occupation and interests have been in the realm of science and I must admit to having little interest or belief in UFOs.

While doing some research, I happened upon this List and was pleasantly surprised by the scientific approach exhibited by the members. Previously encountered discussion groups I found to be populated with the intellectually lazy.

That being said, I wanted to get some objective opinions concerning two events that occurred while researching the sightings/phenomena in Phoenix over the last eight months.

A quick note: I believe it was my video of some lights I captured on June 14th of last year, that started The Phoenix Lights II hoopla. I reported this event and upon learning I had a scientific background, Peter Davenport asked me to look into these events. The preliminary report is here:

<http://www.worldblend.net/worldblendbu/PHXLIGHTS.html>

The specific events that I am having difficulty explaining by conventional means are as follows:

Lights shot on August 19th in high winds and 50 miles from any Military Base or bombing range:

Video: <http://www.worldblend.net/worldblendbu/UPDATE/aug19.wmv>

Still processed to determine shape:

http://www.worldblend.net/worldblendbu/PHOENIX_LIGHTS_GALLERY/IMAG020A.JPG

Jan 26th Audio Event:

<http://www.worldblend.net/worldblendbu/AUDIOANOMALY.html>

Your thoughts and suggestions regarding these two events would be much appreciated.

Regards,

Rob

"The most exciting phrase to hear in science, the one that heralds new discoveries, is not 'Eureka!' (I found it!) but 'Hmmm, That's funny ...' Isaac Asimov (1920 - 1992)
www.worldblend.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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:40:47 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 05:46:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - King

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:43:27 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrrgroup.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>Hi, Kyle,

>>Instead of explaining the term [pelicanist], why not point
>>them to the Updates archive and having them... gasp...
>>investigate for themselves. You did say these were
>>journalists, no?

>In my book Strange Skies (2003, p. 35) I define "pelicanist" as
>"one who proposes hard-to-believe solutions to puzzling UFO
>sightings." It is not synonymous with skeptic; in other words,
>skepticism about UFOs need not be unreasonable in principle,
>even if it sometimes is so in practice. A skeptic becomes a
>pelicanist only in the latter instance.

>I think of pelicanists not as casual dismissers (as, for
>example, most skeptical scientists and journalists are) but as
>persons who know the subject and are active within the UFO
>community. The original pelicanist was James Easton, who
>proposed, then fiercely defended, the scientifically
>unsustainable idea that Kenneth Arnold observed not aircraft of
>some sort but pelicans. Pelicanist interpretations tend to be
>extraordinary claims masquerading as prosaic explanations.

>Even the Magonians, many of whom I think of as pelicanists, have
>taken the term as it was intended, knowing that my intention was
>to put a bit of humor into the longstanding, never-ending debate
>between proponents and debunkers. One Magonia columnist uses the
>pseudonym "The Pelican." I approve, and I chuckle every time I
>see it. If the pseudonymous columnist and I agree on nothing
>else (besides, that is, our taste in music), we do share the
>same sense of humor.

Hi Jerry,

Thanks for the illumination. I too understand that those that
you call pelicanists are not put off by the term as they
understand the underlying meaning at work, and the humor
attached thereto.

But Rich Reynolds, who purportedly is tired of explaining the term, seemed to have another (albeit unmentioned) word in mind, hence my suggestion that skeptic... as you assert... does not fit.

I'm sure that Rich or one of his "roman a clef" cohorts will come up with a perfectly apt term. Of course, few will ever see it, and none of note on this List will subscribe to it. So, as with most of RRR Group's recent rants, it will echo in a single pair of ears, peculiarly tuned to it's rather uninformative frequency.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:36:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:43:27 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>Instead of explaining the term [pelicanist], why not point
>>them to the Updates archive and having them... gasp...
>>investigate for themselves. You did say these were
>>journalists, no?

>In my book Strange Skies (2003, p. 35) I define "pelicanist" as
>"one who proposes hard-to-believe solutions to puzzling UFO
>sightings." It is not synonymous with skeptic; in other words,
>skepticism about UFOs need not be unreasonable in principle,
>even if it sometimes is so in practice. A skeptic becomes a
>pelicanist only in the latter instance.

>I think of pelicanists not as casual dismissers (as, for
>example, most skeptical scientists and journalists are) but as
>persons who know the subject and are active within the UFO
>community. The original pelicanist was James Easton, who
>proposed, then fiercely defended, the scientifically
>unsustainable idea that Kenneth Arnold observed not aircraft of
>some sort but pelicans. Pelicanist interpretations tend to be
>extraordinary claims masquerading as prosaic explanations.

Pelicanism (you heard it here first, folks) embodies:

Rule #1 for debunkers:

Any explanation is better than none.

Pelicanists also make use of Rule 2 for debunkers:

If the first explanation "doesn't fly" <LOL> then propose a
second.

There is also the corollary:

If the second (third, fourth, etc) doesn't 'satisfy' then
propose another.

Of course, the proposal of conventional explanations is part of
the scientific process. Where it leaves science is when the
proposed explanation conflicts with the strongly with the
sighting report, but the pelicanist sticks to it anyway.

From that point of view, we have to consider that the Klass
proposal in 1997 that Arnold saw meteors was also a
'pelicanism'.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: British MoD Comes Clean Over Little Green Men

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:51:01 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:39:53 -0500
Subject: Re: British MoD Comes Clean Over Little Green Men

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 20:55:10 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: British MoD Comes Clean Over Little Green Men

>Source: The Daily Telegraph - London, UK

><http://connected.telegraph.co.uk/connected/main.jhtml?xml=/connected/2005/02/16/ecrqed14.xml>

>02-16-05

>QED: MoD Comes Clean At Last Over Those Little Green Men

>Robert Matthews

>While the world celebrates the apparent rapprochement between
>Israel and the Palestinians, a glimmer of hope can be detected
>in the long-running dispute between another two factions: the
>scientific community and believers in UFOs.

>For more than half a century, the debate over UFOs and whether
>they really are alien spacecraft has been characterised by
>wild-eyed zealotry and a refusal to listen to reasonable
>argument - and that's just the scientists. Those who believe
>that UFOs really are alien spacecraft show a preference for
>conspiracy theories over critical reasoning.

<snip>

>This seems a long way from attitude of the Government working
>party which in 1951 dismissed the idea of taking UFOs seriously
>as "a singularly profitless enterprise". The new receptive
>attitude is in line with that taken by the authorities in a
>growing number of countries, including Belgium, Chile and
>France.

>There are signs that the scientific community might also be
>getting over its aversion to the notion of aliens visiting
>Earth. In recent years, a number of academics have made public
>their frustration with the dismal level of debate on the
>subject, and have sought to rectify it. An independent group of
>American scientists is responsible for the first paper arguing
>for the existence of UFOs to appear in a serious academic
>journal in 25 years.

>Writing in the Journal of the British Interplanetary Society,
>the group claims that advances in scientific knowledge have made
>the case for alien visitation stronger than many might think.

This is, of course, a reference to the paper "Inflation Theory
Implications for ET Visitation" which you can now read at:

<http://brumac.8k.com>.

<snip>

>Yet in the most disconcerting of all their arguments, the
>authors of the JBIS paper claim that all those dodgy photographs

>and spooky encounters may be yet further evidence for the
>reality of aliens. They argue that all those brief encounters of
>the third kind may be part of a deliberate long-term strategy by
>the aliens to ease us all into accepting that we are not alone.
>Some scientists have argued that the proof of the existence of
>aliens could be very traumatic for human society.

We do not claim that "all those dodgy photographs" and "all those brief encounters of the third kind" are evidence of ET activities since many or most are irrelevant to the subject (most are likely to be misidentifications, mental aberrations or hoaxes).

What we do say is that UFO sighting reports should be searched for evidence and we indicate that a subset of UFO sightings could be evidence of ET activities.

>Frankly, it is not half as worrying as discovering we are the
>target of a cosmic campaign run by little green spin doctors.

Uh, oh. There's that "green man" again. Enough to make the ufologist gag (and turn green).

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:52:15 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:41:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

Hello Michael & List

Notwithstanding trenchant comments from guys with slide rules and wrenches - many of them good researchers - I feel you've probably got a point, but one that applies only to a certain genre of sightings or contacts.

If we examine three sets of "experiments" we find:

1) in any quantum operation, if a stern check is made on what's happening - the behavior changes!

Yup - sounds ridiculous, but just check Richard P Feynman's comments on the "two slit experiment"

2) in poltergeist (too many to be false) investigations, any "scientific" checks are always confounded, although police, priests, press etc. continue to witness the actual phenomena

3) in a certain sub-set of UFO sightings or contacts, the same reports of non-physical/shifting-at-will phenomena that characterize quantum and poltergeist/paranormal experiences.

Your suggestion could open a new era of 'realistic' questioning of (falsely) denied phenomena by way of "insulated experiments" where the skepticism of scientists and observers is not allowed to impinge on the sensitive subjects or witnesses.

But, if this is a path to future truths, it will be fought every inch of the way by gov'ts and vested interests - as always.

cheers
Ray D

~~~~~  
"Perceptions" <http://www.perceptions.couk.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:55:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:03:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:09:09 -0800
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 19:42:06 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>>Not a good idea as proposed!

>>>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become
>>>clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO
>>>researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO
>>>research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific
>>>methods for UFO research.

<snip>

>>>The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle for Quantum Physics is
>>>expressed as follows:

>>>"The more precisely the POSITION is determined, the less
>>>precisely the MOMENTUM is known"

>>>What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty
>>>Principle for UFO Research"

>>>"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less
>>>precisely the EVIDENCE is known"

>>Gag!

>Hi Bruce: Gag seconded!

Glad to know this also stuck in someone else's craw!!

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:59:04 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:05:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hall

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:25:02 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>Larry,

>>Thanks Dave, and sorry for all the <snips>.

>No problem. <snip>

<snip>

>>Do you feel that most serious ufologists

>Allow me my definition of a serious ufologist first. That is
>somebody who is very well informed on the subject, is reasonably
>intelligent, reasonably well-educated, not overly gullible one
>way or the other, and capable of analyzing evidence and forming
>logical conclusions.

>Of course this excludes the many dumbbells who think of
>themselves as serious Ufologists but who know next to nothing
>and obviously can't think critically. Why take what they think
>seriously?

>>still take Roswell as
>>the crash of an alien craft, or do you consider yourself (along
>>with Stan and others) in a minority position?

<snip>

>My impression is that most are probably fence-sitters, if
>anything, just as I think most serious Ufologists are. Each has
>their favorite cases which they consider to be strongly
>evidentiary and may devote a great deal of time thinking about
>and digging into them. Others disagree and spend their energies
>elsewhere.

>People like Jerry Clark and and Dick Hall indicate they are in
>the fence-sitting category on Roswell. They are not proponents,
>but they are not debunkers either. I remember Dick Hall once
>making the comment that there seems to be a lot of smoke with
>Roswell which may indicate a conflagration behind it, but he is
>not absolutely convinced.

>>I'm willing to accept other views on Roswell itself, even if I
>>don't agree with them.

>In other words, you are basically a skeptical fence-sitter, as I
>am, e.g., on the "alien autopsy" footage. I lean towards fake,
>but don't know. Nobody can prove it fake and there is some
>evidence that might point to authenticity. I am more interested
>in who made it and why. Is it the real thing, or a fake made by
>a film producer wanting to make money, or is it a "real fake"
>made by a government agency? I actually lean toward the last
>one, which has it's own interesting set of implications.

>My point was that there are many people who I consider "serious
>Ufologists" who believe that Roswell was probably an alien
>crash. One of them emailed me yesterday after my post saying he
>reads Updates but never posts, not wanting to be dragged into
>the cat fights that occur.

>Stan Friedman is far from alone, which was being insinuated
>here. I also outlined some of the better evidence which makes me
>believe Roswell an ET event as well. And based on what some
>high-level witnesses are saying, we aren't alone in that belief.
>It is shared in the military and government as well and may
>extend beyond belief to actually knowing for sure from direct
>knowledge. Some like Gen. Exon just came right out and said it
>was a crashed alien spacecraft. That's a very powerful statement
>of authenticity.

David,

I think you have fairly and accurately summed up both my
position and the general state of affairs. I would only add as
far as my personal view is concerned that the Mogul balloon
interpretation makes no sense to me, and the testimony of people
who were there (and their offspring) which I have heard
first-hand strongly suggests that something extraordinary
occurred.

I am in the truest sense of the word an agnostic, who suspects
that unless someone can come up with a convincing explanation in
terms of secret U.S. technology (which has not happened to
date), then by reductio ad absurdum it was (hypothetically) an
alien spacecraft that crashed. However, unlike most people who
think in either-or terms and revile those who disagree with
their polar view, I fully understand the need for patience, and
more data-gathering, and reserving of judgment until we have
more complete information.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:09:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:08:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - King

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:20:07 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:43:27 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>Kyle:

>My point, was that to keep prodding the issue with the term
>"pelicanist" makes a mockery of the argument.

Hi Rich,

There is no prodding. The pelicanist community is at peace with the moniker. It is a semi-humorous reference to a single case, if not the case, which elegantly and accurately portrays a stated position.

<snip>

>This is what he does with the "pelicanist" bit. It derides the
>person to whom he applies it, but doesn't really answer
>anything. It's a kind of cute ad hominem.

Derides? Please educate us on who feels derided by such an appropriately descriptive term. I'm sure the pelicanists are quite capable of announcing their own disdain, if there were any, for the term.

>The reporters, as I indicated, wanted to know what
>the heck the
>term meant because they kept seeing it.

Reporters come to you for answers? Highly doubtful. If they aren't capable of finding out this easily discerned information on their own, I suspect that these 'reporters' are more a figment than a cadre.

<snip>

>But it only diverted the reporters from the substance
>of UFOs to a side issue which was lost on them.

The term was derived from one of the most reported UFO sightings of all time. Who are these reporters? Do they not have resources beyond Rich Reynolds? Pity, that.

>Journalists, real ones, don't like tags or name-calling. They
>want the information, not the irrelevant stuff. That
>was also a point I was trying to make.

Come again? Democrat, Republican, Conservative, Liberal, Extremist, insurgents, ad nauseum... journalists don't like

labels? What planet are you from? Journalists love nothing more than to condense a myriad of nuance and assorted positions, thoughts, beliefs, etc into nice easy pigeon-holes. Do you really want to suggest otherwise? I need only point to over 200 years of American journalistic history to prove my case.

>Jerry likes the term. He told me he coined it. (There's some
>dispute about that according to an off-list e-mail I
>got). But he's destroyed the word's cachet by overusing it.
>That's all.

The cachet of the term? When I call every policeman I meet a cop, am I unwittingly destroying the cachet of the term? Are cops derided by the term? What about gumshoes, or flatfoot? Derisive? Not at all. Semi-humorous, descriptive, and sometimes even adopted.

>And now I've mad him mad. It had to happen sooner or later.

I am quite certain that Jerome Clark doesn't care enough about you or your weird assertions to be angered. Bored and unimpressed more like. A waste of time, space and surface area, to get Lehmbergian on ya. <g>

Pelicanists exist, and they don't seem perturbed, and in at least one authoritative instance, even adopted the term.

Your protest is impertinent, your case non-existent, and your prose is unhelpful to any debate. Why should he or anyone else read more?

What value are you bringing to anything at all? Oh yes, you poke and prod and indict and provoke. Gee, seems like the pot calling the kettle.

I do think someone here is mad however, but perhaps not in the way you suggested. <g>

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:15:54 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:11:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - King

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:48:09 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>Sir. Pelicanists perform a unique and specific
>>disservice to aggregate humanity and so must endure a unique and
>>specific identifier. That word should be descriptive of the
>>behavior displayed and not be insulting in the same manner that
>>the words "pisswit" and "sh_thead" are, by way of example...
>>"Pelicanist" is the preternatural, profound, and perfect
>>proposal for such an expression. I offer "klasskurtzian," for a
>>little variety. Please pass this on to the different
>>journalists.

>Alfred:

>The term "pelicanist" is fine... just overworked, and
>diverting from the arguments at hand.

>Richard Hall, who won't enter this fray I bet, knows that it is
>an ad hominem, and not worthy of logical discourse.

>But I have been chastised, and take the sally in stride. At
>least you and Jerry didn't call me a pelicanist. Whew.

Rich,

I suggest that you are utterly unqualified to be listed among
the pelicanists number. Having followed a large number of
reasoned threads between them, I suspect that the Pelicanists
agree with you about as often as Jerry. But they can speak for
themselves, as has been demonstrated sufficiently.

I suspect that if you understood the term, you wouldn't be
relieved that you weren't called one. Competely impertinent.

I further suspect that Dick Hall's silence reflects his level
of respect for your assertions rather than any tacit approval
thereof. If you don't have anything nice to say.....

I could be mistaken, however. <g>

Kyle

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

[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:31:30 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:14:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54 - King

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 20:32:38 +0000
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 09:39:40 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>>Knowing nothing about something - in this case gender mores in
>>>Minnesota - and underscoring as much in your odd outburst above,
>>>you nonetheless bloviate bravely onward. How very pelicanist of
>>>you.

>>Jerry...

>>In the past two weeks I've had to explain what "pelicanist"
>>means to three different journalists whom I directed to UFO
>>UpDates in anticipation of the ABC/Jennings UFO broadcast.

>>The "joke" has worn thin and only beclouds a serious issue, one
>>that is seen as monumental by some.

>Thank goodness for some sense. Maybe next we can get rid of
>"skeptibunkers" and "klasskurtzians" and start talking like
>grown-ups.

Hi John,

Perhaps I spoke in error. If there is in fact a sense of
derision at the use of the term, I have rarely if ever heard
same. I thought you had long since accepted the term.

I am about as skeptical as I think I can be, and yet I don't
agree with every post you submit.

I am not a pelicanist.

To call yourself a skeptic and me a skeptic simultaneously is a
disservice to the truth. We are not alike in our approach at
all. The term skeptic in this milieu does the disservice. Overly
broad and unhelpful in attempting to understand the various
factions represented.

You are of course free to coin a suitable term yourself, since
the longhand version takes longer than the average attention
span of humans these days. On either side of the debate.

As if "ufologist" didn't garner enough of a derisive reaction
from most quarters itself, I find it odd that you see sense in
Rich's indictment of such a descriptive and highly specific
term. I've never thought less of your viewpoint because of the

term. I have better reasons, and even then only when I disagree. I don't always, and never because anyone calls you a pelicanist.

Finally, talking like grownups, if you mean using the broad generalizations common to everyday speech, is not something to which one should necessarily aspire.

When one word can communicate, why use several? A lack of understanding by others reveals ignorance, not a need to change the term.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:18:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Connors

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

Rich,

I don't know whether your fezzic nature is to blame or if you really are a PsychOps plant using UFO Updates. But, I really think your saucer is tilted and level flight beyond your capability.

To be terribly blunt and not really caring one way or the other about the repercussions, I think you are a dis-service to the field of Ufology, with your little petty word-baiting games and obtuse thinking skills.

A spoiled little brat is what you remind me of and the rod wouldn't have lain dormant in your upbringing if I could have had a hand in it.

Just what inner hunger do you have that needs to spill out onto UFO UpDates and waste so many people's time? What do you lack and want desperately that you would conduct yourself like a common pest to the whole of UpDates?

I'll tell you what is wrong with you. It is called jealousy.

Many on this List practice what they preach. You just play, and pitifully at that.

I vote with Jerry. You should be deleted and unread.

Wendy Connors
www.fadeddiscs.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:41:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:23:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:40:03 EST
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:07:32 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>>>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>>>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>>>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>>>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

>>Hi Brad,

>>I generally agree, but there is an alternative view...

>>If a technology is far in advance of our own, the owners of that
>>tech might realize that we would be utterly unable to make heads
>>or tails of it until some much later date.

>>Like leaving a coke bottle on an island inhabited by aboriginal
>>natives... what's the harm?

>><snip>

>Environmental harm, physical harm, mental harm. Dangerous
>hazardous materials, possibly explosive or dangerous in a way we
>can't even imagine if they are so "advanced." Coke bottles don't
>fly on their own power and crash. All good and compelling
>reasons why aliens would not leave behind crashed spaceship
>wreckage, besides the reason of not wanting others to get their
>hands on the technology (doesn't have to be "us" either, but to
>prevent other alleged ET races getting their hands or tentacles
>on it).

Hi Brad,

I hadn't considered the "other alleged ET races" angle.

That would seem to support a desire not to leave stuff lying
around.

But as I said, I agree with your point at any rate. I just
can't shake the tendency to play devil's advocate.

Of course, I am one of those that isn't convinced that any ETs
have ever left anything behind in the first place. <g>

Best ,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Simon Hicks <slh.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:37:53 +0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:26:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:59:10 -0600
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:17:48 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

<snip>

>If a whistleblower is revealing top secret government
>information they were sworn not to reveal, why were the
>Disclosure Conference members not herded up in one fell swoop
>and jailed for doing so?

Kyle,

You pose a reasonable question. However, I ask you, from the point of view of maintaining secrecy, which is more effective?

Either, jumping on them for breaking their secrecy oaths - and thereby admitting to the cover-up of whatever the secrecy oath referred to.....

Or:

Ignoring them as tho there was never anything to be covered up in the first place?

Simon

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:28:23 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:30:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:09:28 +0000
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:42:38 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 10:55:35 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 08:54:40 -0800 (PST)
>>>>Subject: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC Special

>>>>We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's
>>>>interview for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in
>>>>the finished piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his
>>>>death, and the only interview he'd granted for a major program
>>>>in many years.

>>>>What!?

>>>>Ya think maybe somebody got to Jennings and his crew?

>>>>Dr. Mack hit a bullseye with his reports on the abductees. How
>>>>can one of the most esteemed men in his field suddenly become
>>>>uninteresting???

>>>>Bullwaffles I say! This is indeed getting scary.

>>>>No, it isn't.

>>>>This is the sort of thing, frankly, that drives me nuts. With no
>>>>evidence at all, Greg, you take the very worst possible -
>>>>actually, wildly paranoid - interpretation, and then you run
>>>>with it as if its truth were so apparent that we all should
>>>>immediately start shaking in our footwear. It's this kind of
>>>>silliness that makes all of us look bad and that fuels popular
>>>>stereotypes about flying-saucer nuts.

>>>>There is no reason to believe that "somebody got to Jennings and
>>>>his crew." Nor, I suspect, will reason for such belief ever
>>>>emerge.

>>>>The UFO subject is a complicated one, with all sorts of aspects,
>>>>and in two hours it simply can't be done justice. Decisions of
>>>>editing and emphasis must be made. From my reading of various
>>>>items about Peter Jennings and his show today, I have the
>>>>impression that the documentary will focus on a handful of hard-
>>>>evidence cases, involving multiple witnesses and documentation
>>>>by tracking instruments. Agree or disagree with that approach (I
>>>>happen to agree with it and would have done the same, given, for
>>>>one thing, the time constraints), it is a perfectly defensible

>>one - even a potentially positive one for those advocating the
>>need for scientific UFO study - and requires no alarmist reading
>>whatever.

>I absolutely, unequivocally agree with Jerry on this. But what
>do we old farts know? Look in the mirror, folks, and youi will
>see some pretty pitiful non-scientific and anti-scientific
>baloney that tends to dominate what people like Peter Jennings,
>members of Congress, etc., see when they examine the subject,
>and no wonder that most of them are turned off. So far I am
>favorably impressed and somewhat encouraged by his interview
>comments about the Feb. 24 special. I spilled my guts to them
>and cooperated fully, gave them lots of good documents,
>information, and leads. So if it all goes south, no one will be
>more disappointed than me. We will all have to watch and see,
>but to suggest that 'evil forces' have influenced the program is
>a total crock (unless the pro-UFO paranoids recognize their own
>negative influences on the whole affair).

Surprise!

I am in full agreement with Jerry and Dick on this one.....

When I was called and told I would be on, I was told that they
couldn't tell me who else would be on, but that there were 100
calls to be made to people who wouldn't be.

Peter Jennings' comments, as reported in newspaper articles,
seem reasonable. I really don't see a conspiracy. Abductions
take a lot of time and have to be done carefully. I suspect John
was more philosophical than most of us. Less distressing events
can be handled much more easily.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Santiago Yturria <syturria.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 20:34:30 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:38:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:48:58 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>From: Santiago Yturria <syturria.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 16:44:06 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 00:27:21 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>><snip>

>>>Now, does anyone have the image from Iqueque?

>>The UFO photo by Mr. Bruna:

>><http://tinyurl.com/48b8u>

>Speaking as one who always tries to eliminate the mundane
>explanations first, I must say that this image appears to be a
>bird in profile flight somewhere between the camera and the
>hilltop in the distance. It appears to be moving left to right
>in the image, and the bright area would correspond to the near
>wing, while the darker area would represent the body.

>I have seen many images like this, and have suggested similar
>explanations before.

>While I could accept a hypothesis that alien craft, secret
>drones, or interdimensional visitors might camouflage themselves
>as birds in flight (a pretty clever idea if detection is not
>desired), I'd need much more than such images alone to be
>convinced of this.

>When creating a list of reported UFO shapes, like disks, orbs,
>triangles, etc., is there a category for "bird-like" shapes?

>Perhaps the volume of such photographs justifies such a
>category.

>I simply don't think so at this point.

Hi Kyle,

This is an interesting photo to analyze and we have to take into account some considerations. Just in case you couldn't read the report, because its in Spanish, the photo was taken by a former government official on assignment in Iquique. So its fair to discard the possibility of a hoax.

The original sized photo is shown in the slideshow window along with three zoomed images. If you notice in the original, the whole landscape is visible and at the top of the mountain the object appears in front of a cloud. The bird theory could have

been a possibility but if you see and measure the distance from the camera to the object what kind of bird would it have been to be that size? Despite other characteristics, it doesn't check to me.

In the original photo, I see a bright white light along with two dark strips a side and the object, despite distance, is clear. Perhaps you have not seen this perspective of the photo because is included only in the slide show. According to the AION researchers, that analyzed the original photo, this object could have measured around 3 or 4 meters in diameter.

If you know any type of bird of this size from your database please let me know the species to make my own comparisons. The AION group concluded this was an authentic UFO photo. Personally I still can not identify this object. If you have another plausible theory beside the bird please let me know.

Just to avoid any confusion, no one has mentioned the words 'alien craft' or 'visitors' in the report.

Santiago

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:48:33 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:41:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:08:49 +1000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>It is easy to find top military people who believe in UFOs as
>>alien spacecraft. Air Chief Marshal Lord Dowding was a believer
>>in Adamski. People like Lord Mountbatten, Prince Philip, Sir
>>Peter Horsley, Admiral of the Fleet Lord Hill-Norton (a believer
>>in MJ-12) are or were prominent in the UK. General L.M. Chassin
>>of NATO was a staunch UFO devotee in France (with a prediction
>>in 1960 that the 'truth' would soon be revealed). None of their
>>views have the slightest bearing on whether Roswell was a UFO
>>crash, nor can such opinions be used in support of this idea.

>>The most important question of all remains unanswered:

>>Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
>>landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
>>recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
>>evidence?

Do you have any idea how many places there are above and
underground for which there is no access without a high level
clearance and a need to know? In case you hadn't noticed the USA
is a very large country.

The last time I checked, New Mexico alone was twice the size of
England and Wales combined and NM is only the 5th largest state!
There are thousands of square miles one can't even fly over. The
amount of space for hiding wreckage and documents is truly
enormous.

>>If it did indeed happen, there must be literally tons of research papers
>>on this. Scientists of many disciplines would have been involved in
>>the ensuing analysis and discussion, perhaps from several countries.
>>Yet we have heard from precisely none of them.

Why would any rational person expect to? In addition many of the
people would have done analysis without knowing the source of
the material being examined. Three nuclear weapons labs together
have about 10,000 engineers and scientists. At one time there
were more than 20,000 people working at Wright Patterson, many
in labs with very restricted access.

>>Not one written word from anyone directly involved.

>>The whole Roswell myth is built on the principle that the
>>'truth' can never be revealed because of the need for one country
>>to maintain tight secrecy on it. Even when scientists are constantly
>>searching for evidence of alien life (as they have been for at least
>>50 years), the greatest scientific discovery of all time still has
>>to be kept under wraps. And this after six decades.

>>I submit that such an idea is utterly incredible

>>CDA

It is your naivete thta is incredible.

Certainly the SETI community is NOT searching for signs of alien life. They are searching for electromagnetic signals from afar and insist on totally ignoring the evidence that aliens are coming here. If aiens are coming there is no need for SETI is there?

While I am at it, I should for the umpteenth time point out that the Twining memo of Sept.23, 1947, was only classified SECRET. It could not possibly contain TOP SECRET or TS Code word info.

Why is that so hard to understand?

With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy, the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

>CDA, you appear to put great faith and belief that Government
>Bodies are not capable of bending or even saying out-right lies.
>If the CIA, NSA or other intelligent organisations cannot get it
>right about weapons of mass destruction (a deliberate lie, I
>believe) and the subsequent attempted coverup of prisoner
>mistreatment in Iraq, you are backing the wrong side. Military
>intelligence is an oxy-moron and their attempts to explain away
>the incident somewhat comical.

>Too many witnesses have come forward over the years regarding
>the Roswell Crash. It is indeed the coverup of the century, and
>one where details of the find, I feel, will never come to light.
>There will be documents missing or accidently destroyed, or
>perhaps they'll say the documents never existed. In other words,
>"These documents will never see the light of day!" If I have to
>put faith and trust on someone, it'll be Stanton Friedman. He
>approaches the subject with vigor while remaining objective. He
>collects the facts, interview the witnesses and puts its all
>together so that we can follow the events of what happened back
>in 1947.

>And make no mistake of this, I am not a believer that a lot of
>the technology we have today was back engineered from this
>crashed saucer.

>I think that is fantasy. We seem to give away too much credit to
>aliens over our capabilities as a race to evolve
>technologically. The gulf between their technology and ours will
>never be breached. My favourite saying is send a laptop computer
>back in time to the cavemen of Africa and see if they can pull
>it apart, study the components and replicate it? I don't think
>so!

I appreciate the kind words, Robert.

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://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of Life

From: NASANews.nul
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:00:20 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:45:25 -0500
Subject: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of Life

Dolores Beasley/Gretchen Cook-Anderson
Headquarters, Wahington
Phone: 202/358-1753/0836

February 18, 2005

RELEASE: 05-052

NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of Life On Mars

News reports on February 16, 2005, that NASA scientists from Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif., have found strong evidence that life may exist on Mars are incorrect.

NASA does not have any observational data from any current Mars missions that supports this claim. The work by the scientists mentioned in the reports cannot be used to directly infer anything about life on Mars, but may help formulate the strategy for how to search for martian life. Their research concerns extreme environments on Earth as analogs of possible environments on Mars. No research paper has been submitted by them to any scientific journal asserting martian life.

For information about NASA and agency programs on the Web, visit:

<http://www.nasa.gov>

For more information about NASA's Mars programs on the Web, visit:

<http://mars.jpl.nasa.gov/>

-end-

* * *

NASA press releases and other information are available automatically by sending an Internet electronic mail message to domo.nul In the body of the message (not the subject line) users should type the words "subscribe press-release" (no quotes). The system will reply with a confirmation via E-mail of each subscription. A second automatic message will include additional information on the service. NASA releases also are available via CompuServe using the command GO NASA.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:11:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:48:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

>>I disagree with this. As our own aviation development advances
>>toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced
>>airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems
>>have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have
>>experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their
>>electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes
>>occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our
>>space shuttles did not fare well either.

>>Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien
>>environment where an unanticipated source of interference could
>>not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may
>>have happened.

><snip>

>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

Or just the opposite, aliens much ahead of us know that we
already have wreckage and have not been able to duplicate the
propulsion system even for the Earth Excursion Modules. Why
worry?

Let us face it, none of us can say what aliens think or
believe.. even if I have said that they would consider us a
primitive society whose major activity is tribal warfare.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:29:12 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:52:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 17:29:39 +0000
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 11:52:41 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>>Your observation that there is no reflected light in the water
>>below this relatively bright UFO in the sky does not rule out
>>the lens flare explanation. In fact, it further supports it.

>>Of course, if this UFO was real object and it was radiating
>>only polarized light perpendicular to the surface of the water,
>>then it would be detected visually and recorded with a camera
>>but there would be no reflection off the water making it what
>>Bruce would call a TRUFO. Of course, the easiest way to test
>>this is to use the same camera to take a picture of the same
>>scene under similar conditions at night from exactly the same
>>location. If the UFO appears, it is an IFO. If it does not, then
>>it must be a TRUFO - which only raises even more questions, one
>>of them being why didn't others observe and report such a bright
>>and massive UFO?

>Surely the reason why there is no reflected light in the water
>is because the object - if such it be - is well back from the
>waterfront, over the hill that the town is standing on. The only
>lights in the water are those reflected from lamps or building
>immediately along the waterfront. None of the houses or other
>buildings further up the hill are reflected in the water either.

On the close-up I didn't expect to see its reflection, John, but
when you see the shot from behind the lights and the white yacht
[camera left], there should be some color in the water, but
perhaps the water is too riffled mid-way between the camera and
the object for there to be a reflection of anything other than
the lights on the water near the far shore.

But Nick, I still don't see this as a lens flare.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:33:39 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:10:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:47:04 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>I presume I can count you along with Stan on the Yea side, and
>>yes there are bound to be others.

>>The implication that most of serious Ufology still takes Roswell
>>as ET, and that it is therefore insular if not dotty; that's
>>what inspired me to say anything at all.

>>I usually avoid Roswell for very predictable reasons, rancor and
>>endless bush-beating high among them.

>>Do you feel that most serious ufologists still take Roswell as
>>the crash of an alien craft, or do you consider yourself (along
>>with Stan and others) in a minority position?

>>I'm willing to accept other views on Roswell itself, even if I
>>don't agree with them.

>I think we can guarantee that even if Stan Friedman is not the
>only 'serious ufologist' to take Roswell as the crash of an
>alien space craft, he is certainly the only such ufologist to go
>along with there being two, yes two, crashes on that same day,
>i.e. one at a site (one of four postulated in the literature)
>near Roswell, and another on the Plains of San Augustin.

Lots of garbage is postulated in the literature including a
Frank Kaufmann site which had no real support in the first
place. Some even postulate the moon is made of green cheese.So?

>Why not ask for a show of 'hands' on those who believe there
>were two UFO crashes within 100 miles of each other on the same
>day?

Ever hear of mid-air collisions? 40% of the more than 800
sightings in Bloecher's 1947 Wave report involved more than one
UFO being observed at a time.....

>By the way, there is not one shred of documentation of any kind
>to indicate a second such crash. Not even a press report. Merely
>a person who spoke to Stan in 1978 following a lecture he gave.
>This guy did not recall the date, and only heard the story from
>a third party (Barney Barnett), nearly 30 years earlier. Even
>Barnett had no memory of the date. Yet Stan has built a totally
>fanciful case for a July 1947 occurrence for this event, when
>there is nothing to show it happened then, or at any other time.

Talk about fanciful!!

Try and do your homework, CDA.

Don't forget Barnett's boss Fleck Danley, his neighbor Harold Baca, from across the street, and William Leed, military officer, etc.

Testimony from circumstantial quite respectable witnesses.

How do you know Barnett had no memory of the date? Out of body contact with the dead? It was his boss who came up with the date after thinking on it. Barney was dead before we started our investigation so we couldn't ask him. There were others like the Datil Postmistress and a rancher.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 03:11:33 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:17:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - Ledger

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:30:52 +0000
>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:10:12 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

><snip>

>>This nails it for me. It's nice that we we get this viewpoint.
>>It supports my suspicion and the hard data at the bookstore.
>>Women read more than men with the numbers supporting a 90-10
>>split in non-fiction for the females and 60-40 fiction, again
>>the females.

>Working in a public library, I can confirm there is a
>considerable difference in the reading habits or men and women,
>however, I'm a little puzzled in the 90-10 split on non-fiction
>reading. Do you mean men 90%, women 10%? My opinion is that men
>read more non-fiction than women, although not by such an
>extreme amount. I would give the split as about 60-40, with, as
>you say, about the opposite proportions for fiction.

>I emphasise that this is borrowing from a library, the split in
>book purchasing may be different, but I'd be surprised if it
>actually reversed the proportions.

Since I am more interested in the selling side - but still love
libraries - I'd tend to agree with the Writers Federation on
this.

But I said 90-10 in favor of women re non-fiction, I had that
backwards. The 60-40 re fiction I had right. Actually more
recently I heard the numbers were increasing greater being
closer to 70-30 in favor of women reading fiction.

>>A week or so ago Paul Kimball noted that the 'New Age' section
>>on the bookshelves at Chapter's [Canadian bookseller similar to
>>Barnes and Noble] were dominated by subjects such as Tarot card
>>reading, Wickens and Witches etc. - usually written by female
>>authors - where once there would have been dozens of male
>>written books on UFOs.

>I think this is more the result of a general decline of
>interest in the subject, than a feminine 'take-over' of the New
>Age shelves. It's always puzzle me why UFOs should be in the
>'New Age' section anyway. Incidentally, one big British bookshop
>chain has renamed its 'new age' or 'mind-body-spirit' section as
>the 'Me Zone'.

You may be right about the interest level. Book sales don't lie.
But I think for different reasons than you would guess. The
numbers are up for "belief" in the phenomenon. Over the last few
years I've made a point of asking young people-30 and below
about what they think is the basis for UFO sightings. I was
surprised when the majority said they felt that these were

extra-terrestrial phenomenon and seemed to just accept this as, why not? with the next observation being 'why should we be the only intelligent life in the universe? To make this short. UFOs are ordinary now. I think we over exposed it. They just aren't as exciting as they used to be. How can you compete with the imagination of Hollywood and their upclose and detailed "alien craft".

This same - or similar - dis-interest exists in another area. Young people or even middle aged people aren't coming out in the numbers they used to in order to learn to fly. To learn to fly a light aircraft isn't exciting enough [poking along at 120 mph] for most youngsters who think they get greater thrills from playing some simulator type video game. Everything is warp drive and Mach numbers these days, when in actuality it is more to do with freedom when you fly.

And it's expensive too.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 02:51:36 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:28:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become
>clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO
>researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO
>research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific
>methods for UFO research. As an advocate of the latter approach,
>I believe it important to justify why this should be done in a
>systematic way. The basis of my argument is that there is a
>distorting factor in the investigative process of the UFO
>phenomenon. This distorting factor is primarily political and is
>related to national security, cultural and religious concerns
>over the ramifications of UFO research and the extraterrestrial
>hypothesis. This distorting factor needs to be systematically
>factored in to UFO research in order to properly deal with the
>growing volume of whistleblowers and others coming forward with
>first hand testimony of classified UFO research and sightings,
>and of working with alleged extraterrestrial related
>technologies and beings.

<snip>

Dr. Salla,

I imagine you were hoping to hear from me again <g>.

Paul Kimball, Kyle King, and Martin Shough said the essentials
of my position. I fully stand behind my original statement. In
your response to the above named gentlemen you had the gall to
try to defend your indefensible position on Dulce Canyon by
supporting it with the names of Dan Burisch, Bob Lazar, etc.
- known frauds.

Despite all your social sciences rhetoric, why you do not vett
your whistleblowers and discard the ones telling tales with no
supporting evidence in making your case? It shows me that you are
trying to make a sand castle with no foundation. For example,
you introduced to us the tale of Charles Hall, a man who claims
to have worked with aliens.

He even stated that something like 41 previous weatherman at his
location quit because they could not handle working with the
"tall white aliens". When you first heard of Charles Hall did
you determine whether he had actually worked in that position or
not? Did you look at records, etc. Did you get the names of the
previous weathermen?

Did you try to do anything to tell whether there was truth in
his tale or not? Or did you just post his tale on your website
and promote his book as if it were the gospel truth? Or did the
government destroy all his records and the other people who had
worked in his location as they did to Bob Lazar's school and
employment records? <g>

Do you have any sense or did it all get swallowed up in the soft evidence swamp of fuzzy illogic? To me you sound like the village idiot who would stand on the corner repeating every tall tale that blew his way. Don't you know to have a grey box in which to park those persons and claims for which there is not enough supporting evidence? Instead you just promote anyone's tale as the truth. I don't buy your belief that anything anyone says supports your exopolitics social science _theory_. To me that theory is nothing but a house of cards built on a swamp.

What you are doing most likely saves the government a lot of time and effort they otherwise would have to invest in disinformation programs to have UFO research look utterly foolish.

>What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty Principle
>for UFO Research"

>"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less precisely
>the EVIDENCE is known"

The above sounds like something George Orwell would have written. I showed it to a few detectives and they cracked up as it is exactly opposite the rules of evidence in the legal world.

>The application of the Uncertainty Principle to UFO research
>would make it legitimate to study and analyze the implications
>of testimonies of witnesses/whistleblowers to multiple aspects
>of the UFO phenomenon where evidentiary support is lacking or
>not compelling. The Uncertainty Principle gives support to a
>systematic analysis of wide-ranging testimonies that reveal a
>complex relationship between Truth and Evidence that emerges due
>to a distorting medium in UFO research. I look forward to
>hearing the forum's views on the systematic application of an
>Uncertainty principle in UFO research.

I believe you are lost in your own uncertainty principle and steadily sinking in the swamp of fuzzy illogic. Your house of cards has collapsed into the wet sand as did your sand castle.

Dr. Salla, I have twice stated my position on your charade and I have no more to say on the matter. Unfortunately people like you cause the media (Peter Jennings and others), the public, and some members of government to have a tough time in taking the UFO phenomenon seriously. It is easy to laugh at what seems utterly foolish.

Happy trails,

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 04:25:18 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:30:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - Hatch

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:30:52 +0000
>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

<snip>

>It's always puzzle me why UFOs should be in the 'New Age'
>section anyway. Incidentally, one big British bookshop chain
>has renamed its 'new age' or 'mind-body-spirit' section
>as the 'Me Zone'.

The 'Me Zone'. If that's a trend, it could wander over here.
Thanks for the warning.

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 06:42:45 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:36:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:59:11 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:52:40 EST
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

<snip>

>>Gee Jerry Clark, I for one would rather have one of the top
>>psychiatrists on Earth get on television and say that witnesses,
>>abductees, whistleblowers aren't nuts than to not address the
>>issue at all.

>That, Greg, is not my decision to make.

Still - it's a no-brainer to anyone remotely read into this
problem that it, most certainly, should have been, at least
partly, your decision to make. Mainstream news is bankrupt
dude. It has become its own irrelevancy, to an almost
insurmountable degree. They hang on the edge of relevancy, and
that small grasp begins to crumble... or didn't Stephen Bassett
just kick mainstream news's ass on the SDI program a couple of
weeks ago? I took a few feeble swings myself. Felt damned
good!

The guy - with all respect to a very brave Thane Burnett who
assumed all the blame for an irrelevant 21st Century
journalism - came back with nothing.

>In any event, I admired
>Dr. Mack's huge courage, but I had many reservations about the
>particular approach he took and the conclusions he drew from
>them.

Yet he was a preeminent social scientist, and his MD makes him
something of a conventional scientist. Moreover, he held a chair
at the center of the bastion that is the man. One would think
he'd hold something of a keynote instead of complete dismissal.
His complete, virtually death-bed, exclusion is, at best,
ill-advised. At worst?

>Years ago I wrote an article for IUR outlining my
>criticisms. History will judge, of course, whether this good and
>courageous man was right or wrong.

I'll look for that, Sir. Or maybe if it's not a lot of trouble
you could pass it on.

>In the meantime, as one makes a case for UFOs as genuine
>anomalies, hard-evidence cases are, I think, the place to
>start.

Still, the truth of this 'thing' is likely to be beyond
something we can hold, readily, in our hand. Consider magnetism
and electricity and we still make 'magical' uses of those...

even as we don't understand them.

But you are correct, if I may be bold, in that it is a good place to start. So ... lets _start_ already, fellow yellow-dog!

There's precious little starting that is not explained in the conventional wisdom that the mainstream is put off by the woo-woos, cracker-pots, and nut cases. That's an _excuse_ I submit. Woo-woos, I say again, don't seem to be a cause more than they can be seen as a symptom. Beyond being put off by nuts, there is a reluctance to investigate because they are discouraged from that investigation, to start.

>Even ufologists disagree on the ontological status of
>abduction experiences.

This is forgetting of course that ufologists agree on very little... with which to begin. <g>.

>The issue isn't whether these people are
>"nuts" - most don't appear to be, and psychological studies seem
>to testify to their fundamental sanity - but whether their
>experiences occur in what we laughingly call event-level
>reality.

How very Rimmarianally stated! Just kidding, but you and I both know quality people (forgetting a moment we've been burned too) who think that they have been abducted by aliens... and that raises some neck hair with you, too, I suspect. It does me.....

>That question has not been settled, nor is it likely to be
>settle in our lifetimes, I suspect.

I'm not going to accept that. I bet you don't either, really.

>Meantime, get a handle on that paranoid streak, and remember,
>lots of stuff just happens and is not generated in somebody's
>sinister plot.

It remains that some may be. And it's not paranoia if they really _are_ out to get you. Then it's proanoia. <g>.

For my part... if this 'thing' is not appropriately addressed by ABC and Peter Jennings, I _will_ do my small part to excoriate him (and ABC) in every way I can, everywhere I can, and every time I can. I'll put a "cool-can" on my warp drive! <g>

I'd likely do all that anyway, but, you know... <g>

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:16:25 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:40:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Reynolds

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:40:47 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

>Hi Jerry,

>Thanks for the illumination. I too understand that those that
>you call pelicanists are not put off by the term as they
>understand the underlying meaning at work, and the humor
>attached thereto.

>But Rich Reynolds, who purportedly is tired of explaining the
>term, seemed to have another (albeit unmentioned) word in mind,
>hence my suggestion that skeptic... as you assert... does not
>fit.

>I'm sure that Rich or one of his "roman a clef" cohorts will
>come up with a perfectly apt term. Of course, few will ever see
>it, and none of note on this List will subscribe to it. So, as
>with most of RRR Group's recent rants, it will echo in a single
>pair of ears, peculiarly tuned to it's rather uninformative
>frequency.

Kyle:

No, I'm not suggesting another term for those who disagree with
Jerry Clark or you.

My suggestion was to make the discussions here relevant, without
rancor or diverting items.

For some reason you would prefer that I and my cohorts keep our
mouths shut and leave you, Jerry, and a few others monopolize
the UFO discussions here and elsewhere.

We've tackled big fish over the years, media persons who are
derelict in their journalistic duties, government officials
about Dr. Condon, U.N. officials about a guy named Betencourt,
and others.

While we admire Jerry Clark, who has actually contributed highly
to the study of UFOs, we offered a suggestion that his
continuing use of the term "pelicanist" has lost its cachet and
is meaningless to those who are coming to the UFO table anew.

He chooses to think otherwise.

And when you say others find the term endearing, they do not, as
some posts here, and privately to me, indicate.

But there is a perception that if one goes head-to-head with

those here who are semi-famous, they'll get marginalized or eliminated altogether. That's the perception, maybe not the reality.

You contribute to the UFO cause, but haven't really done much in a substantive way. But we (the RRRGroup) have a track record, some of it online, which shows that we have been involved for many years and not just in some silly "pelicanist" way.

Jerry Clark can choose to ignore me, which is his prerogative as a bonafide UFO expert. And we respect him anyway.

You, my friend, tend towards a censorship role, and it surprises me because you seem more intelligent than that.

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 04:26:06 -1000
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:44:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:49:03 EST
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 06:49:39 -1000
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 12:38:21 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>><snip>

>><<snip>Without compelling supportive evidence, why should we just
>>>accept the word of "whistleblowers"?

>>>The "Ufology Principle [UFOP]" you outline above is the
>>>antithesis of what good research should be, and indicates that
>>>you are biased from the get go, in a way that compromises any
>>>truly objective study of the evidence as it is presented.

><snip>

>>As far as I can see it, most UFO researchers are arguing that
>>the government/military are kind of like honest crooks. Yes,
>>they withhold evidence, maintain silence and fabricate
>>disinformation, yet they would never discredit witnesses by
>>removing/altering public records that support their testimonies
>>or intimidating/silencing potential corroborating witnesses. So
>>who is presenting the more credible research methodology here?

>Michael:

>They are. The government is simply not capable of altering
>records to the degree you suggest.

That's really the crux of the issue here isn't? How much does the government do in maintaining the conspiracy of silence. Is it just keeping mum and putting out disinformation to put researchers off the trail. If so, then the research methodology of UFO researchers insisting on hard evidence is justified. Or is it much more, along the lines of what I'm suggesting, removing records, intimidating witnesses, etc? If so, then a more flexible research method is appropriate where the mantra of 'hard evidence' is not invoked as much by the true believers. Now what is the source of your belief that the government lacks the capability of altering hard evidence? I'm glad we agree that the military has the power to alter/remove records of its employees. You then say that this governmental power stops when it comes to the individuals one worked with, and then there is the civilian sector where one has professors, degrees, etc., that can be confirmed.

>Take, for example, the matter of Hypothetical Witness A. Now,
>"A" claims to have doctoral degrees in physics from the

>University of X and Law from the University of Y. He also claims
>that he served in the USAF for six years, and was posted at Base
>W, where he saw alien bodies.

>Now, for the sake of argument, I'll concede that the government
>could alter his military records to show that, instead of
>serving at Base W, he actually served at Base Q. However,
>Witness "A" should be able to provide names of the people he
>worked with at Base W, names of people in the community whom he
>knew, receipts from local businesses where he purchased goods or
>did business, etc.

>Also, when it comes time to judge his credibility, he should be
>able to produce his doctoral degrees (and his undergrad ones as
>well), yearbooks, similar personal records as to his time in
>university, etc., names of friends who knew him at school, etc.
>If he cannot do any of this, then his credibility is zilch, zip,
>zero and nada. His "testimony" doesn't belong in the "grey"
>basket - it belongs in the trash-can.

>Alas, all too often amongst the more credulous in ufology, these
>background checks are not performed and, if the results prove
>that Witness A has been less than forthcoming about his
>background, the conspiracy theorists will simply say - "well,
>the government erased his records."

>I kept my law degree - it's hanging on my office wall. I have my
>law school yearbook, my transcripts, etc. How is the government
>supposed to erase all of that? How will they be able to track
>down all of my friends from all my years (10) at various
>universities?

The simplest answer is that you are not working on a classified project. As far as one's peers are concerned, if one is working on a Waived Special Access Program (deep black project) and comes across UFO/ET related information then it's unrealistic to expect that it will be easy to check employee records and confirm employment and fellow workers. After all, this is all highly classified work and to expect people to put their careers and families on the line to support a maverick employee spilling the beans is simply unrealistic. Have you had any experience in working with or interviewing former employees of black projects? If so, you'll find that this is not exactly a transparent field where records are freely available and where you can interview anyone to confirm testimonies of a whistleblower.

As for civilian records, friends, professors, university registrars that can confirm that one was employed in a black project, completed a university degree, can the government alter these? I guess the answer would be how long the whistleblower has been employed in black projects with UFO/ET applications and what they agreed to when signing onto the project. Project Managers of classified programs have different security standards. In one you might be able to simply sign on, get your security clearance and away you go. In another, one of the conditions may be to agree to have all one's civilian records removed in order to be employed.

You point to friends, professors etc., that can confirm one's degrees. In doing the background security checks on an individual, the employing mil-intel agency has all the information on key individuals who have known the prospective employee. This is quite thorough and in doing a background security check, professors who have personally known students are interviewed. I've done a few interviews myself for former students. So it wouldn't be too hard to track down the professors of those individuals who decide to become whistleblowers and persuade them to remain silent if asked to corroborate on the grounds of national security. You might say that this is all conspiracy theory, yet I can reply that the government does have the capability to do this. The question is do they have the political will to do it? The answer depends on whether national security agencies responsible for maintaining security are inspired by Kant's 'Categorical Imperative' or Machiavelli's 'The Prince'.

What influenced me in reaching my conclusion about the government actually removing or altering records, was reading the testimony of whistleblowers such as Bob Lazar, Michael Wolfe, Dan Burisch, Phil Schneider, et al., who described what happened in their own cases. I think Bob Lazar's example was

quite revealing in how this was done. Now you and others might say that Lazar and co were just faking it. That when credible researchers did the necessary background check, there wasn't anything to substantiate the various degrees and jobs they claimed to have. Thus their testimonies lack credibility, and they were merely claiming the existence of secret government manipulation to put out a good story. Now I've had some experience interviewing people who have been threatened, intimidated from government authorities. I did field research in East Timor, Kosovo, Sri Lanka and saw what happened and got much experience in just listening to people's stories and ascertaining if they were speaking the truth or not about government repression and abuses. I guess one just develops an intuition or gut feeling about whether one is being told a tall tale or the truth since the hard evidence is often difficult to get in such situations.

One thing that helps in understanding government capabilities to remove/alter records is finding out the motivation of people like Lazar, Wolfe, Burisch, Shneider making these claims about shadow government agencies removing their records, intimidating them, etc. I really don't see a motivation for them lying and just fabricating the whole thing for fame and money. There's nothing in Lazar's record that indicates he would have any motivation for going public about his alleged work at S4. His hobby is making rocket cars and he appears to appreciate his privacy, and also doesn't seem to have made much money from his testimony. So why would he go public with these allegations of a working on an ET vehicle at S4? It doesn't make sense to me unless he was telling the truth. I think that the four whistleblowers I've mentioned above and those in Greer's Disclosure Project were telling the truth as far as they could recall it. That doesn't mean we need to accept everything they say since it's one man's recollection of what happened and they may be mistaken in some of the things they observed. However, I do think it important to accept that they were telling the truth as best they recall it and we need to start analyzing the implications of what they say. Putting whistleblower testimonies in a 'gray box' and moving on in the perennial search for hard evidence is not methodologically sound.

This is where I part company with many UFO researchers who don't want to discuss things in the 'gray box' since it's inconclusive and genuine scientists refrain from speculation. Let me say in conclusion that analysing testimonies in the 'gray box' is a methodological necessity. It's where the real political science happens since the closer one gets to the truth, the more difficult it will be to find hard evidence substantiating it due to government interference.

In peace,

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:46:24 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:48:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

>Of course, the proposal of conventional explanations is part of
>the scientific process. Where it leaves science is when the
>proposed explanation conflicts with the strongly with the
>sighting report, but the pelicanist sticks to it anyway.

>From that point of view, we have to consider that the Klass
>proposal in 1997 that Arnold saw meteors was also a
>'pelicanism'.

But not a pelicanist, perhaps... No, Mr. Klass is likely a
full-blown pelican or how do you explain the red herring
fishtail perpetually hanging out of the corner of his mouth
(beak?). See how I take metaphor and turn ad hominum into valid
criticism?

Another avian rule might be: Accuse others of that which you
are, yourself, guilty.

alienview.nul - :| :-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:53:37 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:50:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:52:15 +0000
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>Notwithstanding trenchant comments from guys with slide rules
>and wrenches - many of them good researchers - I feel you've
>probably got a point, but one that applies only to a certain
>genre of sightings or contacts.

>If we examine three sets of "experiments" we find:

>1) in any quantum operation, if a stern check is made on what's
>happening - the behavior changes!

>Yup - sounds ridiculous, but just check Richard P Feynman's
>comments on the "two slit experiment"

>2) in poltergeist (too many to be false) investigations, any
>"scientific" checks are always confounded, although police,
>priests, press etc. continue to witness the actual phenomena

>3) in a certain sub-set of UFO sightings or contacts, the same
>reports of non-physical/shifting-at-will phenomena that
>characterize quantum and poltergeist/paranormal experiences.

>Your suggestion could open a new era of 'realistic' questioning
>of (falsely) denied phenomena by way of "insulated experiments"
>where the skepticism of scientists and observers is not allowed
>to impinge on the sensitive subjects or witnesses.

>But, if this is a path to future truths, it will be fought
>every inch of the way by gov'ts and vested interests - as
>always.

A locally well respected anthropologist and paleoarcheologist
named once told me in conversation that he was sure that the
uncertainty principle most likely applied to 'everything'.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Mystery Of Tasmanian UFO Deepens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:54:50 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:54:50 -0500
Subject: Mystery Of Tasmanian UFO Deepens

Source: The Mercury - Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/4t6ry>

02-19-05

Mystery Of UFO Deepens
By Phil Beck

The status of an unidentified flying object seen above the Midland Highway Monday night remains a mystery.

Co-ordinator of UFO Reports and Sightings Tasmania, Keith Roberts said yesterday the report now fell into the 5 per cent of UFO sightings which could not be explained.

"We checked up with the airport, helicopter companies, crop dusters, the Navy and the Department of Defence and drew a blank with all of them," Mr Roberts said.

"Out of 100 reports, there is usually a ready explanation for 80 per cent and further investigations explain another 15 per cent.

"This report, however, falls into the 5 per cent which are not explained. But we are ready to receive more information which can help."

Monday night's report was made by a 43-year-old Kingston woman who was driving north on the highway with her sister and a friend.

They first spotted a bright light near Brighton about midnight but by the time they were near the Bothwell turnoff the bright light appeared to be heading towards them.

The woman, who said she was not one to believe in aliens, said the object was about half the size of a house and had one red pulsating light on one side and a similar blue light on the other. They had pulled over and got out of the car, and within minutes the object was hovering about 30m above the ground less than 300m away.

She said the craft was shaped like an AFL football as it came towards them, but when it was closer she guessed it was saucer shaped.

Mr Roberts said he hoped other people would come forward with information on the sighting.

"At the moment we are left with an unexplained object," Mr Roberts said.

"There was a similar sighting in the same area in the 1970s, when a driver saw a bright mass of light before his car conked out."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:36:01 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:58:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Clark

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:31:30 -0600
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 20:32:38 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

Hi, Kyle,

>>Thank goodness for some sense. Maybe next we can get rid of
>>"skeptibunkers" and "klasskurtzians" and start talking like
>>grown-ups.

>Perhaps I spoke in error. If there is in fact a sense of
>derision at the use of the term, I have rarely if ever heard
>same. I thought you had long since accepted the term.

I also spoke in error. I seem unable to learn by experience and
continue to think that pelicanists, who can certainly dish it
out, understand that they have to take it, too. I keep learning,
as above, how wrong I am. Another serious mistake on my part is
in thinking they have a sense of humor. Sadly, no.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:35:58 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:00:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:59:11 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:52:40 EST
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:42:38 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

<snip>

>>Gee Jerry Clark, I for one would rather have one of the top
>>psychiatrists on Earth get on television and say that witnesses,
>>abductees, whistleblowers aren't nuts than to not address the
>>issue at all.

>That, Greg, is not my decision to make. In any event, I admired
>Dr. Mack's huge courage, but I had many reservations about the
>particular approach he took and the conclusions he drew from
>them. Years ago I wrote an article for IUR outlining my
>criticisms. History will judge, of course, whether this good and
>couragous man was right or wrong.

>In the meantime, as one makes a case for UFOs as genuine
>anomalies, hard-evidence cases are, I think, the place to
>start. Even ufologists disagree on the ontological status of
>abduction experiences. The issue isn't whether these people are
>"nuts" - most don't appear to be, and psychological studies seem
>to testify to their fundamental sanity - but whether their
>experiences occur in what we laughingly call event-level
>reality.

>That question has not been settled, nor is it likely to be
>settleed in our lifetimes, I suspect.

Sure I can see that. No prob there. Since batteries of tests
conducted for almost 50 years, something is true or it isn't.
Notice we don't haul in religious people who see any number of
assorted strange beings whom they claim interact with their
lives from anything from saving their lives to hiding their
television remote.

Fair's fair. If psychiatry and psychology are going to be used
to condemn, then it equally should be used to emancipate. Since
any UFOlogist worth his trace samples knows, intimidation and
invalidation are the tools used to demean witnesses and
abductees and researchers. My point is if Dr. Mack's research is
valid in other areas then it's valid here. Sure we could pick at
it but that's the way research goes.

>Meantime, get a handle on that paranoid streak, and remember,
>lots of stuff just happens and is not generated in somebody's
>sinister plot.

No, I'm not paranoid. Next time I'll put a big sign on my posts saying:

It's a joke fellas!

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:41:42 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:02:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Clark

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:59:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:25:02 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>People like Jerry Clark and and Dick Hall indicate they are in
>>the fence-sitting category on Roswell. They are not proponents,
>>but they are not debunkers either. I remember Dick Hall once
>>making the comment that there seems to be a lot of smoke with
>>Roswell which may indicate a conflagration behind it, but he is
>>not absolutely convinced.

>I think you have fairly and accurately summed up both my
>position and the general state of affairs. I would only add as
>far as my personal view is concerned that the Mogul balloon
>interpretation makes no sense to me, and the testimony of people
>who were there (and their offspring) which I have heard first-
>hand strongly suggests that something extraordinary occurred.

>I am in the truest sense of the word an agnostic, who suspects
>that unless someone can come up with a convincing explanation in
>terms of secret U.S. technology (which has not happened to
>date), then by reductio ad absurdum it was (hypothetically) an
>alien spacecraft that crashed. However, unlike most people who
>think in either-or terms and revile those who disagree with
>their polar view, I fully understand the need for patience, and
>more data-gathering, and reserving of judgment until we have
>more complete information.

If Dick Hall and I keep agreeing, one of us may prove
unnecessary. But I'll risk that fate and state that in the
paragraph above Dick has summed up my position exactly.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Reynolds

From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:42:55 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:04:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Reynolds

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>I vote with Jerry. You should be deleted and unread.

Okay, Wendy, Kyle, and Jerry...

You win. I'm the enemy... and I have ruffled some non-pelicanist feathers here.

So I bow out, to make you happy and secure.

It was fun while it lasted (for me anyway).

Rich Reynolds

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 05:52:26 -1000
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:08:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 19:42:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

<snip>

>The more precisely the truth is determined, the more likely it
>is that the evidence, whatever form it takes, is true.

Aloha Bruce,

I agree that this is the case in a 'normal situation'. However, is this what happens in the world of black projects where witnesses, evidence etc., come under the purview of a project manager and/or national security agencies that may seek to distort/alter this on the grounds of maintaining national security? After all this is what I'm proposing, the classified nature of UFO/ET related projects leads to the alteration or distortion of evidence that might substantiate what a whistleblower is claiming. So we can't assume the UFO phenomenon occurs in a normal or ideal laboratory conditions here. UFO research is not just an applied physics problem. There is a distorting medium of government interference with evidence that makes this a political problem as well.

>The precision of the evidence would, presumably, also be better.
>(But "precision" and "truth" are rather orthogonal concepts...
>something can be very precise and very wrong or imprecise but
>correct. Or course , precise and correct is the best.)

I'm not sure about what you are saying here about 'precision' and 'truth' being orthogonal so let me see if I can address this as best I can. Truth is a qualifier that can be ascribed to a proposition. Precision is a also a qualifier, but is a concept that can be attributed to particular kinds of proposition pertaining to knowing something. For example, I can say "it's a sunny day today on the Big Island of Hawaii". That proposition can be true or false based on where I'm saying it and the time I'm saying it. Yet, the precision of the proposition can be debated in terms of what is a sunny day, where exactly I'm located on the Big Island, etc. So we are talking about a particular category of propositions when using the qualifier precision. So truth and precision are different logical categories. In Aristotelian logic, this would be pretty close to a category mistake here. I don't know if this is what you mean by them being orthogonal.

>I have no problem with 'exopolitics' as an academic activity,
>but I think it should be based on the most verifiable evidence
>without diluting the veracity of the evidence by including 'wild
>stories'.

Thanks, maybe there's hope for me yet in academia. I agree that

verifiable evidence is most desirable. Netherless, verifiable evidence is hard to come by in the world of highly classified projects (eg., waived Special Access Programs) especially those projects dealing with UFO/ET related technologies/information. That's just a fact of life. Making verifiable evidence the standard for exopolitical research would significantly reduce exopolitical research to little more than analysing why and how the government is withholding UFO related material. Doing exopolitical research requires being able to analyse the available evidence including whistleblower testimony since this is mother lode of information on what is happening concerning UFOs/ETs. Making verifiable evidence the crux for admissability of whistleblower testimony would mean that most if not every whistleblower from a waived special access programs for example would ultimately have to be igored since s/he didn't have verifiable evidence. If they did have verifiable evidence, the security manager of the classified program in question would be in much trouble indeed. Question is, how far can the security manager go in removing verifiable evidence available to a whistleblower? We can debate that one. I don't think it helps coming up with dismissive labels such as 'wild stories'. People who have a story to tell will ultimately be judged on how persuasive and credible they are, rather solely the verifiable evidence they provide. I'm just prepared to give whistleblowers more slack based on my basic premise that the government interferes with whatever verifiable evidence enters the public arena.

>Imagine that someone goes through a rigorous analysis and
>devises an exopolitics (how to interact with the aliens) based
>on Adamski's stories. Will the political recommendations or
>understanding based on his stories tell us anything about how we
>should react to the _actual_ ETs? Only the Adamski supporters
>would say yes.

This comes down to the question of whether one believes Adamski or other contactees are telling the truth about what they allegedly saw. Adamski provided physical evidence and there were witnesses to support his alleged contacts. Can you say for sure they didn't happen based on the controversy over the accuracy of his photos, films? Perhaps it's an article of faith in UFO research that Adamski is a fraud. Since I'm still relatively new to this field and operate under the premise of government interference with UFO/ET evidence, then I have an open mind about people like Adamski. Would an exopolitical analysis based on Adamski's contacts tell us much about actual ETs? I really can't answer that one.

>To base exopolitical analysis on hoax claims about ETs (e.g.
>'Dr.' Reed) would be a waste of time.

>I think a valuable exopolitical study could be presented in the
>following very general, highly simplified, form:

>'If the aliens/ET's behave in (some particular) manner, then we
>should react (in the following manner).'

>For example, if the ETs are really nice guys and gals, then we
>should welcome them and have a good time.

>Or, If the ETs are mean and nasty we should avoid them as much
>as possible.

>Or, if they hate our guts then we should bend WAYYY over, put
>our heads between our legs and kiss our buttocks goodbye.

That's something that was already allegedly done by Oppenheimer and Einstein in their paper, Relationships With Inhabitants Of Celestial Bodies. See:

http://209.132.68.98/pdf/oppenheimer_einstein.pdf

Apparently, George Marshall didn't think their reflections worthy of being passed on to the President.

To finish up, I think there are important analyses that can be drawn by whistleblowers despite the lack of verifiable evidence. I don't think dismissing these as speculations based on wild stories helps advance understanding much in this area. We need to consider these cases on their merits despite the absence of verifiable evidence. The absence of verifiable evidence is I

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

believe a necessary rather than contingent condition of UFO
research - hence the Uncertainty Principle I proposed.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:39:29 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:15:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

>I disagree with this. As our own aviation development advances
>toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced
>airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems
>have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have
>experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their
>electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes
>occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our
>space shuttles did not fare well either.

You are trying to compare extremely advanced alien technology
with our relatively primitive technology. This is not valid. Our
technology is extremely limited based on mass and energy
considerations. You must assume that for any aliens to have
gotten here from across the interstellar void, they must have
overcome these limits and thus can pack lots of redundancy,
backups, fancy hardware to prevent any accident and quickly
recover from such.

>Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien
>environment where an unanticipated source of interference could
>not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may
>have happened.

Only for "first timers". However, you must agree that the odds
of any alien visitors coming across our planet as the first in
their travels is extremely unlikely, just as it would be
extremely unlikely that they have not been visiting us thousands
of years prior to now. No, the most likely scenario is that they
have visited 1000's of other planets and have acquired databases
on all possible interactions with alien environments and have
been able to engineer needed hardware backups/redundancy to
prevent catastrophic failure.

>I believe there is no good reason to exclude the ETH as an
>explanation of the Roswell incident.

I think any crash UFO story is extremely suspect unless
you have evidence of metal with non-terrestrial isotopes
or integrated nanotechnology in the crashed pieces.

>>No, if the alien race is far advanced then there are no limits
>>to the safety or defense of their vehicles.

<snip>

>Yes, and our shuttle computers and yet things can go wrong. The
>Space Shuttle uses a complex set of software and hardware to
>guide, navigate and control it through all phases of flight.
>Five IBM AP-101B flight computers host a set of highly critical
>and complex programs. The current man-machine interface consists
>of a series of dedicated electromechanical instruments and
>switches combined with specialized displays with limited
>function.

I am sorry, but if you think the Shuttle is advanced, then further discussion is useless. The Shuttle is mass and energy limited. The computers are very primitive when you consider the likely range of technology for alien civilizations. It was designed with specific failure modes and effects analyses which includes reliability analyses of all hardware. Our technology level is very primitive so we can only do so much redundancy and deal with most of the failure modes. But if an alien race did failure modes and effects analysis based on 1000's to 1000000's of sorties to planetary surfaces, then you would think that they would have assembled a database by now of all such possible problems and (if they valued their craft and people) would design fault/failure tolerant or recoverable hardware.

>If an alien craft is on its first sortie to a planet, its
>advanced control system may not be programmed for all
>eventualities.

Its first sortie? What are the odds? No, if there are alien races visiting other worlds, the odds are that they have done it many, many times prior to visiting us. We are not the center of the Universe.

>We cannot presume to know what weaknesses exist
>in an alien society. It might even be presumed that one of the
>aliens could have sabotaged the ship because it was unhappy with
>the other crew members or its compensation or it could be the
>crew were biological machines that malfunctioned for spurious
>reasons. There are so many possibilities that cannot be ruled
>out.

Well, this is a sad scenario. Actually, I think that the odds are that this is very unlikely since for any civilization to survive long enough for easy interstellar travel, they must have been able to ferret out malcontents and create social uniformity. Consider psychological monitoring to likely be the norm, if not genetically configured into their makeup. Chaos and civilization longevity seem to be antithetical.

>The important thing is not the possibilities. The important
>thing is the evidence and whether those who examined the
>physical evidence found that it pointed to something that was
>out of this world.

Yes, the important thing is hard evidence of crashed UFO hardware. Then we are getting somewhere.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:48:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:17:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 06:42:45 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:59:11 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:52:40 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>Years ago I wrote an article for IUR outlining my
>>criticisms [of John Mack's theories and conclusions].
>>History will judge, of course, whether this good and
>>courageous man was right or wrong.

>I'll look for that, Sir. Or maybe if it's not a lot of trouble
>you could pass it on.

The essay was titled "Big (Space) Brothers." It appeared in
International UFO Reporter, March/April 1994, pages 7-10.

The issue is available for \$6 postpaid from J. Allen Hynek
Center for UFO Studies, 2457 West Peterson Avenue, Chicago,
Illinois 60659.

My views on these matters have not changed. I do, however,
admire Dr. Mack for his integrity, commitment, and courage.
History will be kinder to him, I expect, than to the academic
war party that howled for his scalp.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:02:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:18:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:53:37 -0600
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:52:15 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

<snip>

>A locally well respected anthropologist and paleoarcheologist
>named once told me in conversation that he was sure that the
>uncertainty principle most likely applied to 'everything'.

I'm sorry... Dr. Bobby Rowe...

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:05:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:21:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Santiago Yturria <syturria.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 20:34:30 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:48:58 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Santiago Yturria <syturria.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 16:44:06 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 00:27:21 -0600
>>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>>>><snip>

>>>>Now, does anyone have the image from Iquique?

>>>>The UFO photo by Mr. Bruna:

>>>><http://tinyurl.com/48b8u>

<snip>

>This is an interesting photo to analyze and we have to take into
>account some considerations. Just in case you couldn't read the
>report, because its in Spanish, the photo was taken by a former
>government official on assignment in Iquique. So its fair to
>discard the possibility of a hoax.

>The original sized photo is shown in the slideshow window along
>with three zoomed images. If you notice in the original, the
>whole landscape is visible and at the top of the mountain the
>object appears in front of a cloud. The bird theory could have
>been a possibility but if you see and measure the distance from
>the camera to the object what kind of bird would it have been to
>be that size? Despite other characteristics, it doesn't check
>to me.

<snip>

Hi Santiago,

I appreciate your comments, but have a question and a comment.

What is the methodology used to determine the object's distance
from the camera?

A 2-dimensional image is very revealing, and yet often
misleading.

The "motion blur" evident in the image is telling. It either
indicates a very large object far from the camera moving at

tremendous speed, or a smaller object closer to the camera moving at a lower speed.

I propose the latter until convinced of the former.

I propose so because I _don't_ know of such a bird, and am not accepting of a thesis such as you suggest until shown the method whereby such a thesis was derived.

I did see the other views, since I now understand the operation of the site mentioned (even though my Spanish is very limited).

I look forward to reading the methodology, and stand ready to be convinced.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:12:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:24:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:29:12 -0400
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 17:29:39 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 11:52:41 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>But Nick, I still don't see this as a lens flare.

Hi Don,

Since the photo has been reproduced with witnesses at the same place and time-of day with the original camera and photographer, and as the photographer himself has admitted so, what do you think it is in the image?

What alternative do you propose?

I originally thought it was a reflection from behind as well. But if those that reproduced the effect were not behind a window, it obviously was produced "in camera".

While it might be accurate to say this wasn't a "lens flare", the term is simply being used to describe the mechanism, not the actual effect.

My guess would be that a filter is on the camera lens, which acts as a window would.

Unfortunately, the re-creation report doesn't mention any possible camera add-ons, but does say the camera is equipped the same as when the presented image was acquired.

Not a classis lens flare, but definitely a camera-induced effect.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 18](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:18:56 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:28:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Simon Hicks <slh.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:37:53 +0800
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:59:10 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

<snip>

>>If a whistleblower is revealing top secret government
>>information they were sworn not to reveal, why were the
>>Disclosure Conference members not herded up in one fell swoop
>>and jailed for doing so?

>You pose a reasonable question. However, I ask you, from the
>point of view of maintaining secrecy, which is more effective?

>Either, jumping on them for breaking their secrecy oaths - and
>thereby admitting to the cover-up of whatever the secrecy oath
>referred to.....

>Or:

>Ignoring them as tho there was never anything to be covered up
>in the first place?

Hi Simon,

Your comments require that the Disclosure whistleblowers would
be allowed to publicize and report their findings prior to being
silenced.

My thesis is that if the whistleblowers revealed themselves,
even to a select few, and the govt. wanted them silenced, we'd
have never heard of them at all.

If the govt. has a vested interest in keeping this stuff secret,
they'd have long since infiltrated the groups and keep tabs.

As soon as such a conference was even considered, those needing
silencing would just disappear.

The organizers of the conference could of course scream that
people were being silenced...but that's what they're already
saying, so there's no change to the status quo.

The fact that such a conference was held at all seems to support
the notion that the govt. didn't much care. I find this
supportive of the thesis that there was nothing revealed that
the govt. didn't want revealed, if you accept that they are
powerful enough to prevent such things.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 18:31:28 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:01:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Bourdais

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>>Maybe a thousand years from now our spacecraft will be a million
>>>times safer than they are now, and passenger space travel will
>>>be as common as jet travel today. But even then there will be
>>>the occasional crash. Pilots will still make mistakes, highly
>>>advanced technology will still sometimes fail, and the
>>>unexpected will still happen. Nothing is ever perfect.

>>I was buying your arguments up until this point.

>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

>First, since none of us has access to alien physics books,
>alien engineering schematics, or alien FAA safety records, we
>are, of course, only speculating one way or another.

David, James, Larry and All,

First, thank you again, David, for you clear summary on Roswell
and Mogul, in answer to Larry Hatch. Yes, there was no Mogul 4
balloon train.

Another argument to discard Mogul, again, is the peculiar
testimony of Col. Cavitt in the Roswell Report. All the USAF
asked him was to "remember" even vaguely, that, yes, he had
found a Mogul balloon train with Marcel. But, no, he had only
found a weather balloon! There was an obvious message there:

"I am not going along with your bigger lie. I stick to the old
one".

Excuse me if repeat myself - I wrote it before. Larry, you make
me feel that all the previous messages I sent to this List were
for naught.

Now, the discussion is interesting, on the "accident hypothesis"
and other possible explanations. I feel that the accident

remains at the top the list, but that the "conflict hypothesis" is not to be ruled out, especially in consideration of the ancient historical dimensions of ufolog - celestial wars, with legends of celestial wars, etc. Just for comparison, the colonial powers were often at war for control of colonies.

About the accident hypothesis - there are some sources describing very light craft, electrically powered, charged like a capacitor (presumably aboard the mother ship). Maybe such craft are vulnerable to a lightning bolt, for instance. I also read somewhere that there was a powerful experimental radar in the area of Corona at the time but I am afraid it's a dubious rumor. Any idea about that?

Gildas

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:35:42 -0700
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:03:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Connors

>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:42:55 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrgroup.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

Rich,

You are not an enemy. You never were. You didn't come to learn and participate. You came strictly to lob chaos on an already challenging phenomenon and became a pest. It's that simple.

Post to your heart's content. This isn't my List. You're good for a chuckle once in awhile, if time permits.

Wendy Connors
www.fadeddiscs.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:38:06 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:06:30 -0500
Subject: Re: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of

>From: NASANews.nul
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 10:00:20 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of Life On Mars

>Dolores Beasley/Gretchen Cook-Anderson
>Headquarters, Wahington
>Phone: 202/358-1753/0836

>February 18, 2005

>RELEASE: 05-052

>NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of Life On Mars

>News reports on February 16, 2005, that NASA scientists from
>Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif., have found strong
>evidence that life may exist on Mars are incorrect.

>NASA does not have any observational data from any current Mars
>missions that supports this claim. The work by the scientists
>mentioned in the reports cannot be used to directly infer
>anything about life on Mars, but may help formulate the strategy
>for how to search for martian life. Their research concerns
>extreme environments on Earth as analogs of possible
>environments on Mars. No research paper has been submitted by
>them to any scientific journal asserting martian life.

>For information about NASA and agency programs on the Web, visit:

><http://www.nasa.gov>

>For more information about NASA's Mars programs on the Web, visit:

><http://mars.jpl.nasa.gov/>

List,

Man oh man, does this reek or what?

First Formisano, and now this. Is the fix in, or are these folks
all wrong now?

I guess if it doesn't come from O'Keefe's letterhead itself, it
ain't true after all.

Boy, the web is getting tangled. But are we being deceived...?

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO -

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:49:38 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:09:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO -

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 06:42:45 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

<snip>

>Yet he was a preeminent social scientist, and his MD makes him
>something of a conventional scientist. Moreover, he held a chair
>at the center of the bastion that is the man. One would think
>he'd hold something of a keynote instead of complete dismissal.
>His complete, virtually death-bed, exclusion is, at best,
>ill-advised. At worst?

I didn't mean to start any talk of conspiracy when I announced
the news about John's last interview being omitted from the
program.

Peter Jennings Production seems to be independent from ABC.
Being independent from ABC means that Jennings programs are
unlikely to be influenced by the stock holders meetings at which
CSICOP members use their stock ownership to exert their
political pressure on the content of programs. Jennings make
about four documentaries a year, and ABC buys them, and that is
pretty much the extent of their relationship. It's a nice perk
for Jennings.

So I'd like to believe that whatever conclusions Peter Jennings
Productions/Springs Media Inc came to, they came to on their
own.

As I've said elsewhere, I understand that making a film is a
process rather like sculpture, finding out what is inside this
block of stone they chip away at. Pieces get cut.

However my concern is that if the documentary touches on the
alien encounter subject (rather than being purely about flying
saucers), omitting Mack may mean that this subject of alien
encounters or alien contact is not presented fairly. I am
unconvinced that it could be presented fairly if he is not in
it, but I am willing to be pleasantly surprised.

Consider what it means there is no pleasant surprise. Several
experiencers took part in the program with the understanding
that their comments would be presented within the context of a
fair and balanced examination of the subject - a context which
was implied by the presence of Dr. Mack, and a context which may
now be lacking. Is that fair?

It may well be that you'll have a Ph.D. skeptic or two voicing
the hard radical line against the experiencers, and then you'll
have some experiencers who appeared with the expectation they'd
be presented fairly - but then there will be no similar "Ph.D."
or "M.D." lending their more sympathetic perspective. Yet
Jennings had that opportunity with John Mack; Mack spoke out
about the McNally study, for example, for the first time on
camera. They had an exclusive of John Mack making statements
about where McNally went wrong. So if their program is not
balanced, it isn't for lack of having the materials they needed

to make it so.

Perhaps Mack's perspective wasn't needed because the show may be entirely about flying saucers and never touches on alien encounters. All we know so far about whether alien encounters are part of the program is based on a few promos and an interview in the Seattle Post Intelligencer, where Jennings said "I grant you that there may be a lot of people out there in the country who think they've had these experiences, and some of them may even be unhinged," he said, "but I think even those people deserve a serious hearing from a serious reporter."

That seems to imply that the subject of alien encounters is indeed in the finished piece. So I stand by my note of perplexity (the state of being perplexed) in wondering how they could present the subject of alien encounters without taking advantage of their interview with John Mack.

Maybe if this program comes out on DVD (as Jennings' Jesus special did) they might include some of their cut scenes as bonus features. That would be nice.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:53:36 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:12:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:41:42 -0600
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:59:04 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:25:02 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

><snip>

>>>People like Jerry Clark and and Dick Hall indicate they are in
>>>the fence-sitting category on Roswell. They are not proponents,
>>>but they are not debunkers either. I remember Dick Hall once
>>>making the comment that there seems to be a lot of smoke with
>>>Roswell which may indicate a conflagration behind it, but he is
>>>not absolutely convinced.

>>I think you have fairly and accurately summed up both my
>>position and the general state of affairs. I would only add as
>>far as my personal view is concerned that the Mogul balloon
>>interpretation makes no sense to me, and the testimony of people
>>who were there (and their offspring) which I have heard
>>first-hand strongly suggests that something extraordinary occurred.

>>I am in the truest sense of the word an agnostic, who suspects
>>that unless someone can come up with a convincing explanation in
>>terms of secret U.S. technology (which has not happened to
>>date), then by reductio ad absurdum it was (hypothetically) an
>>alien spacecraft that crashed. However, unlike most people who
>>think in either-or terms and revile those who disagree with
>>their polar view, I fully understand the need for patience, and
>>more data-gathering, and reserving of judgment until we have
>>more complete information.

>If Dick Hall and I keep agreeing, one of us may prove
>unnecessary. But I'll risk that fate and state that in the
>paragraph above Dick has summed up my position exactly.

Gentlemen,

While my credentials are anything but equal to your own, might I
offer that you both have outlined my feelings on this matter, as
well.

That reasonable men might reasonably disagree is a given. That
they might occasionally agree is, while not a given, at least a
thing of intellectual beauty.

I feel that my entire entry into this List is now somewhat vindicated,
and that I am at least in very good company vis a vis my views.

Thanks to you both.

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:57:43 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:15:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:47:18 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>Thanks to the web site below which was brought to our attention
>by Kyle King in a recent post to UFO UpDates, I think we can now
>safely conclude that this very interesting structured UFO in the
>picture(s) was simply an honest misrepresentation of an IFO. To
>continue to promote this UFO in public as a TRUFO would not only
>be dishonest but it would do damage to the credibility of all of
>us who study UFOs (or more accurately, UFO reports).

><http://www.ufoinfo.com/sightings/chile/041000.shtml>

Nick,

Rather than lens flare the more apt description is a reflection
off the camera's own lens retainer or the edge of the lenses
themselves. The light source was probably something above the
photographer's position.

The explanatory note with the URL above is skimpy in detail as
to just how the reflection occurred. But if they were able to
re-create the shot using the original camera, there's not much
doubt. If this had been a lens flare there would likely have
been more than one image in the shot. The problem with camera
lenses is that they have two sides and thickness.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Women In Ufology - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:18:20 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:27:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Women In Ufology - King

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 03:11:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:30:52 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:10:12 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Women In Ufology

<snip>

>This same - or similar - dis-interest exists in another area.
>Young people or even middle aged people aren't coming out in the
>numbers they used to in order to learn to fly. To learn to fly a
>light aircraft isn't exciting enough [poking along at 120 mph]
>for most youngsters who think they get greater thrills from
>playing some simulator type video game. Everything is warp drive
>and Mach numbers these days, when in actuality it is more to do
>with freedom when you fly.

>And it's expensive too.

Hi Don,

Man, you hit a nerve there!!

I've wanted to become a pilot ever since meeting an uncle who is an air traffic controller. I even took the ATC test during high school and was accepted to ATC school in Oklahoma. By the time I got the letter however, I was already employed in the then-infantile IT industry, and stayed with the paying job. No regrets, but a little melancholy from time to time as a result.

I have wanted to become a pilot ever since. Time, circumstance, and familial commitments have conspired to prevent this, but mostly due to the expense. I have the luxury of time these days, but not the financial wherewithal. And it's a real shame that the expense likely prevents many from doing so.

Like the first time an astronaut sees the curvature of the earth, and its relative insignificance among the vastness of space, likewise it would be transcendent for everyone to be able to feel the liberating sensation of flight under ones own control. To see people and places from far above lends the same "we're all just ants on a big ball" analogy, and the resulting insight could help with many things derived from ego- or ethno-centric attitudes. Even if not, the experience is well worth the effort. But the cost is damnably prohibitive.

That this experience is not possible for most, chiefly due to cost, is almost a crime. No, it is a crime. It should be as normal as getting a drivers license...a rite of passage as it were.

How might our world be different if flight was mundane, cheap and accessible? Might this difference be feared, and prevented, by keeping flight the province of monied types alone, or the very lucky few?

Probably just my lament and nothing more. But damnably frustrating.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:23:39 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:30:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>The only possibilities

>The "only" possibilities? Come on.

I meant "the only possibilities that I can think of given the amount of time and effort I have to devote to this topic at this time". I am sorry I did not adequately qualify this.

>Those are those hidden assumptions I was talking about. Nobody >knows for sure how these things are bolted together, so sweeping >statements like yours are just more speculation.

Its all speculation until we get some hard proof of a "crashed" UFO (that hasn't completely been removed by the military of every government in the world apparently).

>How about a missile with a nuke blown high in the atmosphere >near one of these things? Think that might be capable of >bringing one of these things down? I do.

I don't. Do you think that an alien ship does not have sensors of such advanced nature that they not only can see every wavelength but also are based on weird stuff like those Princeton "EGGS" we are hearing about recently? How about their fast speed? We hear so much how they move instantaneously, well why not as soon as the bomb going off, the craft zips away wagging its tongue? Or how about gravity manipulation beams, heat beams, EMP beams to screw up the A-bomb? Or force shields?

>Let's not automatically >assume magical sci-fi movie properties to these things that make >them absolutely invulnerable to anything that could conceivably >happen or anything we might throw at them.

Well, I will just say that the odds favor magical sci-fi properties, in MOST scenarios. Your scenarios are the few in opposition.

>In the right circumstances, a thrown rock by a Neanderthal can >kill you just as sure as a advanced tech phaser blast by a >Trifalgorean.

Yes, but if a Neanderthal throws a rock at a Trifalgorean, my money is on the Trifalgorean since he likely has fancy armor/shield/whatever to defend against any attacks. (By the way, such armor is cheap/standard issue to all foot soldiers, farm hands).

>Bullets and explosives might be crude, weapons by , but they
>sure can be effective for destroying things. A fighter jet
>intercepting one of these craft might just get lucky and hit
>one.

Catching up with it problem one, hitting is problem two,
and damaging is problem 3. Good luck to our intrepid
pilot!

>An example of such a "crashed saucer" story was told by Canadian
>radio engineer Wilbert Smith, who said in an interview that some
>high-level, supersecret U.S. government organization had passed
>on to him a piece of metal he was told was shot off a small
>flying saucer as it overflowed Washington, D.C. back in 1952.

Yeah, right. Show me the tests from two reputable independent
testing labs that show the materials are "not of this world" and
I will eat crow. I am talking about isotope ratios or even
nanomanufactured surfaces, but if there is some impossible
element in there, that would be nice.

>>2) they wanted to crash because they are
>>suicidal or maybe wanted to help our race by giving it their
>>technology,

>With expendable, manufactured, cloned crews it's certainly a
>possibility. Whitley Strieber used that premise in his
>fictionalized account about Roswell called "Majestic," that he
>claimed in his preface was based on information provided by a
>government insider.

I am not keen on the expendable crew concept but it is possible.

>The deliberately crashed technology could be their lower end
>stuff. It might still take us 100 or 200 years to back-engineer
>it (like the time-traveling 747). Even when we finally
>replicated it, it would pose no great danger to them. The
>Indians could have our rifles in exchange for favors, but damned
>if they were going to get our Gatling guns or cannons. And the
>Indians sure weren't going to learn to make their own rifles and
>bullets any time soon, so their supply was going to be limited.

The problem with this is "Why?". What is the point when they
could easily just blast us to hash (if they don't like our
looks) or open up alien versions of Mc Donald's (if they want to
integrate us into the "family of planets")?

>>3) some weird unpredictable highly improbable
>>spacetime muck up happened and blasted them either from the past
>>or future to 1947 or across space.

>OK, that's certainly not one possibility I would have dreamed up
>since I consider it enormously improbable to the point of
>ridiculous. Of course this is all speculation anyway, but I like
>to stick to at least slightly plausible speculation.

Sorry, but the very idea of fallible highly advanced aliens is
such wishful thinking that I consider it enormously
improbable.

>>Only the first one seems likely if you want to believe in UFO
>>crashes in general.

>Again with the "only."

I will try to correct this embarrassing habit of using the term
"only". I really meant, "it seems to me given the little time
and effort I have devoted to the idea that only the first one
seems likely".

>Reasoning like this reminds me of many silly engineering
>assumptions I've seen being made on a variety of projects.

Are you implying that I have considered every possibility? Don't
be absurd! I just devoted a small fraction of my time to this. I
offer only my own intuitive and experiential insights. If I was
paid well to do so, I would think out every possibility and
consult those with contrary opinions to assure with widest
possible coverage of ideas.

>Remember how NASA shuttle engineers initially calculated

>catastrophic failure on a shuttle as a one in a million because
>of all the backup systems? They assumed absurdly low
>probabilities of failure on a number of systems and further
>compounded their flawed thinking by failing to realize that the
>net probability of failure was additive. Lots of systems with
>lots of things that can go wrong add up to much higher
>probabilities of failure, just like lots of very rare fatal
>diseases or "fluke accidents" adds up to lots of people dying of
>rare diseases or fluke accidents.

Yes, humans are fallible because we are not advanced enough.
However, with highly advanced aliens, they have so-called
"clone" armies of technicians/engineers and/or
superfast/superintelligent computer artificial intelligences
that go through the possibilities of failure modes and effects
and add to that thousands of years of real-life hardware testing
and continuous quality improvement.

>No shuttle engineer could imagine that a chunk of insulating
>foam hitting a wing could ever bring down a shuttle either. But
>it did, didn't it? Just because something is "unimaginable" or
>extremely unlikely doesn't mean that it can't happen.

>Closer to home, engineers sold the San Francisco Bay Area public
>on the BART system as a futuristic subway system where a new
>train would arrive every two minutes because the trains would
>never break down and the central computer would know exactly
>where the trains were at every instant and would be able to keep
>them close, but safely spaced.

Yes, Humans, we poor primitive humans, are fallible. If only
we had an advanced civilization. But be assured that there are
aliens that had/have a society without limitations of economy,
energy.

>>No way does our technology have a chance to bring one of them
>>down.

>Not even a nuke or even a lucky shot at close range?

My money would not be on us.

>Remember, there are lots of ways that even unlikely things can
>happen, which makes the net probability of an unlikely event
>getting you much higher than simple statistical arguments might
>make you think. People die from "fluke accidents" all the time.

The difference between primitive peoples like us, who can't even
control (or predict) the weather and alien races with >1000 year
or more likely >10000 year head start on us is mind boggling.
They of course can predict such things.

>>The dumb alien scenario doesn't work because they would have
>>been eliminated by now by our friend Darwin from the universe by
>>blundering way before they got to us.

>Are you sure about that?

Yes. If a dumb alien blundered into space travel and
landed/crashed on a planet of the apes, then they are likely
dead. Eventually, if enough dumb aliens kept crashing on planets
they would crash on one with smart enough folk who would take
and backengineer the vehicles and possibly wipe out the dumb
aliens. Given the possibility that aggressive/hostile
civilizations tend to wipe themselves out prior to space travel,
the dumb aliens giving such races a way to circumvent this kind
of selflimiting end would be suicidal for the poor dumb alien
race.

>How does one make a "perfect" biological being?
>What exactly is "perfect" anyway? Sure, maybe
>one can devise a being that is much more intelligent than us,
>free from disease and self-destructive tendencies, etc. But can
>one make a being that can anticipate every possible eventuality?

Sure, if you are advanced enough. Stick in enough neurons or
upgrade to nanotech connections or quantum connections.

>How can one know a priori that what we encounter is somehow the
>ultimate in alien evolution?

I don't care whether the actual alien in the craft is perfect or an idiot. The alien craft is what I am talking about. I assume it has underlying technology which would not be something aliens wish us to have, otherwise they would be landing all the time and opening used alien spacecraft lots.

>Isn't it at least conceivable we
>are seeing the expendable, cloned aliens who might be considered
>lower forms of life by their masters? Meanwhile the elite,
>"perfect" aliens are back on the mothership or on Trifamalogor,
>letting the serfs handle the more dangerous and dirty work, just
>like generals and politicians hide behind the lines, while
>ordering some poor farm boys to charge into battle.

I agree it is possible. But my problem is there is no battle.

Anything being done by these farm hands seems to be do-able by robots or simply on-board computers.

If these craft really were totally expendable with their crews, I would argue then that the ground should be covered by them raining down upon us over the 100000 years of likely visitations. Sort of like the grass around a suburban intersection with its mounds of McDonald's wrappers cigarette butts and cups.

>Perfect aliens and perfect technology that can handle any
>possible situation? Other scenarios being literally
>inconceivable? Sorry, I don't buy it.

We each have our opinion.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:08:53 -1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:38:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 02:51:36 -0800
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has become
>>clear to me that there is a fundamental divide between those UFO
>>researchers insisting on clear objective evidence to sustain UFO
>>research, and those advocating more flexible social scientific
>>methods for UFO research. As an advocate of the latter approach,
>>I believe it important to justify why this should be done in a
>>systematic way. The basis of my argument is that there is a
>>distorting factor in the investigative process of the UFO
>>phenomenon. This distorting factor is primarily political and is
>>related to national security, cultural and religious concerns
>>over the ramifications of UFO research and the extraterrestrial
>>hypothesis. This distorting factor needs to be systematically
>>factored in to UFO research in order to properly deal with the
>>growing volume of whistleblowers and others coming forward with
>>first hand testimony of classified UFO research and sightings,
>>and of working with alleged extraterrestrial related
>>technologies and beings.

><snip>

>Dr. Salla,

>I imagine you were hoping to hear from me again <g>.

>Paul Kimball, Kyle King, and Martin Shough said the essentials
>of my position. I fully stand behind my original statement. In
>your response to the above named gentlemen you had the gall to
>try to defend your indefensible position on Dulce Canyon by
>supporting it with the names of Dan Burisch, Bob Lazar, etc.
>- known frauds.

>Despite all your social sciences rhetoric, why you do not vett
>your whistleblowers and discard the ones telling tales with no
>supporting evidence in making your case? It shows me that you are
>trying to make a sand castle with no foundation. For example,
>you introduced to us the tale of Charles Hall, a man who claims
>to have worked with aliens.

>He even stated that something like 41 previous weatherman at his
>location quit because they could not handle working with the
>"tall white aliens". When you first heard of Charles Hall did
>you determine whether he had actually worked in that position or
>not? Did you look at records, etc. Did you get the names of the
>previous weathermen?

>Did you try to do anything to tell whether there was truth in
>his tale or not? Or did you just post his tale on your website

>and promote his book as if it were the gospel truth? Or did the
>government destroy all his records and the other people who had
>worked in his location as they did to Bob Lazar's school and
>employment records? <g>

Aloha Josh, I've replied to the posts by Paul Kimball and Bruce Maccabee and made my case so there's no point repeating myself. I think I've made myself clear and one can't do more than that.

You don't agree with me, that's fine. Others do however, so that gives me the confidence that this line of research has a future despite the efforts of those such as yourself to malign those promoting exopolitics research.

I've articulated my research methodology, defended it, heard criticisms and in the end have concluded that the criticisms are not persuasive and that I should persist with my methodology.

That's about as much as you can do for any new line of scholarly research so I'm now ready to move to the next level of the debate concerning whistleblower testimonies concerning UFO's/ETs.

I do want to reply to the points you made about Charles Hall since I believe it is an important case so thanks for the opportunity to present my views on why Hall's testimony is important.

I was contacted by Paola Harris who did the initial research on Charles Hall and said I should read his works and then speak to him.

Paola has been investigating his case for over 18 months now and found him to be credible.

I've met and talked with Paola and think she is a fine researcher. Her book, *Connecting the Dots*, outlines some of the interviews she's done with a range of people. I think she has good intuition and has identified some important whistleblowers and contactees in her interviews. I know some of the veteran researchers might dispute this but nevertheless, I think she is a good investigator and she did the field work on Charles Hall.

I henceforth took her advise, read his books, had a phone interview with him, did some correspondence and believe he is credible. I think his case is an important development that gives many important insights into what has been secretly happening in terms of secret government - ET agreements. I recommend those members who haven't already done so to take a look at some of the Hall material at:

<http://www.exopolitics.org/charles-hall.htm>

>Do you have any sense or did it all get swallowed up in the soft
>evidence swamp of fuzzy illogic? To me you sound like the
>village idiot who would stand on the corner repeating every tall
>tale that blew his way. Don't you know to have a grey box in
>which to park those persons and claims for which there is not
>enough supporting evidence? Instead you just promote anyone's
>tale as the truth. I don't buy your belief that anything anyone
>says supports your exopolitics social science _theory_. To me
>that theory is nothing but a house of cards built on a swamp.

>What you are doing most likely saves the government a lot of
>time and effort they otherwise would have to invest in
>disinformation programs to have UFO research look utterly
>foolish.

>>What I will now advocate is the following Uncertainty Principle
>>for UFO Research"

>>"The more precisely the TRUTH is determined, the less precisely
>>the EVIDENCE is known"

>The above sounds like something George Orwell would have
>written. I showed it to a few detectives and they cracked up as
>it is exactly opposite the rules of evidence in the legal world.

Wow, that's an amazing research methodology! The 'Detective Laugh Index' for determining the merit of new principles for UFO research. You crack me up Josh. You don't moonlight as comedian

do you?

Well, I better sign off before I develop my own unique research method using the 'Dolphin Laugh Index' when I next do a dolphin swim out here on the Big Island, Hawaii.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:32:28 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:40:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>Even the Magonians, many of whom I think of as pelicanists, have
>taken the term as it was intended, knowing that my intention was
>to put a bit of humor into the longstanding, never-ending debate
>between proponents and debunkers. One Magonia columnist uses the
>pseudonym "The Pelican." I approve, and I chuckle every time I
>see it. If the pseudonymous columnist and I agree on nothing
>else (besides, that is, our taste in music), we do share the
>same sense of humor.

Jerry, if you think The Pelican shares your taste in music I can
advise you that, as I have long suspected, your identification
of the amiable avian is sadly amiss.

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hamilton

From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:39:19 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:36:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hamilton

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

>>I disagree with this. As our own aviation development advances
>>toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced
>>airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems
>>have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have
>>experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their
>>electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes
>>occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our
>>space shuttles did not fare well either.

>>Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien
>>environment where an unanticipated source of interference could
>>not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may
>>have happened.

><snip>

>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

We are all entitled to our disagreements, but why make an
assumption when so many courses of action are possible? Suppose
the advanced alien craft crashed and aliens responded by landing
at the site to clean up the crash just as the army jeeps were
arriving or an army plane was flying in the vicinity. Photos of
them doing so would serve a purpose if we could not scare them
off with our mighty weapons of mass destruction (sorry I had to
get that in).

Any rate, what the aliens did or did not do, whether feasible is
just speculation in the absence of examined evidence. Since the

Roswell craft, if an ET spaceship of any kind, made such an historical impact on our civilization, and supposing that the retrieved parts were kept in a secure facility, they may one day be on display in a museum (my hopeful thinking).

Bill

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:39:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:51:06 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:14:22 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>Anyone watching me "carry on" in a bar is in for a dull evening.

>That's not for you to decide. Those watching you closely may
>detect all sorts of psychosocial clues to your behavior, needs,
>and innermost secrets, which then can be employed to prove
>whatever point the observer wants to prove. On the other hand,
>since I feel no such inclination or ambition, all I can tell you
>is that the one evening I spent in your company, I actually
>enjoyed myself. I recall that you, I, and our little dinner
>group (comprising Loren Coleman, Peter Rogerson, Peter
>Brookesmith, Bill Ellis, and Bob Rickard, if memory serves; I
>may be missing somebody - Steve Moore?) spent a whole lot of
>time laughing and engaging in light-hearted banter, fueled by
>that great English beer.

It was actually Chinese beer, (Tsingtao, I think), but still
pretty good.

>To be honest, I didn't find you dull at all.

Well then you just didn't.

>But then maybe that's just me. I tend to like people, even
>people I disagree with.

>Anyway, in your weirdly defensive response to what was simply an
>observation, not a criticism, you've managed to confirm what I
>said to start with: there seem to be no active female
>pelicanists.

Time for another Jerry Clark conjugation:

- I make light-hearted banter.
- You make weirdly defensive responses.

And it's not for me to say whether any of the women involved
with sceptics groups in Britain are or are not Pelicanists.
Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only they
know what the silly term means.

--
John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/00/newmag.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:41:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:43:27 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement No. 54

<snip>

>>I think of pelicanists not as casual dismissers (as, for
>>example, most skeptical scientists and journalists are) but as
>>persons who know the subject and are active within the UFO
>>community. The original pelicanist was James Easton, who
>>proposed, then fiercely defended, the scientifically
>>unsustainable idea that Kenneth Arnold observed not aircraft of
>>some sort but pelicans. Pelicanist interpretations tend to be
>>extraordinary claims masquerading as prosaic explanations.

<snip>

>>From that point of view, we have to consider that the Klass
>>proposal in 1997 that Arnold saw meteors was also a
>>'pelicanism'.

I am convinced that Arnold saw daytime meteor fireballs,
does that make me a "pelicanist" too? There is nothing
"scientifically unsustainable" about that.

Arnold could not make up his mind about whether he saw tiny
objects flashing light in front of the mountain(s) or behind
them, and in his first published interview with the morning
Chicago Tribune (which beat the afternoon East Oregonian) he
said specifically the objects "went behind Mt. Rainier."

Since the objects were not seen continuously but only on
scattered occasions about once every 9 seconds or so, they could
"miss" the entire mountain in between, in one of those 9-second
gaps of not being visible, and Arnold would not know it.

However, you would have to actually read Arnold's descriptions
of the exact appearance and stop fixating on the popular
misconception of Arnold seeing "flying saucers" when he
describes "thin black lines" and "intense blinding flashes."

Arnold measured the angular size of the objects at closest
approach, which converts to 2.8 arcminutes, barely above minimum
angular resolution for the human eye of about 1 arcminute, but
under these conditions of objects moving at high velocity (about
2 degrees per second) the resolution in the lateral direction of
motion would seriously degrade, making it physically impossible
for Arnold to have seen details of any alleged convex-tailed

bat-shape or half-moon shape.

I believe optical experiments that model the actual conditions of the objects' high speed motion instead of static visualizations where you get to stare at the object on a card (or whatever) for as long as you want, minutes and minutes if need be, until you "see something," would bear out this impossibility-to-see shapes.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 21:23:50 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:43:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 12:38:21 EST
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>Applying the Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>>In discussion over the last week on UFO updates it has
>>become clear to me that there is a fundamental divide
>>between those UFO researchers insisting on clear
>>objective evidence to sustain UFOresearch, and
>>those advocating more flexible social scientific
>>methods for UFO research.

<snip>

Hi Michael, Paul et al,

If I were to appear on behalf of a client in Court and submit that the Judge should apply the proposed "Uncertainty Principle" to the evidence, I would be fairly confident that:

(a) the Judge would not be impressed;

(b) I would be opening myself up to a potential negligence claim by my client for failing to exercise reasonable skill and care.

At least in the English Courts, a judge would be rather bemused by any suggestion that he is not to determine the case on anything other than "objective evidence".

>The more I hear about the need for various scientific method
>approaches in ufology, the more I come to realise that science
>has less to do with it than the law <snip>

Paul's observation is one that has been by various researchers (skeptics and ETH-proponents) in the past. Paul and some others might be interested if I draw a few of the relevant comments together and if I (as a barrister) then go on to make a few comments:

(a) Peter Brookesmith has suggested that "Judging where the truth lies in UFO cases is more like considering evidence in a courtroom than it is like scientific investigation" (see his "UFO: The Complete Sightings Catalogue" (1995) at page 171 (in Appendix 9) of the BCA hardback edition (with the same page numbering in the Blitz hardback edition, and in the Barnes & Noble edition published under the title "UFO: The Complete Sightings").

(b) John Keel : "Witnesses should be judged only by experts trained in such matters: psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists, and experienced journalists. An experienced lawyer can be a much better UFO investigator than an astrophysicist for

example, whose training does not include dealing with - and judging - people. If nothing else, the past thirty years have taught us that technology is virtually useless in UFO investigations" (in "Phenomenon" (1988) (edited by John Spencer and Hilary Evans) at page 197 of the MacDonald hardback edition (Part 3, in the unnumbered chapter entitled "The People Problem").

(c) Philip J. Klass : "An experienced trial lawyer, who is familiar with the often widely divergent testimony of eyewitnesses, a criminal investigator or investigative journalist who is intrinsically wary of accepting statements of act without deep probing and perhaps some 'discounting', is much better qualified in many respects for the role of a UFO investigator than is a physical scientist. An experimental psychologist, experienced in the inherent limitations of human perception and recall, would place far less credence in UFO reports from pilots, police officers and airport-tower operators than would a physicist or an astronomer, and with good reason. Yet relatively few persons with these types of expertise have become UFO investigators, compared with those whose backgrounds are in physical science. The few who have entered the field of UFOlogy often find themselves seriously handicapped for lack of a background in physical science in dealing with cases such as the RB-47 and Bentwaters-Lakenheath incidents." (in his "UFOs Explained" (1974) at pages 352-353 (Chapter 30) of the Random House hardback edition, at pages 418-419 of Random House paperback edition).

(d) Frank Salisbury : ". when a really ingenious person wants to perpetrate a hoax, it is not always easy for others to see how it is done. I have wondered sometimes whether scientists are the best trained individuals to investigate UFO sightings. Perhaps magicians should try their hands at providing explanations - and perhaps lawyers should do the interviewing of witnesses!" (in his "The Utah UFO Display: A Biologist's Report" (1974) at page 139 (in Chapter 4) of the Devin Adair hardback edition)

More fundamental and far-reaching analyses of the distinction (in the context of ufology) between the legal framework and the scientific framework have been published by several individuals. I have found the following two to be particularly interesting:

(a) Don Donderi's essay entitled "Science, Law and War: Alternative Frameworks for the UFO Evidence" (which appears as Chapter 3 at pages 56-81 in "UFOs and Abductions: Challenging the Borders of Knowledge" (2000) (edited by David Jacobs)). This is the most detailed discussion I have read of the applicability of legal standards of evidence and methodology to ufological issues. Donderi's essay begins with the following comments which indicate the objective and conclusion of his essay : "Science is not the only profession that collects and analyzes evidence. To put the almost complete rejection of the UFO evidence by scientists into perspective, I contrast the goals and methods of the scientific community with those of two other professional communities: the legal profession and the profession of military intelligence analysis. Lawyers and military analysts use evidence differently and have different rules for understanding it. Comparing law and military intelligence with science highlights the weaknesses of the scientific method and suggests that lawyers and military intelligence analysts are trained to do a better job when scientists when it comes to evaluating the UFO evidence".

Rather surprisingly (to me at least) the most detailed discussion I have thus far read of such issues was not written by lawyer but by a Donderi (a psychologist). Donderi's background may explain why I found the essay very interesting but disagreed with many of the points made in it, particularly when Donderi made more specific comments (in relation to jurisprudence, trial tactics etc), and may explain why he does not address various further legal skills that could be useful in relation to ufology.

(b) Jodi Dean discusses the distinction between the law/science framework in her "Aliens in America" (1998) at pages 42-46, 52, 53-54, 58, 59, 60 (in Chapter 1) of the Cornell University softcover edition.

Apart from areas within which lawyers might be expected to have directly applicable skills (e.g. in relation to Freedom of Information Act issues, interviewing of witnesses etc), the basic skills and concepts used and developed by lawyers may have a wider role. Given the nature of the debate within Ufology, it is surprising that lawyers appear not to have a more active role in the discussions.

In particular, it appears to me to be desirable to consider whether any of the tools used by lawyers (e.g. fact and issue management devices) and concepts used by lawyers (e.g. relating to standards of proof, burdens of proof, weight of evidence, relevance, materiality, proportionality etc) could be useful be deployed.

Of course, lawyers do not have a monopoly on the use of most of these tools and concepts. However, many of the comments made in the present ufological literature betray a lack of understanding of some of the fundamental understanding of relevant concepts. For example, many of the comments in ufological literature in relation to the legal standards of evidence are limited to rather superficial suggestions that "extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence", or "the eyewitness evidence that exists would be ample to convict a man of murder". In fact, the jurisprudential issues underlying such comments have been discussed by some of the finest legal minds for centuries and are the subject of hundreds of pages of analysis in numerous judgments. (For example, in England, see the House of Lords cases of *Re H* [1996] AC 563 and *Secretary of State for the Home Department v Rehman* [2003] 1 AC 153).

Some of the more detailed (relatively speaking) comments that I've noted in ufological literature on such issues are listed below (in alphabetical order). (I hope that some of you will be able to tell me that I've missed a number of significant discussions of issues relating to standards and burdens of proof.)

(a) Erich Von Daniken in his "According to the evidence" (1977) at pages 2-3 (in Chapter 1) of the Souvenir Press hardback edition.

(b) The discussion by Hilary Evans of burdens and standards of proof in "Phenomenon" (1988) (edited by John Spencer and Hilary Evans) at pages 379, 386 of the MacDonald hardback edition (Part 6, in the unnumbered chapter entitled "The Case for Scepticism").

(c) Stanton Friedman's brief reference to various standards of proof in an interview in "UFOs And The Alien Presence: Six Viewpoints" (1991) (Edited by Michael Lindemann) at page 16 (in Chapter 1) of the 2002 Group softcover edition.

(d) James Oberg's discussion of burden and standard of proof at pages 3-4 of in his "UFOs & Outer Space Mysteries" (1982) in the Donning paperback edition.

(e) Marcello Truzzi's article "Anomalistics - On Some Unfair Practices towards Claims of the Paranormal" (available online at <http://www.skepticalinvestigations.org/anomalistics/practices.htm>). See, in particular, the section in that article entitled "A Catch-22 in the Burden of Proof?".

Personally, I consider the major contribution that lawyers could make to ufology in its present state is at a far more pragmatic level. To reduce the amount of reinvention of the wheel within ufology it appears to me to be worth giving further consideration to the fact and issue management tools used by lawyers (particularly in factually complex cases).

For example, under the present civil litigation procedure in England in large commercial cases, the parties to litigation are expected to co-operate in various respects so as to make a case fit for trial in as efficient and fair a manner as possible. This involves, at the most basic level, producing various agreed (and therefore non-contentiously drafted) documents so that the trial judge will be able to understand the nature of the dispute and the issues in dispute as efficiently as possible. Even if not directed to jointly produce such documents by the judge, the parties may jointly prepare such documents in an attempt to

narrow the issues between themselves, or draft documents themselves in a non-contentious manner to assist the Court.

These non-contentious documents typically include:

(a) a chronology (giving the dates of key events, a few words to identify the event and cross references to further material relied upon by both sides in relation to that event ;

(b) a List of Issues (listing the main issues agreed and not agreed between the parties);

(c) a case memorandum (summarising the case in just a few pages);

(d) a dramatis personae (listing the names that the Judge will come across at trial, with a few words to identify them);

(e) a glossary (listing technical terms or terms of art that will arise during the trial, with an agreed definition of those terms);

(f) a reading list (of material to be read in advance of the trial).

(As I've mentioned previously, I will shortly be making a chronology available for download. The covering note with that Chronology will list some of the currently available ufological/SETI chronologies (in print and on the Internet) and explain why I nonetheless considered it desirable to draft my own Chronology).

For now I'll conclude with a few lighter hearted comments.

First, I note Warren Smith's suggestion that a disproportionate number of abductees are lawyers and speculates on the purposes of the abductors, asking: "How many policemen, judges and lawmakers are now agents?..." (Warren Smith in his "UFO Trek" (1976) at page 99 (in Chapter 6) of the Sphere paperback edition).

I'm not sure if any other researcher has noted the correlation suggest by Warren Smith. Ruppelt made a comment that "I don't understand this apparent correlation between flying saucers and lawyers" (see his letter to Dr Hynek dated 21 February 1955 - the text of which is presented by Hall, Michael David and Connors, Wendy Ann in their "Captain Edward J Ruppelt : Summer of the Saucers - 1952" (2000) at page 93 (in Chapter 3) of the Rose Press softcover edition). However, given its context, it is clear that Ruppelt's remark was in the context of various people that had been involved in Project Blue Book later going on to train as lawyers, including Bob Olsson, Kerry Rothstein, and Max Flutch.

Second, given that ufology and lawyers are both the subject of a considerable amount of humour/ridicule, it was perhaps inevitable that jokes would emerge which combine these two popular topics. The following joke is littered all over the Internet:

Q: What do honest lawyers and UFOs have in common?

A: You always hear about them, but you never see them.

Kind Regards,

Isaac Koi

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 16:28:27 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:45:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:11:27 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

>Or just the opposite, aliens much ahead of us know that we
>already have wreckage and have not been able to duplicate the
>propulsion system even for the Earth Excursion Modules. Why
>worry?

The problem with this argument is obvious if taken to extremes.
If the standard operating procedure for aliens is "disposable
spacecraft/crew", then given the odds that they have been
present for a "real" long time and that there are alot of these
aliens at any one time, there should be a hell of a lot of
debris covering the planet from said vehicles. This not being
the case, I must infer that this is not the case.

Also, how do you know that "we" have not been able to duplicate
any of their modules or at least lower level tech?

You are right that they may not worry, but why they don't worry
is up to question. Is it because they can be assured that any of
their tech cannot crash or that it self destructs (like the
aliens in "The Invaders" - In Color)?

Since we do not have overt interaction with alien craft/aliens
then we must assume they like some level of non-interaction. But
if they don't care, doesn't this imply there should be alot of
such interactions and thus we should have the proof we need of
such alien interaction/involvement on our planet?

>Let us face it, none of us can say what aliens think or
>believe... even if I have said that they would consider us a
>primitive society whose major activity is tribal warfare.

Well, it seems to me based on inference and deduction since we
know what HASN'T happened (alien takeover, enslavement,etc), we
should be able to reach some sort of conclusions and not just
shrug the whole thing off as unknowable.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:41:14 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:46:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:39:29 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>The important thing is not the possibilities. The important
>>thing is the evidence and whether those who examined the
>>physical evidence found that it pointed to something that was
>>out of this world.

>Yes, the important thing is hard evidence of crashed UFO
>hardware. Then we are getting somewhere.

Frankly James, I am truly impressed with your proclamations
about perfect infallible aliens for which you provide not a whit
of any kind of evidence, but then you demand access to hard
evidence of crashed saucers.! That takeschutzpah. One would
think you had studied a myriad of alien civilizations, their
accident rates, travel technology, etc. Witness testimony isn't
good enough for you. It is good enough to lead to the death
penalty in Texas .

I think you have been reading too much science fiction. Come on
out to the real world fallible as it may be.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparkks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 16:57:59 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:47:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:48:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:08:49 +1000
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
>>>landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
>>>recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
>>>evidence?
<snip>

>With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a
>multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy,
>the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

The "Manhattan Project" (that was never its official name) was
not set up by the President and run by a committee of top
interagency directors, generals and scientists. Yes that refutes
the "Majestic 12" model right there.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: **From: Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:18:11 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:49:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:11:27 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

>>>>I disagree with this. As our own aviation development advances
>>>>toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced
>>>>airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems
>>>>have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have
>>>>experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their
>>>>electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes
>>>>occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our
>>>>space shuttles did not fare well either.

>>>>Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien
>>>>environment where an unanticipated source of interference could
>>>>not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may
>>>>have happened.

<snip>

>>>>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>>>>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>>>>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>>>>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>>>>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

>Or just the opposite, aliens much ahead of us know that we
>already have wreckage and have not been able to duplicate the
>propulsion system even for the Earth Excursion Modules. Why
>worry?

Are you saying that to date in 2005 the Roswell ET spaceship

propulsion has not been successfully duplicated on Earth?

In other postings I've pointed out the environmental hazards and other dangers of leaving wreckage behind instead of cleaning up the messes. Are you saying highly advanced aliens would be anti-environmentalist and careless about cleanups?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies - Harrison

From: Diane Harrison <aufor.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 08:35:55 +1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:52:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies - Harrison

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 4 Dec 2004 15:39:58 EST
>Subject: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies

>Woman Wins Lawsuits Against 'The Matrix' & 'The Terminator' Movies!!!

><http://www.slccglobelink.com/main.cfm/include/detail/storyid/785067.html>

>I am so blown away at this story!

<snip>

>Shows you why the media suppresses stories. It's not in their
>best interest monetarily, socially to bring the truth to the
>people but they'll sure as heck hide behind the 1st Amendment.

Sorry Greg: a correction from the same source:

<http://www.slccglobelink.com/news/2004/11/16/News/Corrections-805777.shtml>

In reference to the recent article entitled "Mother of the
Matrix Victorious," some information has been deemed misleading.

Ms. Sophia Stewart has not yet won her case against Joel Silver,
Time Warner and the Wachowski Bros. The decision on October 4th
enabled Ms. Stewart to proceed with her case, as all attempts to
have it dismissed were unsuccessful. Ms. Stewart's case will
proceed through the Central District Court of California.

In this case someone was a little to quick off the mark.

<http://tinyurl.com/3vpmz>

--
Co Editor
The Australasian UFOlogist Magazine
Diane Harrison
<http://homepage.powerup.com.au/~ufologist/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: William Matchen <heyzeus321.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 14:46:28 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:56:48 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:17:27 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:46:23 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

I sent an e-mail the the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and asked if any flights arrived or departed from Ronald Reagan National Airport on Feb 10, 2005 at 3:15 am.

Here's the response I got:

Subject:
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:53:04 -0500
From: "Phillips, Neal" <Neal.Phillips.nul>
To: heyzeus321.nul
CC: "Hamilton, Tara" <Tara.Hamilton.nul>

Thank you for your inquiry concerning flights on February 10, 2005. According to the operations log for the 10th of February there were no arrivals, or departures, around 3:15 A.M. There were two arrivals after midnight (12:15 A.M. and 1:11 A.M.) then none until after 6:00 A.M.

Neal Phillips

Manager, Noise Abatement

Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:49:52 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:58:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 04:26:06 -1000
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:49:03 EST
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

<snip>

>Michael:

>>The government is simply not capable of altering records to
>>the degree you suggest.

<snip>

>What influenced me in reaching my conclusion about the
>government actually removing or altering records, was reading
>the testimony of whistleblowers such as Bob Lazar, Michael
>Wolfe, Dan Burisch, Phil Schneider, et al., who described what
>happened in their own cases. I think Bob Lazar's example was
>quite revealing in how this was done. Now you and others might
>say that Lazar and co were just faking it. That when credible
>researchers did the necessary background check, there wasn't
>anything to substantiate the various degrees and jobs they
>claimed to have. Thus their testimonies lack credibility, and
>they were merely claiming the existence of secret government
>manipulation to put out a good story.

Bob Lazar?

He proves my point - why can he not produce his advanced degrees from MIT? Yearbooks with his picture in it? Transcripts? He would have copies of all of those things if he had been a student. Where are they? Forget his alleged government records - what about his civilian records? Did the government boogey-men steal them all?

Stan Friedman had it right - Bunk! Absurd!

<snip>

>One thing that helps in understanding government capabilities to
>remove/alter records is finding out the motivation of people
>like Lazar, Wolfe, Burisch, Shneider making these claims about
>shadow government agencies removing their records, intimidating
>them, etc. I really don't see a motivation for them lying and
>just fabricating the whole thing for fame and money.

Fame (of a sad, pathetic sort). Money. Government disinformation agents. Hoaxers for the sake of pulling a fast one. Pick your poison - ufology has seen them all over the years.

<snip>

>There's nothing in Lazar's record that indicates he would have

>any motivation for going public about his alleged work at S4.

Lazar's record? Now you want to talk about his record?? The whole problem with Lazar is that he has no record - at least not the kind that really matters when trying to determine his credibility.

<snip>

>However, I do think it important to accept that they were telling
>the truth as best they recall it and we need to start analyzing the
>implications of what they say. Putting whistleblower testimonies
>in a 'gray box' and moving on in the perennial search for hard
>evidence is not methodologically sound.

Unbelievable! The sad part of this is that there are people out there who will swallow this line of "reasoning". I feel sorry for them.

When I go to a UFO conference and someone asks me to sign a copy of one of my films (something which stills makes me feel a bit strange), I preface the signature with "Evidence - Not Belief" in what I hope is more than a vain attempt to counterbalance the effect people like you might have on them, and convince them that there's a better way to approach the UFO problem than the one you suggest.

Paul Kimball

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Bill Moore Interviews Project Beta Author Sunday

From: **Greg Bishop** <exclmid.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 14:55:51 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:00:09 -0500
Subject: Bill Moore Interviews Project Beta Author Sunday

Bill Moore will be live on my internet show this Sunday night to interview me about the new book on the Bennewitz case. Everyone on this list will realize how interesting/ funny/ and strange this could be! There will be a chance for listeners to call in with questions.

Radio Misterioso will air live at:

www.killradio.org

from 8-10 PM PST, Sunday, February 20th.

Greg Bishop

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Disclosure Australia announcement 22

From: Diane Harrison <aufor.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 12:18:57 +1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:01:16 -0500
Subject: Disclosure Australia announcement 22

Hi Everyone,

Issue 21 of the Disclosure Australia Project Newsletter is in the process of being uploaded to the project web site at:

<http://disclosure.freewebsite.org>

This issue concentrates on material concerning the former Federal Government Department of Supply.

--

The Australian UFO Research
Network Disclosure Project

Auspiced by the
Australian UFO Research Network
PO Box 738, Beaudesert,
Queensland 4285
<http://www.hypermax.net.au/~auforn>

Secretariat: the
Australian UFO Research Association
PO Box 786, North Adelaide,
South Australia 5006
<http://disclosure.freewebsite.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

AF Debunker Balloons Even Before MOGUL

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 23:41:31 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:07:39 -0500
Subject: AF Debunker Balloons Even Before MOGUL

In the standard party-line history, the innocent AF was contacted by an outside researcher in early 1994 who suggested that Roswell was really the crash of a secret Project MOGUL balloon. (Pflock 2001, pp. 218-9) Only then did the AF look into the matter and suddenly find that a stray MOGUL balloon could tie up all the loose ends of the Roswell case, nice and neatly, and not by some desperate forced-fit effort. AF issued a huge report later in 1994 saying there really was a coverup after all but it was of a TOP SECRET" intelligence project that lost its balloon, nothing more. End of story.

Recently I went over some old notes and discovered a phone-log entry for a call I received from a tireless researcher on April 23, 1988, at 12:23-40 PM. He had written to Litton Industries to find out about early General Mills balloon launches, as Litton had bought out General Mills.

The Litton librarian, Courtland Jones, talked to an AF Col., Barney Oldfield, who suggested calling retired AF Col. William Coleman who seemed to already know all about a research balloon as the cause of Roswell. (Coleman had been the AF's spokesman on UFOs in the 70's and continued to maintain interest and involvement in the subject. Coleman also was involved in the strange AF and AFOSI, AF Office of Special Investigations, overtures to producer Robert Emenegger and others in 1972-3 about the AF purportedly releasing spectacular proof of ET reality, 800 feet of film of a UFO landing at Holloman AFB, etc.)

Coleman said there was an ONR (Office of Naval Research) Skyhook balloon that was LOST from a launch near White Sands heading East on June 28, 1947, that had an instrument package and RADAR REFLECTORS but was never recovered. This info was in records at the Library of Congress he told the researcher. This was supposed to be the true explanation for Roswell. And it was coming from AF sources operating behind the scenes.

Where might this idea have come from? Already in the apparently AFOSI-involved hoaxed MJ-12 documents released publicly in May 1987 it was alleged that after the Roswell recovery an "effective cover story" was released to news reporters of falsely claiming it was just a "misguided weather RESEARCH BALLOON." Notice that this is not an ordinary "weather balloon" but a RESEARCH balloon, like maybe a Skyhook or a MOGUL under a cover story.

Debunkers in 1987-8 already were abuzz with rumors of "secret balloons" and "secret projects." Notorious UFO debunker Andy Roberts explained away Roswell in the book Phenomenon: Forty Years of Flying Saucers, written in 1987 and published the following year. Roberts wrote that the Roswell material looked like a balloon with radar target material (foil, threads, balsa struts) then added:

"Secret balloon launches were taking place at that period and there seems no good reason to suspect anything other than a secret test object of balloon type was retrieved. The actions of the military in clearing the area meticulously and their

treatment of Brazel ... would seem in line with the testing of some type of secret device."

So six years before the AF ever heard of MOGUL in connection with Roswell the AF was already digging hard to research secret balloon launches as the explanation for Roswell. But despite trying to "float" or "launch" this debunking explanation in 1988, the AF failed to get any traction with it. It seems also that the AF was trying to do things "behind the scenes" with UFO researchers to plant these ideas and alleged facts without publicly being visible and being seen to be doing so. Evidently the AF hoped the idea would catch on somewhere so that someone else could appear to be responsible and so the AF would not be blamed for this balloon debunking of Roswell. When this did not work, and Roswell publicity continued to increase with tv shows and the Randle-Schmitt books and articles in the late 80's and early 90's, the MOGUL idea came along and presented a new ready-made opportunity to float a very similar Secret Balloon Project explanation.

Thus the MOGUL balloon and "top secret project" in 1994 were not the first AF attempts to derail or debunk Roswell.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 21:21:47 -1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:09:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Goldstein

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

>>I disagree with this. As our own aviation development advances
>>toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced
>>airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems
>>have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have
>>experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their
>>electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes
>>occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our
>>space shuttles did not fare well either.

>>Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien
>>environment where an unanticipated source of interference could
>>not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may
>>have happened.

><snip>

>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

Hello Listerions,

I have to laugh every time I see these kinds of anthropomorphic
projections. To act as if we humans have even the slightest idea
how aliens would think or behave seems silly to me. We really
have no idea what they would or would not do.

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 22:23:02 -1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:12:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Goldstein

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrrgroup.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

><snip>

>I don't know whether your fezzic nature is to blame or if you
>really are a PsychOps plant using UFO Updates. But, I really
>think your saucer is tilted and level flight beyond your
>capability.

Hello Wendy,

I don't disagree with your post but I must question your use of the term "fezzic nature". I could not find fezzic in any dictionary so I must ask you whether it means wearing a fez? You used it in a negative context so does that mean wearing a fez tilts one's head to the side and therefore impedes proper brain bloodflow?

Rich Reynolds, do you wear a fez? To what side does your head tilt? Turks seem to be levelheaded but I seem to be stumped over fezzic. Should I wear a fez for a while and see what happens?

Wendy, can you please clear up my confusion by letting me know what "fezzic" means? For example, I understand the humorous aspect of the term pelicanist but when I consider its origin as an explanation of the Kenneth Arnold case it brings up the disparaging sense of pelicanist = birdbrain. Is there something wrong with me? Am I acting fezzic? I hope not, even though I don't know what it means. Please help me Wendy.

Thanks,

Josh

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 09:30:47 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:13:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:33:39 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:47:04 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>I think we can guarantee that even if Stan Friedman is not the
>>only 'serious ufologist' to take Roswell as the crash of an
>>alien space craft, he is certainly the only such ufologist to go
>>along with there being two, yes two, crashes on that same day,
>>i.e. one at a site (one of four postulated in the literature)
>>near Roswell, and another on the Plains of San Augustin.

>Lots of garbage is postulated in the literature including a
>Frank Kaufmann site which had no real support in the first
>place. Some even postulate the moon is made of green cheese.So?

>>Why not ask for a show of 'hands' on those who believe there
>>were two UFO crashes within 100 miles of each other on the same
>>day?

>Ever hear of mid-air collisions? 40% of the more than 800
>sightings in Bloecher's 1947 Wave report involved more than one
>UFO being observed at a time.....

>>By the way, there is not one shred of documentation of any kind
>>to indicate a second such crash. Not even a press report. Merely
>>a person who spoke to Stan in 1978 following a lecture he gave.
>>This guy did not recall the date, and only heard the story from
>>a third party (Barney Barnett), nearly 30 years earlier. Even
>>Barnett had no memory of the date. Yet Stan has built a totally
>>fanciful case for a July 1947 occurrence for this event, when
>>there is nothing to show it happened then, or at any other time.

>Talk about fanciful!!

>Try and do your homework, CDA.

>Don't forget Barnett's boss Fleck Danley, his neighbor Harold
>Baca, from across the street, and William Leed, military
>officer, etc.

>Testimony from circumstantial quite respectable witnesses.

>How do you know Barnett had no memory of the date? Out of body
>contact with the dead? It was his boss who came up with the date
>after thinking on it. Barney was dead before we started our
>investigation so we couldn't ask him. There were others like the
>Datil Postmistress and a rancher.

Nobody has ever come up with a date for the Plains crash. Stan
should read his own literature. True, someone suggested it might
have been in the summer of 1947, but that is as far as it got.
Certainly no month and day. Stan has tried to weave this second
'crash' into the Roswell legend for his own purposes.

Stan: There was, I recall, a conference under Michael Swords as chairman, on this subject where you tried hard to convince other Roswell investigators about this second crash, but they did not buy it. You had the worst of the debate. It mainly revolved around the dubious 1947 date. Among other things, the archaeologists were there in 1946 not 47.

Strange this crash got left out of the MJ-12 briefing, isn't it?

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Peter Jennings Focuses On Matters Of The Media

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 05:03:59 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:15:47 -0500
Subject: Peter Jennings Focuses On Matters Of The Media

Source: The Houston Chronicle

<http://www.chron.com/cs/CDA/ssistory.mpl/ae/tv/3046641>

02-18-05

Local panelists discuss concerns
Peter Jennings focuses on matters of the media
By MIKE MCDANIEL
Copyright 2005 Houston Chronicle

Media bashing has become a favorite sport among armchair remote hogs and those who blaze and blog on the Internet. Sunday night, the pastime becomes more of a contact sport as members of the local community address their concerns with members of the local media face to face.

Media Matters: A Town Hall Meeting With Peter Jennings (10:30 p.m. Sunday, Channel 13), taped Feb. 13 at KTRK, provides further anecdotal evidence that there is a disconnect between media and the public, particularly among minorities.

A small, invited audience (approximately 50 people) spoke to a panel that included University of Houston communications professor Garth Jowett; KSEV-AM owner and talk-show host Dan Patrick; Channel 13 reporters Miya Shay and Wayne Dolcefino; Carlos Puig, managing editor of the Spanish-language newspaper Rumbo; and Sonny Messiah-Jiles, publisher of the Houston Defender. None were shy about discussing topics that affect their careers.

One concern voiced was that the public no longer trusts the media.

"A lot of people think we're more conspiratorial than we really are," Dolcefino said. "The CBS story (about President Bush and the Air National Guard) hurt us. (The public) didn't trust us anyway. Now they don't even trust our documents."

Patrick pointed to a failing, among all media, to devote the time and money necessary to do real investigative reporting.

Messiah-Jiles' most strident message of the hour was that the media has failed to honor its commitment to covering all of the community. "What the media doesn't understand is that coverage needs to be balanced," she said. Her fellow panelists agreed that such a change won't happen until minorities become the "gatekeepers" who decide what the day's news is.

Jennings, who moderated the discussion, was particularly good at providing illustrations about issues being discussed. For example, he noted that the media is more likely to do stories about lost or kidnapped white children than black children.

The effect of the Internet on the media was also discussed. How much should we trust what we read on the Web, one audience member asked.

"I'm forced to deal with this every day (in grading papers),"

said Jowett. "There's a lot of truth (online) but also a lot of unverifiable rumors."

"The market will move those people (who produce unverifiable accounts) to the side," interjected Patrick, a blogger and anti-Chronicle crusader who believes newspapers will be dinosaurs once the baby-boomer generation expires. "The public is more sophisticated than the media gives them credit for."

As a member of the media who covers the media, I thought the show was an excellent primer that demands deeper discussion, particularly about how mainstream media should deal with wildcatters on the Web.

It's worth noting that Jennings never veered off-topic, although there was temptation to whenever the topic of the CBS/Dan Rather scandal came up. In a conversation with the Chronicle, he made it clear that he believes that something like the National Guard story would not be likely to happen at ABC.

"It would be foolish to say never, but our safeguards are pretty potent," he said. When the incident happened at CBS, "we were sensitive and pleased that most of the checks and balances (recommended at CBS after an investigation) were already in place here (at ABC). World News Tonight is very closely edited."

Unlike Rather, Jennings does not carry the mantle of managing editor of his newscast. Instead, he is senior editor. For a report on UFOs to air Thursday on ABC, he plays three roles: writer, reporter and editor.

He believes UFOs: Seeing Is Believing (7-9 p.m., Channel 13) is going to be "stunning."

"Some people in the UFO community were a little bit surprised that we were going to do it," he said. "What we've done here is take both the established and UFO communities seriously. They don't often converge, but they do on occasion."

More than 150 "serious and thoughtful people" are interviewed for the special, Jennings said, though he admitted, "That doesn't mean there are no kooks."

"However skeptical we begin, you come to the end of this believing people should have taken it more seriously (in the beginning). You certainly wish that of government. The government intention has been to dismiss the notion of UFOs. It creates a disconnect between the public and government credibility."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 10:06:04 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:17:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:40:03 EST
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:07:32 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>If a technology is far in advance of our own, the owners of that
>>tech might realize that we would be utterly unable to make heads
>>or tails of it until some much later date.

>>Like leaving a coke bottle on an island inhabited by aboriginal
>>natives... what's the harm?

Well, an alien Coke bottle may have antimatter or something
worse on the inside. Yes, lets see the natives bang it against
a rock.

>Environmental harm, physical harm, mental harm. Dangerous
>hazardous materials, possibly explosive or dangerous in a way we
>can't even imagine if they are so "advanced." Coke bottles don't
>fly on their own power and crash. All good and compelling
>reasons why aliens would not leave behind crashed spaceship
>wreckage, besides the reason of not wanting others to get their
>hands on the technology (doesn't have to be "us" either, but to
>prevent other alleged ET races getting their hands or tentacles
>on it).

I agree completely. We have examples of how Earth natives or
uninformed folk have recovered OUR re-entered spacecraft
hardware and tried to take it apart (I think some were
successful). And this can be considered only a 100-500 year
difference in technology level.

Am I suggesting these natives could have used these bits and
pieces to reverse engineer a spacecraft? No. Am I suggesting
that lots of people could be killed? Yes.

Reverse engineering hardware with such a drastic technology
difference would be next to impossible simply because we have no
machines to make the alien hardware. We may begin to understand
how it works, but if the hardware to make it is impossible for
us, we would likely not be able to us this data.

What impact would exist on our society if we knew a propulsion
system worked using some element we have never seen before, but
we can't make the element and the aliens didn't give us the data
how to do so?

But even if we couldn't build a whole spacecraft, the data
gleaned from basic aspects could impact and guide our technology
investments, for instance, if we found certain kinds of alloys
or nanostructures, we would know these were likely the result of
significant investment.

Examination of a crashed alien spacecraft could provide useful

clues to us primitives as to how to defend against it. Namely, we could do projectile testing of the outer shell of the spacecraft and thus see what would be the best way to puncture it. We could examine it and determine possible electromagnetic signatures to help in tracking. Dead crew members could provide useful data in developing pathogens to stop them.

So it doesn't seem smart of aliens to allow a crashed spacecraft or crew and definitely they wouldn't want it lying there for humans to tinker with.

And we really must consider the motivations of alien visitors when considering if crashes are possible or if any debris would remain if they do crash. Based on the large number of the UFO sightings, you would think that they would have had ample opportunity to kill large numbers of humans if they "didn't care" or if they "considered our welfare unimportant". Assuming they are indeed visiting our world, it seems likely that for some reason they don't want to damage this world or the people on it. If they needed our natural resources or living space, they would have moved in long ago and gotten rid of us.

Since this hasn't happened, it seems that they might need something from us which forbids any drastic intervention in our world. This could be science data or something organic from us. So it would seem that they would not want to crash (i.e. most UFOs don't) and would definitely not want to leave any crashed material or ANY hardware/crew.

Brad, you make a very good point about other alleged ET races finding competing alien hardware. One more serious disincentive for allowing crashed hardware.

Really, this adds an interesting spin in that the odds are that there are more than one alien race that may be visiting us. Clearly one would be ahead of the other giving the one behind incentive to get by hook or crook any technology from the more advanced race. If the advanced race chooses to build Grade B spacecraft with cloned zombie crew that are expendible, this provides the lessor race a pathway into the higher grade technology by infiltrating the ill-defended, moronic cloned crew. Just speculation, but really, it doesn't show the higher alien race to be very smart. It seems to me that they would want to build the most well-defended craft possible, always keeping ahead of competitors by continuous technology development.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:07:26 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:18:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Bourdais

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 14:12:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Steve Owens <p944dc.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:51:11 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 13:57:50 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>Thanks Dave, and sorry for all the <snips>.
>>>I was just looking for votes yea or nay on Roswell.

>>As you are merely looking for votes "yea or nay" please put me
>>- a Roswell Native - Go Coyotes! - in the Nay leaning crowd.

>Thanks Steve:

>Of those very few responding, it looks evenly divided. Beware
>the statistics of small numbers though.

>I suppose many or most are on the fence pending better
>information, or else just want to avoid the flak. I can't blame
>them much.

Larry,

When I visited Roswell in 1995, I talked with a "native", in a
bar, with his boots and hat. he knew nothing and believed
nothing of the Roswell crash.

One more for the "Nay crowd".

Another exemple of "informed" people. Kent Jeffrey met with
former pilots of Roswell : they did not remember anything, not
even a paper headline, although it was the big title of the day,
even in the New York Times of July 9. It was not local news, but
they knew nothing. Oh yes, one of them remembered a rumor at the
base, that there was a small amount of debris, just enough to
fill a wheelbarrow. Do you see what that means : had it been
the phantom Mogul 4 balloon train, they had not even been told.
So, about a flying saucer... Or they had been told to keep their
mouth shut. Gildas Bourdais

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Introduction & Information On Events In

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 07:18:05 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:20:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Introduction & Information On Events In

>From: Rob Kritkauskay <robkrit.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:55 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Introduction & Information On Events In Phoenix

>Please allow me to introduce myself, my name is Rob Kritkauskay
>and I live in Phoenix, Arizona. In the past, my occupation and
>interests have been in the realm of science and I must admit to
>having little interest or belief in UFOs.

>While doing some research, I happened upon this List and was
>pleasantly surprised by the scientific approach exhibited by the
>members. Previously encountered discussion groups I found to be
>populated with the intellectually lazy.

Welcome to this forum Rob! I agree with your views about the
various lists.

>That being said, I wanted to get some objective opinions
>concerning two events that occurred while researching the
>sightings/phenomena in Phoenix over the last eight months.

<snip>

Some of us, myself included, do not put much stock in lights in
the night sky. There are several reasons.

One of these is low information content. Lacking discernible
shape and exterior details, there isn't a lot to report outside
of color, relative brightness, apparent trajectory and so forth.

It goes without saying that mundane explanations are easy to
suggest given only lights were seen.

Personally, I am so bummed out with nite-lites that I no longer
catalog them. Some of my work is displayed on this site:

<http://www.larryhatch.net/>

Not everyone here is a scientist or a Ph.D. I can't call myself
a scientist although I value the scientific method.

If you stick around for a while, you will see that all sorts of
views are held and expressed. It won't take long before you
start to recognize the contributors by name, along with their
take on things.

Keep one finger on the delete key, you may find it handy.
Regardless, and unlike the garbage lists you referred to, (not
by name of course) you won't be entirely alone.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 05:24:36 -1000
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:21:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:52:15 +0000
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 19:03:30 -1000
>>Subject: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>Notwithstanding trenchant comments from guys with slide rules
>and wrenches - many of them good researchers - I feel you've
>probably got a point, but one that applies only to a certain
>genre of sightings or contacts.

>If we examine three sets of "experiments" we find:

>1) in any quantum operation, if a stern check is made on what's
>happening - the behavior changes!

>Yup - sounds ridiculous, but just check Richard P Feynman's
>comments on the "two slit experiment"

>2) in poltergeist (too many to be false) investigations, any
>"scientific" checks are always confounded, although police,
>priests, press etc. continue to witness the actual phenomena

>3) in a certain sub-set of UFO sightings or contacts, the same
>reports of non-physical/shifting-at-will phenomena that
>characterize quantum and poltergeist/paranormal experiences.

>Your suggestion could open a new era of 'realistic' questioning
>of (falsely) denied phenomena by way of "insulated experiments"
>where the skepticism of scientists and observers is not allowed
>to impinge on the sensitive subjects or witnesses.

Aloha Ray, thanks, for seeing the point of what I'm trying to do
here. A 'realistic questioning' of witnesses is part of the goal
here given the sensitivity of the issues across the spectrum:
legal, career, and personal that confront each witness.

Insulating these interviewees to some degree from unnecessary
skepticism is very helpful since they have a story to tell and
these shouldn't be shoved and forgotten into some gray box. The
expression and analysis of witness testimonies should not be
encumbered by unreasonable demands from those wanting to raise
the threshold of objective evidence to an unrealistically high
level. We must remember that these are often highly classified
projects the witnesses are discussing so objective evidence will
be hard to come buy.

>But, if this is a path to future truths, it will be fought
>every inch of the way by gov'ts and vested interests - as
>always.

I think that some of those who have spoken against this more
'witness friendly' process to standards of objective evidence
are justified in seeking as much objective evidence as is
available. Those advocating a more 'witness friendly' approach

need to be sensitive to this and gain as much objective evidence as possible. This may not be enough to satisfy critics, but should be enough to show we've done our homework. The resistance of critics ultimately comes from seeking certainty in an area where there can't be any due to underlying political constraints. We need to be comfortable in analysing those witness testimonies where there is considerable uncertainty over the persuasiveness of the objective evidence supporting them. That's just a fact of life when it comes to dealing with whistleblowers discussing classified projects of the nature we are investigating on this forum.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 09:46:12 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:24:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:32:28 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>Even the Magonians, many of whom I think of as pelicanists,
>>have taken the term as it was intended, knowing that my
>>intention was to put a bit of humor into the longstanding,
>>never-ending debate between proponents and debunkers. One
>>Magonia columnist uses the pseudonym "The Pelican." I approve,
>>and I chuckle every time I see it. If the pseudonymous columnist
>>and I agree on nothing else (besides, that is, our taste in
>>music), we do share the same sense of humor.

>Jerry, if you think The Pelican shares your taste in music I
>can advise you that, as I have long suspected, your
>identification of the amiable avian is sadly amiss.

To the more important question:

Why does he hide behind a pseudonym - however amusing - anyway?
Not the world's most pressing question, admittedly, but it's
always been a principle of mine, and I think of most writers',
that if you're going to criticize others - or make fun of them -
you have some ethical obligation to do so under your own name.
I can't imagine a circumstance under which I'd hide from the
targets of my sniping in that fashion.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 09:46:36 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:26:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Lehmberg

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 18:31:28 +0100
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>About the accident hypothesis - there are some sources
>describing very light craft, electrically powered, charged like
>a capacitor (presumably aboard the mother ship). Maybe such
>craft are vulnerable to a lightning bolt, for instance. I also
>read somewhere that there was a powerful experimental radar in
>the area of Corona at the time but I am afraid it's a dubious
>rumor. Any idea about that?

I've watched this thread with some interest. It was a call to try to have people resolve where they stood on a watershed issue and ends up being a bunch of us trying to violate the uncertainty principle. What you try to measure, changes. It might be that you can't remotely gauge what you'd try to measure in this fashion, as a result.

Generally, if you've been a member of UFO UpDates for a while you know where people stand, just reading broadly between the lines of what they've been writing... but ask them to come down hard and fast, black or white, on or off, left or right... and watch them turn into photons with a million qualifications, a trillion prerequisites, and a bazillion criterions to justify their positions. Some will even end up on the other side from where they really want to be! Isn't that astonishing?

Thing is... with Roswell, a lackluster case not as important as some other cases... Kirtland AFB (11\4\57), Hynek Blue Book Case (5\5\65), Malmstrom AFB (3/20/67), Incident at Redlands, Ca. (Hynek, BB, 2\4\68), Exeter, New Hampshire (9\3\65), Malmstrom AFB (11\7\75), Iran F-4 Incident (9\76), Belgium (1989\90), Illinois, USA (1\5\2000)... to name just a few (thanx to aatoth to J. Cohen), the most important position (and the one most reflective of reality) is the position that you don't know.

I don't know.

I don't know if ET crashed at Corona... but you know what? I could know. I should know. I would know.

I'm not accorded the respect of knowing. I'm not accorded the respect of giving my informed consent with regard to knowing. I'm trifled with by my media. I'm betrayed by my government. I'm revolted by my church. I'm disgusted by my society, ashamed of my culture, and appalled with our aggregate ignorance.

Admittedly, the hyperbole circuit-breaker gets a little warm, but you get the point:

We should know, and it's a wrong that we don't. Whole lives fall into the crack of that ignorance...

[alienview.nul](#) -:|:- Restore John Ford
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 19](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 11:09:19 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:30:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

Hi David,

Sorry, I had to break up your response and reply in parts.

>First, since none of us has access to alien physics books, alien
>engineering schematics, or alien FAA safety records, we are, of
>course, only speculating one way or another.

Yes. Obviously its hard to project what alien societies would do
and what their technology looks like. But if you assume it is
much more advanced than ours then it doesn't make sense it would
be just as fallible as ours.

>What any of us thinks likely or probable depends on our
>assumptions, explicit or implicit. I'm assuming that technology
>has its ultimate limits while you do not. You are assuming the
>craft we see are their ultimate 'A' technology and they would
>place very high priority in keeping it out of our hands. I'm
>assuming that's not necessarily the case.

If you want. It IS a possibility. Critical, no.

>You are assuming that
>they would place a very high premium on the lives of their
>pilots. I'm again assuming that's not necessarily the case.

It IS a possibility, but its not that important.

>We could go on and on enumerating such assumptions, but
>you get the point.

>I could, e.g., envision the following scenario (all speculative
>again). The craft we see and the one's that crash are their
>smaller scout craft using principles and technology different
>from their mothership interstellar craft.

Fine, its possible that power is beamed from the "mother" ship
to the scout ship, thus no energy storage/generator is needed.

>Thus the helicopter on
>the atomic aircraft carrier does not work in the same way as the
>aircraft carrier. We may not care if the other side gets our
>lower tech helos armed with conventional bullets and rockets,
>but would care a great deal if they seized the aircraft carrier
>with its atomic reactor and arsenal of atomic weapons and
>missiles to carry them.

We primitives may still be able to build defenses to at least
the scout craft and crew based on data gleaned from a crashed

UFO. This would not be in the interests of the alien overlords. If the alien overlords didn't care about scout ships falling apart (sort of like the Kamikaze aircraft which were held together with bailing wire), then why aren't we up to our chins with broken down UFOs?

>For all the lip service we pay about how we value human life,
>the leaders who start the wars don't seem to care much at all.
>Why would aliens necessarily be different? Conceivably the alien
>pilots could be some genetically engineered drones, a lower form
>of life designed for only one function, and considered to be
>completely expendable by the alien aristocracy, as they dab
>their three upper lips with their hankies. There are certainly
>some crashed saucer stories out there where the crews are
>claimed to be exactly this, genetically identical, biologically
>degenerate drones, hardly "perfect" biological beings at all.

Again, it makes no sense to provide humans with samples of the fruits of their genetic cloning labors from which humans could develop pathogens to kill them off or perhaps detect them. Really, I doubt the drones would fly the craft anyway, being as dumb as you say. But if the overlords want to have such beings do their bidding, the overlords must want the work done and not have the drones die before accomplishing their task. Thus, lousy, crashable alien spacecraft, with or without zombielike drones on them makes no sense. The overlords want a cow anus and they want it yesterday!

>Or even if their scout craft are sufficiently advanced, they
>also may not care because it would take us too long to back-
>engineer them to pose any short-term threat to them.

Reverse engineering may be impossible because they did not conveniently crash some manufacturing machinery to actually make the stuff, no to mention provide extra Unobtainium to make it with. No, their real problem is that we may be able to understand more how to bring the craft or crew down using the data in an endless arms race.

>Imagine if
>the first 747 from 1969 was suddenly hurdled only 100 years back
>in time and landed on the White House lawn. How fast could it be
>back-engineered and replicated? 19th and early 20th Century
>scientists and engineers would have a helluva time figuring the
>thing out and reproducing it, from the electronics and
>metallurgy to the plastics, tires, instruments, and basic
>principles of operation. When you think about all the problems
>they would encounter, it probably wouldn't speeded up
>introduction of the first 747 much at all, maybe a few years at
>most.

Well, the situation is different in that the 1869 skies would not be full of 747's and the threat caused by them not recognized since this would be a pre-nuclear age. Anyway, assuming it happened, I think that you would have a dramatic impact in technology areas that could be related to, such as electricity, lights, fuels. Obviously, the areas they had no inkling about would be left mysteriously with no impact. Still, the great thing would be that there would be no coverup because why would there be? This means the data would get the widest distribution and great minds such as Einstein coming along would eventually figure out what the devices did, accelerating our technology greatly by causing our funding to be optimized, rather than following deadends.

>Even without pilot or engineering error, there is still always
>the unexpected. E.g., one of the more credible eyewitness
>reports concerning a crashed saucer came from Capt. V. A.
>Postlethwaite, an intelligence officer, who told Leonard
>Stringfield that back in 1948 he received a top secret telex
>directed to the commanding general of White Sands Proving
>Grounds. The message described a 100 foot saucer with a paper-
>thin hull impenetrable by conventional tools. The craft was
>brought down by a blown portal window from a small meteorite
>strike, causing the death of its alien crew. Presumably the
>craft landed by automated control. Postlethwaite's story is
>usually associated with the 1948 Aztec, N.M. crash.

Good grief! Are you asking me to believe that an alien race that has travelled untold many lightyears and have to come to an end because of a blown portal window due to a small meteorite?

That's pretty funny! Good Lord! Yes, really, this story sounds really true and everything! But of course, these aliens are expendible Kamikaze drone clones and their spaceships of no real value to us in any way.

Okay, how many thousands of years of space travel do you think aliens would have gone through before getting to our planet? They have alot of experience yes? They likely have encountered meteors before, right? They likely not only have sensors to detect meteors within a set distance but also have controls to move the ship automatically to avoid the object right? Or better, blast it with a death ray. Or gravity beam. Or design their ship with hulls resistant to such things. Self healing ships. Double hulls. Explosive surfaced hulls. Or just stick a force field around the craft. These are not Apollo or Space Shuttle style craft we are talking about, where every ounce counts and power is limited, speed limited.

>The point is that sushi always happens. All the presumably >highly advanced supertechnology and super beings can't >necessarily stop it.

Sorry, but logically this is wrong. The higher the technology the more things that CAN be prevented going wrong, the more things that can be predicted, detected, sensed. With vast amounts of energy, you can do a helluva lot of stuff that would not be practical otherwise (closed life support, laser cannon, "shields").

>Without knowing the engineering specs on these devices, nobody >can say with 100% assurance that something else, like a >lightning strike, might have also brought these things down. >Saying that's impossible is basically saying one knows exactly >how these things work, and who can honestly say that?

I'm saying that these things can be brought down, by an alien technology greater than their own. I am saying that mundane, prosaic things like lightning strikes, bird strikes, rock strikes, shotguns, meteors, cosmic rays are likely to have already been encountered and defended against. They may not have a defense against scalar waves, quantum time string wave beams, antigraviton beams, or whatever else we don't have (at least I don't think so). If we look at their vehicle long enough, we could find an Achille's heel (like on the Death Star) to allow us to track and maybe even disable them (for a while until they upgrade their technology).

>>Failure of hardware can obviously occur

>>Right. Things like energy sources can overload; even >>supermaterials can fail if stressed enough.

Pshaw! They will have designed them to not fail and not be forced to fail.

>>but are these aliens >>cheapskates who only have zero-fault tolerance? I doubt it. The >>most likely design of any spacecraft with beings would be two >>fault tolerance.

>We design backup systems into our aircraft and they still crash. >Jetliners have multiple hydraulic systems, the theory being that >that the odds of all of them failing simultaneously is virtually >zero. Yet there are two crashes I'm aware of where structural >failure severed all hydraulics simultaneously where they came >together, the pilots couldn't control the planes, and the planes >crashed.

>One of our nuclear reactors (I think in Tennessee) almost melted >down several decades back when they lost control of the reactor >for a few hours. Lack of backup systems? No. They had three >"independent" electronic control systems in case one of them >failed. The problem was, just like for the jetliner hydraulics, >was that there was a choke point and the systems were no longer >truly independent. A fire broke out in a room through which all >the electrical cabling ran.

Blah-blah-blah. Yes, we humans are fallible. But we are improving. Imagine in >1000 years time we will have very impressive protection/predictive hardware. Of course, we could kill the planet prior to that or be taken over by alien

overlords (with clone armies).

>>And remember these beings should be able to
>>afford it because they have already decided to invest vast sums
>>of resources to get to Earth.

>Again, they may not give a damn about the crews or the craft for
>various reasons, any more than our military or political leaders
>care that much when a plane and crew perish in Iraq. We have an
>inexhaustible supply of planes and pilots waiting to take their
>place.

Yes, but these "aliens" don't seem to want to overtly announce
their presence. Covering the ground with their incompetent
spacecraft and dead clone crew doesn't seem an option they are
exercising.

>>The design method of making an alien spacecraft is not going to
>>be a fashion show. It will involve vast computer simulation
>>models which we can only marvel at. Plus they will have had
>>millenia of test models and operational experience to revise and
>>improve these vehicles to make them able to handle any
>>situation.

>Or they might be cheapskates with throwaway craft and crews that
>can easily be replaced. How can anybody know for sure?

Because the ground isn't riddled with their spacecraft and
bodies.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 12:13:14 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:33:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 18:31:28 +0100
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 18:41:38 -0800
>>>>Subject: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

><snip>

>David, James, Larry and All,

>First, thank you again, David, for you clear summary on Roswell
>and Mogul, in answer to Larry Hatch. Yes, there was no Mogul 4
>balloon train.

>Another argument to discard Mogul, again, is the peculiar
>testimony of Col. Cavitt in the Roswell Report. All the USAF
>asked him was to "remember" even vaguely, that, yes, he had
>found a Mogul balloon train with Marcel. But, no, he had only
>found a weather balloon! There was an obvious message there:

>"I am not going along with your bigger lie. I stick to the old
>one".

>Excuse me if repeat myself - I wrote it before. Larry, you make
>me feel that all the previous messages I sent to this List were
>for naught.

>Now, the discussion is interesting, on the "accident hypothesis"
>and other possible explanations. I feel that the accident
>remains at the top the list, but that the "conflict hypothesis"
>is not to be ruled out, especially in consideration of the
>ancient historical dimensions of ufolog - celestial wars, with
>legends of celestial wars, etc. Just for comparison, the
>colonial powers were often at war for control of colonies.

>About the accident hypothesis - there are some sources
>describing very light craft, electrically powered, charged like
>a capacitor (presumably aboard the mother ship). Maybe such
>craft are vulnerable to a lightning bolt, for instance. I also
>read somewhere that there was a powerful experimental radar in
>the area of Corona at the time but I am afraid it's a dubious
>rumor. Any idea about that?

One thing we do know is that a powerful radar tracking system

was on at White Sands because a V-2 rocket was scheduled for launch the morning of July 3, 1947. It was required that upper atmosphere winds be monitored 72, 48, 24, and 4 hours before launch. This was done with weather balloons and radar reflectors. Because these were, of course, vacuum tube radars, they were left on. It may have been the only place on the planet that day out in the middle of nowhere where two UFOs could have run into such a stationary beam. It was aimed to the north because all launches were to the North. It could have interfered with propulsion or guidance systems or both and caused a brief but deadly mid air collision.

Ironically the article describing the use of such a system was right next to the article on the front page of the Alamogordo News of July 10 describing the staged launch of such a combo under the headline "Fantasy of Flying Disc Explained Here" with 3 pictures.

It should also be noted that the group doing these launches was part of the Air Materiel Command under the direction of General Nathan F. Twining who went there on July 7, left NM on July 11, and later was a member of Operation Majestic 12. He was based at Wright Field in Dayton.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:31:19 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:36:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:48:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:08:49 +1000
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>The most important question of all remains unanswered:

>>>Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
>>>landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
>>>recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
>>>evidence?

>Do you have any idea how many places there are above and
>underground for which there is no access without a high level
>clearance and a need to know? In case you hadn't noticed the USA
>is a very large country.

Wholly irrelevant. In fact the UK government has enough space in
this small country to store alien craft & bodies if it really
wanted to. Such as in that tunnel linking Rudloe Manor to
Whitehall. (ha!)

But that is not really the point. The point is: Why should the
US still want to keep such a discovery under wraps after 6
decades? And how have they managed to keep this awful secret
for so long when another crash could occur at any time in
Russia, China, Australia, etc.? Do you think other countries
have some secret pact with the US to hand over such crashed
saucers immediately?

>The last time I checked, New Mexico alone was twice the size of
>England and Wales combined and NM is only the 5th largest state!
>There are thousands of square miles one can't even fly over. The
>amount of space for hiding wreckage and documents is truly
>enormous.

What on earth has the size of New Mexico got to do with it?
See above.

>>>If it did indeed happen, there must be literally tons of research papers
>>>on this. Scientists of many disciplines would have been involved in
>>>the ensuing analysis and discussion, perhaps from several countries.
>>>Yet we have heard from precisely none of them.

>Why would any rational person expect to? In addition many of the
>people would have done analysis without knowing the source of
>the material being examined. Three nuclear weapons labs together
>have about 10,000 engineers and scientists. At one time there
>were more than 20,000 people working at Wright Patterson, many

>in labs with very restricted access.

>>>Not one written word from anyone directly involved.

>>>The whole Roswell myth is built on the principle that the
>>>'truth' can never be revealed because of the need for one country
>>>to maintain tight secrecy on it. Even when scientists are constantly
>>>searching for evidence of alien life (as they have been for at least
>>>50 years),. the greatest scientific discovery of all time still has
>>>to be kept under wraps. And this after six decades.

>>>I submit that such an idea is utterly incredible

>It is your naivete that is incredible.

>Certainly the SETI community is NOT searching for signs of alien
>life. They are searching for electromagnetic signals from afar
>and insist on totally ignoring the evidence that aliens are
>coming here. If aliens are coming there is no need for SETI is
>there?

Perhaps among SETI scientists there are a few who do accept
UFOs as possible ET visitations but are keeping quiet about it.
However, I would assume the great majority are anti-UFO.

>While I am at it, I should for the umpteenth time point out that
>the Twining memo of Sept.23, 1947, was only classified SECRET.
>It could not possibly contain TOP SECRET or TS Code word info.

>Why is that so hard to understand?

It is not hard to understand. My point is that you have not
shown that the Roswell crash or any other ET discovery, ever was
or would be a matter of 'top secrecy'. It is purely an
assumption, something you have promoted since 1980, something
that suits your whole 'Cosmic Watergate' fabric. For all you
know crashes have occurred in other countries before, and after,
Roswell. Why have we not heard anything from them? Where is
their hard evidence? Top secret again?

Instead of telling us about the size of the US airspace, size of
New Mexico etc. why just not produce the real evidence, the hard
evidence scientists desperately would love to get their hands
on? Then we can begin a proper scientific analysis, instead of
regurgitating the endless anecdotes & rumors.

It seems you have to fall back on the 'above top secret'
scenario time and again to explain the lack of hard evidence.
Instead, why not admit the obvious: There aint no hard
evidence.

The few claimed bits of Roswell hardware turn out to be either
fictitious, terrestrial material or just plain junk.

However, I concede something might, just might, turn up one day
(via a real UFO crash).

But I, for one, am not holding my breath.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Alien Autopsy Info Request

From: Philip Mantle <philip.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:10:59 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:48:44 -0500
Subject: Alien Autopsy Info Request

Dear Colleagues,

I am preparing a chapter on my new book on the alien autopsy film. The chapter in question concerns comments on the film from the medical profession. Unfortunately one of my floppy discs containing a lot of this information has been corrupted, so I've had to start all over again.

I'd therefore like to ask if you have any information either for or against the authenticity of the alien autopsy film from anyone within the medical profession.

Your assistance with this request is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Philip Mantle
www.beyondroswell.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 12:18:54 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:50:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 18:31:28 +0100
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

snip

>First, thank you again, David, for you clear summary on Roswell
>and Mogul, in answer to Larry Hatch. Yes, there was no Mogul 4
>balloon train.

>Another argument to discard Mogul, again, is the peculiar
>testimony of Col. Cavitt in the Roswell Report. All the USAF
>asked him was to "remember" even vaguely, that, yes, he had
>found a Mogul balloon train with Marcel. But, no, he had only
>found a weather balloon! There was an obvious message there:

>"I am not going along with your bigger lie. I stick to the old
>one".

Cavitt's testimony bacfired on the government. See: Cavitt
Emptor

<http://brumac.8k.com>

Scroll down the page.....

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:54:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:49:20 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 18:42:52 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>I would have thought that the explanation that a particular UFO
>>report was produced by the planet Venus would be pretty
>>conclusively disproved if it was completely overcast at the
>>time, or if Venus was not visible from that location at that
>>date.

>It might, unless of course one were to argue that the witness
>was mistaken about the time and date, or that they were mistaken
>about the weather (and the available weather reports didn't take
>adequate account of local microclimates). Or unless the deus ex
>machina of "radical misperception" were to be invoked so that
>any difference whatever between the witness report and the Venus
>hypothesis were to be attributed to some generic and undefinable
>process of "observer error".

The idea of radical misperception is not something invented by
CSICOPERS or even Magonian pelicanists but is something that has
been discovered by a number of front line investigators over the
years, as much as a surprise to them as anyone else. Perhaps
radical misperceptions are one of those new pieces of
knowledge that can be gained from ufology.

>>An explanation involving hallucination would be pretty lame for
>>a case involving multiple independent witnesses at different
>>locations and half a dozen separate vide/CCTV images.

>And similarly the ETH (any version of it) or the TSH, or the
>zerographic hypomollification hypothesis, or any other
>hypothesis you care to name, would be falsified if the multiple
>independent witnesses were subsequently shown to be members of
>the same extended family and the computer which had been used to
>manipulate the video images were to come to light after it went
>into a repair shop for servicing.

In practice you would learn about the extended family from
someone in a bar at a UFO conference, but the case would still
appear as unexplained in book after book, and another set of UFO
investigators would deny the extended family story and accuse
the guy who told you in the bar of being a pelicanist. Or the
original investigators would argue that the fact that witnesses
were in an extended family was irrelevant, and that the bloke in
the video shop had been bribed by a either a rival UFO group or
the authorities to denigrate the poor innocent witnesses. >Of
course, you're partly right - there is a null hypothesis for
>UFO studies, which is that every UFO report can be explained
>using only known entities. And that null hypothesis certainly
>can be falsified, and frequently is, or we would have no UFO
>reports to begin with (if we disregard the CSICOPian position,
>which is in fact completely unfalsifiable).

But UFO reports are just reports of things that are puzzling to the witness, and 90-95% are described as IFOs by non pelicanist Ufologists. Some British Ufologists feel that the number of (non obvious) IFO cases is as low as 2%. Though CSICOP-ers know that the null hypothesis is true and Ufologists know that it is false, in reality very little of the detailed critical investigation that would be needed to resolve the issue has gone on. Most UFO investigation is really just the assemblage of evidence to bank up the investigators preconceptions and both sides spin like Mandelson and Campbell

>But isn't the null hypothesis we're interested in, it's the
>explanatory hypotheses which are put forward to account for
>those reports where the null hypothesis has already been
>rejected. And for these, your definition of falsification is
>completely trivial, for three reasons. Firstly, because we have
>to deal with the report we have, not the report we would like to
>have - if we don't have multiple witnesses and video images,
>then we don't have multiple witnesses and video images, and you
>cannot use this **post hoc** as a falsification condition.

Yes, most dramatic UFO cases are reports by single witnesses or by small groups which might be literal descriptions of real physical events, or might be some sort of subjective experience, or it might just be made up. There is often no way of telling. Of course many Ufologists get round this by taking up the mantra that nice middle class people like them don't lie, and the stupid peasants/country hicks/ trailer trash etc don't have the intelligence to get one over the college educated Ufologist/psychical researcher

>Secondly, because while your Venus explanation may be
>falsifiable under the specific conditions you mention, the
>hypothesis belongs to a set of similar hypotheses which is
>indefinitely large, and one cannot falsify indefinitely large
>sets by sequentially eliminating their individual members.
>Unless there is a falsification condition for the entire set,
>the set itself is indefinitely elastic and hence unfalsifiable.

That argument implies all UFO reports have a common trigger and stand and fall together. We can only deal with cases on a case by case basis (I argued to the contrary back in the 1970s but I was wrong)

>And thirdly, because falsification (unlike testability) is
>supposed to be a definitive criterion, in that the falsification
>condition will always hold if the hypothesis itself is untrue.
>If I've lost a book and I hypothesize that it's on the coffee-
>table downstairs, and I go downstairs to check and it isn't
>there, then my hypothesis is definitively falsified - there is
>no realistic set of conditions under which it could still hold.

Have you never had the experience of searching high and low for something then a bit later finding it in front of your nose, which might suggest that things in the environment can fall out of ones visual experience (or that the boggarts teleported the object away and returned it just to annoy you)

>This is admittedly a very stringent criterion, which in practice
>is seldom met - but at the very least, a falsification criterion
>should be capable of partitioning the set of conditions under
>which the hypothesis can hold in some non-trivial way.

I suspect many of your points would apply equally well to much mainstream science, and that issues of falsifiability etc are indeed much more complicated in practice than theory.

Cheers

Peter

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

EBE Awards Listings?

From: **Dante Rosati** <dante.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:01:07 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:56:53 -0500
Subject: EBE Awards Listings?

Hi all-

I am unable to find a web page that lists the EBE award winners in the various catagories over the years. I don't see anything at ufocongress.com - does anyone know of such a listing?

Thanks

Dante

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 13:39:10 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:58:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:32:28 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>Even the Magonians, many of whom I think of as pelicanists, have
>>taken the term as it was intended, knowing that my intention was
>>to put a bit of humor into the longstanding, never-ending debate
>>between proponents and debunkers. One Magonia columnist uses the
>>pseudonym "The Pelican." I approve, and I chuckle every time I
>>see it. If the pseudonymous columnist and I agree on nothing
>>else (besides, that is, our taste in music), we do share the
>>same sense of humor.

>Jerry, if you think The Pelican shares your taste in music I can
>advise you that, as I have long suspected, your identification
>of the amiable avian is sadly amiss.

I, too, thought it odd that Mr. Clark would be amused by chanted
Vogon poetry in front of a chorus of amorous female cats.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:01:28 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:00:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:57:43 -0400
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:47:18 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

><snip>

>>Thanks to the web site below which was brought to our attention
>>by Kyle King in a recent post to UFO UpDates, I think we can now
>>safely conclude that this very interesting structured UFO in the
>>picture(s) was simply an honest misrepresentation of an IFO. To
>>continue to promote this UFO in public as a TRUFO would not only
>>be dishonest but it would do damage to the credibility of all of
>>us who study UFOs (or more accurately, UFO reports).

>><http://www.ufoinfo.com/sightings/chile/041000.shtml>

>Rather than lens flare the more apt description is a reflection
>off the camera's own lens retainer or the edge of the lenses
>themselves. The light source was probably something above the
>photographer's position.

>The explanatory note with the URL above is skimpy in detail as
>to just how the reflection occurred. But if they were able to
>re-create the shot using the original camera, there's not much
>doubt. If this had been a lens flare there would likely have
>been more than one image in the shot. The problem with camera
>lenses is that they have two sides and thickness.

Hi Don,

I would have to agree. I too wish there was more information at
the site noted.

My first impression, as posted here, was a reflection from a
light source behind the camera, like you said.

Only after reading the info at the site did I have to rethink.

But yes, a lens with a filter or even just the lens itself
provides ample sources for reflection, totally aside from
typical lens flare.

At any rate, this case shows everyone how easy it is to get some
truly remarkable images of something that isn't really "there".

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:55:11 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:06:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:51:06 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:14:22 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

>Time for another Jerry Clark conjugation:

>- I make light-hearted banter.
>- You make weirdly defensive responses.

>And it's not for me to say whether any of the women involved
>with sceptics groups in Britain are or are not Pelicanists.
>Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
>qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only they
>know what the silly term means.

A rose by any other name would smell as sweetly, Mr. Rimmer,
even as your own name enters the new lexicon.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 15:59:16 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:11:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies - Boone

>From: Diane Harrison <aufor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 08:35:55 +1000
>Subject: Re: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 4 Dec 2004 15:39:58 EST
>>Subject: Woman Wins Lawsuits Against Movies

>>Woman Wins Lawsuits Against 'The Matrix' & 'The Terminator'
>>Movies!

>><http://www.slccglobelink.com/main.cfm/include/detail/storyid/785067.html>

>>I am so blown away at this story!

>><snip>

>>Shows you why the media suppresses stories. It's not in their
>>best interest monetarily, socially to bring the truth to the
>>people but they'll sure as heck hide behind the 1st Amendment.

>Sorry Greg: a correction from the same source:

>>In reference to the recent article entitled "Mother of the
>Matrix Victorious," some information has been deemed misleading.

>Ms. Sophia Stewart has not yet won her case against Joel Silver,
>Time Warner and the Wachowski Bros. The decision on October 4th
>enabled Ms. Stewart to proceed with her case, as all attempts to
>have it dismissed were unsuccessful. Ms. Stewart's case will
>proceed through the Central District Court of California.

>In this case someone was a little to quick off the mark.

><http://tinyurl.com/3vpmz>

Diane, yep, we sent out the correction afterwards but it still stands.

Ms. Stewart's case is still rolling along more powerful than before and if you'd have tuned in to the hundreds of radio, tv and print interviews you'd see same.

The article wasn't wrong, it was printed outside of the time space continuum thingie. :) aka prophecy.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:23:42 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:16:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 12:39:19 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might
>>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

>We are all entitled to our disagreements, but why make an
>assumption when so many courses of action are possible? Suppose
>the advanced alien craft crashed and aliens responded by landing
>at the site to clean up the crash just as the army jeeps were
>arriving or an army plane was flying in the vicinity. Photos of
>them doing so would serve a purpose if we could not scare them
>off with our mighty weapons of mass destruction (sorry I had to
>get that in).

Are the aliens anti-environmentalist and just go around leaving
behind hazardous wastes and dangerous hyperdrive ships just
anywhere?? Do they just leave their technology behind for other
aliens, possibly enemies, to pick up? What if it isn't even the
technology transfer to an enemy they are concerned about but
intelligence knowledge of their activities on a given planet?
Why leave behind evidence of their activities for potential
alien enemies? Haven't we already heard about alleged warring
races of aliens, so why would this reasoning be a surprise to
anyone on this List?

Why would highly advanced aliens stop retrieving their crashed
spaceship just because some army jeeps arrive? Why would they
stop there? Why couldn't they trace the wreckage to the
warehouse and retrieve it when no one was around or use
hypnosis, drugs, remote brain control EM emissions or paralysis
beams to knock out the guards and get their ship back?

Anyway this whole discussion violates fundamental principles of
logic and scientific reasoning, namely Occam's Razor, which
requires that the simplest explanations be eliminated first
before going on to the more complex. Here, the lowest level of
advanced ET civilization must be explored as a possibility
before resorting to highly advanced ET civilizations. This
thread is filled with arguments that jump back and forth between
high and low ET technology levels even within the same posting!
You can't have it both ways people! If the ET ships crash and
they don't bother to retrieve the remains, even for
environmental cleanup, then they must be at around our 21st
century level of technology and are physically and
technologically unable to clean up their crashes. This implies
certain limitations on the alien technology and their

capabilities which logically exclude suddenly making hogwash arguments about the aliens being billions of years ahead of us and therefore inscrutable, so don't bother even discussing the matter! Either they are at about our level of 21st century technology and therefore sometimes crash their ships and are unable to retrieve it or they are not! Ideas have consequences. People on this List seem to want to avoid the consequences of their theories as soon as their pet theories run into logical or scientific trouble - and that's when they abruptly invoke Arthur C. Clarke's Law (whether they know it by name or not), that aliens are so far ahead of us they must seem like "magic" to us, in order to get out of the jam.

>Any rate, what the aliens did or did not do, whether feasible is
>just speculation in the absence of examined evidence. Since the
>Roswell craft, if an ET spaceship of any kind, made such an
>historical impact on our civilization, and supposing that the
>retrieved parts were kept in a secure facility, they may one day
>be on display in a museum (my hopeful thinking).

What "historical impact on our civilization"?? I don't see any.
I see an impact on US policymakers in the late 40's and that's
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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Peter Jennings Focuses On Matters Of The Media

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:28:37 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:17:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Peter Jennings Focuses On Matters Of The Media

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 05:03:59 -0800
>Subject: Peter Jennings Focuses On Matters Of The Media

>Source: The Houston Chronicle

><http://www.chron.com/cs/CDA/ssistory.mpl/ae/tv/3046641>

>02-18-05

>Local panelists discuss concerns
>Peter Jennings focuses on matters of the media
>By MIKE MCDANIEL
>Copyright 2005 Houston Chronicle

>Media bashing has become a favorite sport among armchair remote
>hogs and those who blaze and blog on the Internet. Sunday night,
>the pastime becomes more of a contact sport as members of the
>local community address their concerns with members of the local
>media face to face.

<snip>

>"However skeptical we begin, you come to the end of this
>believing people should have taken it more seriously (in the
>beginning). You certainly wish that of government. The
>government intention has been to dismiss the notion of UFOs. It
>creates a disconnect between the public and government
>credibility."

That last paragraph I can live with. There's a subtle moment of Hitchcockian terror there where Jennings says,

"However skeptical we begin, you come to the end of this believing people should have taken it more seriously (in the beginning)."

That says a mouthful.

Sounds like what people said after Noah shut the Ark door.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:05:00 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:19:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle to UFO Research

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 21:23:50 -0000
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 12:38:21 EST
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

<snip>

>If I were to appear on behalf of a client in Court and submit
>that the Judge should apply the proposed "Uncertainty Principle"
>to the evidence, I would be fairly confident that:

>(a) the Judge would not be impressed;

>(b) I would be opening myself up to a potential negligence claim
>by my client for failing to exercise reasonable skill and care.

>At least in the English Courts, a judge would be rather bemused
>by any suggestion that he is not to determine the case on
>anything other than "objective evidence".

My dad was a criminal court judge for 24 years - you can rest assured that Canadian judges would be similarly bemused, as, I suspect, would most south of the border (I say most because any country that elects some of its judges is probably going to end up with a greater proportion of idiots, more adept at raising money than interpreting evidence or applying the law, sitting on the bench).

I appeared before at least a couple of judges in my oh-so-brief legal career would would have gone beyond being "less than impressed." They would have told me to shut up and sit down.

>>The more I hear about the need for various scientific method
>>approaches in ufology, the more I come to realise that science
>>has less to do with it than the law

>Paul's observation is one that has been by various researchers
>(skeptics and ETH-proponents) in the past. Paul and some others
>might be interested if I draw a few of the relevant comments
>together and if I (as a barrister) then go on to make a few
>comments:

Ahh - it's always nice to see the use of the word Barrister, especially when our American cousins insist on "Attorney". As a sidenote, I was introduced at a conference in the United States recently as a member of the Nova Scotia Bannister's Society, after which I had to explain to the audience that I was a Barrister, and had no idea what a Bannister's society was, but that it sounded vaguely painful.

<snip>

>(a) Peter Brookesmith has suggested that "Judging where the
>truth lies in UFO cases is more like considering evidence in a

>courtroom than it is like scientific investigation"

Where witnesses are concerned, this is absolutely the case. With physical evidence (soil traces, for example) there is a greater need for science.

<snip>

>(c) Philip J. Klass : "An experienced trial lawyer, who is familiar with the often widely divergent testimony of eyewitnesses, a criminal investigator or investigative journalist who is intrinsically wary of accepting statements of act without deep probing and perhaps some 'discounting', is much better qualified in many respects for the role of a UFO investigator than is a physical scientist.

Ohmigod - I agree with Phil Klass. Wow. I hope that doesn't make me a Pelicanist.

<snip>

>An experimental psychologist, experienced in the inherent limitations of human perception and recall, would place far less credence in UFO reports from pilots, police officers and airport-tower operators than would a physicist or an astronomer, and with good reason.

Okay, I knew it was too good to last. Beware Klasskurtzian amplifiers liek "Far less" and "with good reason" - with "good reason" I might add.

<snip>

>More fundamental and far-reaching analyses of the distinction (in the context of ufology) between the legal framework and the scientific framework have been published by several individuals. >I have found the following two to be particularly interesting:

>(a) Don Donderi's essay entitled "Science, Law and War: Alternative Frameworks for the UFO Evidence" (which appears as Chapter 3 at pages 56-81 in "UFOs and Abductions: Challenging the Borders of Knowledge" (2000) (edited by David Jacobs)). This is the most detailed discussion I have read of the applicability of legal standards of evidence and methodology to ufological issues. Donderi's essay begins with the following comments which indicate the objective and conclusion of his essay : "Science is not the only profession that collects and analyzes evidence. To put the almost complete rejection of the UFO evidence by scientists into perspective, I contrast the goals and methods of the scientific community with those of two other professional communities: the legal profession and the profession of military intelligence analysis. Lawyers and military analysts use evidence differently and have different rules for understanding it. Comparing law and military intelligence with science highlights the weaknesses of the scientific method and suggests that lawyers and military intelligence analysts are trained to do a better job when scientists when it comes to evaluating the UFO evidence".

I agree with this wholeheartedly. Of course, as a lawyer, I would. The truth is, there's room for everyone in the field of ufology, so long as they employ the proper methodology. A non-lawyer can still teach themselves, or be taught by others, to employ the skills of a lawyer, or a historian trained in oral research methodology, or a psychiatrist, at least to the point of being able to use the basic concepts in their own research. We non-scientists, similarly, are never going to build a nuclear reactor, but we are capable of understanding the basic principles. Ditto space flight.

I remain uncertain about just who, exactly, is going to provide us all with education in the underlying methodology of exopolitics, however. Perhaps a course taught by Jerry Springer?

<snip>

>Apart from areas within which lawyers might be expected to have directly applicable skills (e.g. in relation to Freedom of Information Act issues, interviewing of witnesses etc), the basic skills and concepts used and developed by lawyers may have a wider role. Given the nature of the debate within Ufology, it is surprising that lawyers appear not to have a more active role

>in the discussions.

Not really surprising to me. Most of them work long hours, and the last thing they'd want to do, unless they were already interested in the UFO phenomenon, would be to spend their free time doing for free the same things they do at work.

<snip>

>Personally, I consider the major contribution that lawyers could >make to ufology in its present state is at a far more pragmatic >level. To reduce the amount of reinvention of the wheel within >ufology it appears to me to be worth giving further >consideration to the fact and issue management tools used by >lawyers (particularly in factually complex cases).

>For example, under the present civil litigation procedure in >England in large commercial cases, the parties to litigation are >expected to co-operate in various respects so as to make a case >fit for trial in as efficient and fair a manner as possible. >This involves, at the most basic level, producing various agreed >(and therefore non-contentiously drafted) documents so that the >trial judge will be able to understand the nature of the dispute >and the issues in dispute as efficiently as possible. Even if >not directed to jointly produce such documents by the judge, the >parties may jointly prepare such documents in an attempt to >narrow the issues between themselves, or draft documents >themselves in a non-contentious manner to assist the Court.

This is quite a sensible suggestion. In order to put my money where my mouth is, I will do just that for one of my favourite cases - Aztec - (Roswell would be too easy), and post it on our website at www.redstarfilm.com within the next three weeks. I'll post a notice on Updates when it's done.

<snip>

>Second, given that ufology and lawyers are both the subject of a >considerable amount of humour/ridicule, it was perhaps >inevitable that jokes would emerge which combine these two >popular topics. The following joke is littered all over the >Internet:

>Q: What do honest lawyers and UFOs have in common?

>A: You always hear about them, but you never see them.

That one never gets old:)

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:11:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:22:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 21:23:50 -0000
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 12:38:21 EST
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

<snip>

>>The more I hear about the need for various scientific method
>>approaches in ufology, the more I come to realise that science
>>has less to do with it than the law <snip>

>Paul's observation is one that has been by various researchers
>(skeptics and ETH-proponents) in the past. Paul and some others
>might be interested if I draw a few of the relevant comments
>together and if I (as a barrister) then go on to make a few
>comments:

>(a) Peter Brookesmith has suggested that "Judging where the
>truth lies in UFO cases is more like considering evidence in a
>courtroom than it is like scientific investigation" (see his
>"UFO: The Complete Sightings Catalogue" (1995) at page 171 (in
>Appendix 9) of the BCA hardback edition (with the same page
>numbering in the Blitz hardback edition, and in the Barnes &
>Noble edition published under the title "UFO: The Complete
>Sightings").

snip

>(c) Philip J. Klass : "An experienced trial lawyer, who is
>familiar with the often widely divergent testimony of
>eyewitnesses, a criminal investigator or investigative
>journalist who is intrinsically wary of accepting statements of
>act without deep probing and perhaps some 'discounting', is much
>better qualified in many respects for the role of a UFO
>investigator than is a physical scientist.

Years ago I realized that UFO investigation, because it includes
an investigation (of some sort) of the witness, is like a
criminal investigation because "seeing/reporting a UFO is a
crime" (against conventional science). In that regard,
investigation of the sighting report itself (apart from the
reporter) is like "forensic science" or, as a friend said to me
some 20 years ago, "what you do is forensic physics."

A "crime" has been committed (the report). The report must be
analyzed to find out "how the crime was committed" or, if
something truly unexplainable actually occurred.

This is the forensic physics: try to explain the report in terms
of a conventional phenomenon (could it have been an airplane, a
balloon, Venus, the moon, etc.).

At the same time it is necessary to evaluate the witness(es) to
try to determine whether or not the report itself is accurate

(was it a hoax? a result of mental problems?).

In some cases I have been put into the position of the "defense lawyer", trying to rebut the critics when I think the sighting is true.

The example of this with the longest time duration by far is the Trent case, against there were numerous "attacks" by the "prosecution". Many of these attacks involved the photos themselves and the attacks could only be rebutted by detailed physical analyses i.e., forensic physics (brightnesses of shadows, physics of photography, physics of the atmosphere, etc.)

The truth and accuracy of the witnesses themselves were attacked by the prosecution and these had to be rebutted one way or another by the defense before the "jury" of other interested UFO investigators (and skeptics and debunkers).

The point is, that, yes, UFO investigation can be more like a criminal investigation than like normal science.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:15:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:24:27 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: William Matchen <heyzeus321.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 14:46:28 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>I sent an e-mail the the Metropolitan Washington Airports
>Authority and asked if any flights arrived or departed from
>ronald reagan national airport on Feb 10, 2005 at 3:15 am.

>Here's the response I got:

<snip>

>2005. According to the operations log for the 10th of February
>there were no arrivals, or departures, around 3:15 A.M. There

<snip>

Not surprising. Of course the source of the unexpected lights
could have been a helicopter that didn't land at Reagan or even
some private plane.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Michel

From: Lyle Michel <courtroomevidence456.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:47:21 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:28:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Michel

Roswell involved at least two craft of an extraterrestrial origin! There are buckets full of eyewitnesses to the event! If you are confused about what constitutes courtroom type evidence I suggest you look it up in a legal dictionary or on the Internet!

To believe that the crash of extraterrestrial vehicles in the area of Roswell New Mexico did not happen in 1947 is on par with the extraterrestrials trying to figure out whether earthlings need to eat in order to live!

I hope this will make sense to most of you!

Lyle Michel

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:05:37 -0700
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:29:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Connors

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 22:23:02 -1000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrrgroup.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

>Wendy, can you please clear up my confusion by letting me know
>what "fezzic" means?

>Thanks,

Hi Josh,

Sure. It means a person who acts jicky.

Wendy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Jennings Explores ABCs Of UFOs

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:22:36 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:31:40 -0500
Subject: Jennings Explores ABCs Of UFOs

I knew they'd throw Art Bell into the mix. At least he admits that he has crazies on his show. :-)

Source: The Washington Post

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A26961-2005Feb15.html>

Jennings Explores ABCs of UFOs

By Kathy Blumenstock
Washington Post Staff Writer
Sunday, February 20, 2005; Page Y06

Flying saucers and strange beings who have visited Earth aren't the typical topics reported by Peter Jennings, anchor of ABC's "World News Tonight." Jennings, whose new two-hour special tackles the subject of UFOs, admits he and his production team began the project with doubts and a dose of curiosity.

"We have a lot of skeptics - I am very skeptical - but we seriously investigated something a lot of people are serious about," he said. "And when we come to the end, this is wonderfully interesting.

"More than 80 million Americans believe intelligent beings from somewhere else have come here," he said. "Forty million believe they have seen UFOs, so this is of deep interest to people."

Produced for ABC News by Jennings's production company, which also has delved into the JFK assassination conspiracy theories, the program examines the UFO phenomenon from an early milestone: a 1947 sighting by a man named Kenneth Arnold.

Segments include visits to the Center for UFO Studies outside Chicago, where files bulge with reports of sightings, and to a radio talk show on "UFology." That show's host, Art Bell, cites among his 18 million weekly listeners "the most informed UFOlogists, the best scientists and some of the craziest people you'll ever meet."

Spanning the range of believers and skeptics, sightings and science, the show includes interviews "with people in so many traditional, trusted walks of life - cops, pilots, detectives, scientists, historians," Jennings said. "All with their own views, but all who have taken this seriously."

Some of those interviewed describe what they have seen in the sky, from mysterious lights to giant hovering triangular objects.

In 1997, hundreds of people reported seeing a large craft move slowly over Phoenix. In 2000, police officers from five different departments spotted a strange object in St. Clair County, Ill. The police-radio relays describe the low-flying, brightly lit object being tracked.

With no videotape of the sightings, Jennings's program uses

sophisticated animation to illustrate each incident. Photographs were taken of the locations, duplicating weather conditions and time of day, then witnesses' descriptions were used to depict the event.

"In every piece of animation, we talked to the eyewitnesses, built the animation according to what they said, then went back to show them," Jennings said. "And they'd respond, 'No, it was bigger,' or, 'The nose was redder.' So ultimately what we have is animation that accurately reflects what you hear the eyewitnesses describe."

Executive producer Tom Yellin said the UFO field is "a risky thing to report since it doesn't go with the conventional wisdom that this stuff is kind of silly, and the whole subject has been tainted by the brush of wackiness."

Like Jennings, Yellin initially had reservations about devoting a program to UFOs. "I thought it was all a bunch of baloney. Even though it has public appeal, you don't want to do something that subjects you to ridicule just to get a rating."

But Yellin discovered "a tremendous amount of information that deserves further examination.

"The U.S. government and every government has a policy of knocking [UFO reports] down, and that is very different from covering it up," he said. "The field has been abandoned to kooks and amateurs, and we felt it was worth looking at more closely."

One segment of the show highlights "Operation Blue Book," a lightly staffed department run by the Air Force during the 1950s and '60s. The office's purpose was to debunk reports of UFO sightings that poured in.

"There was one scientist assigned to it for its entire existence," Jennings said of J. Allen Hynek. "He started off dismissive and became a believer. Then he spent the rest of his life trying to get people to believe him."

Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - seeing is believing

Thursday at 8 p.m. on ABC

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 22:14:24 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:35:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:41:14 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:39:29 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>Yes, the important thing is hard evidence of crashed UFO
>>hardware. Then we are getting somewhere.

>Frankly James, I am truly impressed with your proclamations
>about perfect infallible aliens for which you provide not a whit
>of any kind of evidence, but then you demand access to hard
>evidence of crashed saucers.! That takes chutzpah. One would
>think you had studied a myriad of alien civilizations, their
>accident rates, travel technology, etc. Witness testimony isn't
>good enough for you.It is good enough to lead to the death
>penalty in Texas.

>I think you have been reading too much science fiction. Come on
>out to the real world fallible as it may be.

Hi Stan,

Just butting in to mention that here in Texas... at least since
the Bush years... getting the death penalty requires much less
than witness testimony. Heck, if they don't have the evidence
they need, they just make it up in the crime lab.

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Pelicanist - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 22:29:49 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:37:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - King

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 22:23:02 -1000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrrgroup.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>><snip>

>>I don't know whether your fezzic nature is to blame or if you
>>really are a PsychOps plant using UFO Updates. But, I really
>>think your saucer is tilted and level flight beyond your
>>capability.

>I don't disagree with your post but I must question your use of
>the term "fezzic nature". I could not find fezzic in any
>dictionary so I must ask you whether it means wearing
>a fez?

<snip>

Hi Josh,

I took her word to mean like the rather oafish big guy in the
absolutely wonderful film "Princess Bride", played by Andre the
Giant. He neither wore a fez, nor was he a Moroccan in the film,
and in a manner of speaking he was a hero. But he was oafish and
innocently simplistic, which is where I thought the word fit.

I could be and probably am wrong, but how delicious the analogy.

No offense, Rich, Fezzic was just alright with me. <g>

Hope this helps.

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO -

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 20:51:48 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:39:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO -

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:49:38 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 06:42:45 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

><snip>

>>Yet he was a preeminent social scientist, and his MD makes him
>>something of a conventional scientist. Moreover, he held a chair
>>at the center of the bastion that is the man. One would think
>>he'd hold something of a keynote instead of complete dismissal.
>>His complete, virtually death-bed, exclusion is, at best,
>>ill-advised. At worst?

>I didn't mean to start any talk of conspiracy when I announced
>the news about John's last interview being omitted from the
>program.

<snip>

I can only speculate why Dr. Mack may be left out of the program.

From my point of view it would be possible that they decided to not including him despite all his work in the subject because he had lost his professional objectivity and detachment by wrapping it all up within his own spiritual concepts.

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:54:57 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:41:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Hall

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:51:06 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
>qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only they
>know what the silly term means.

A sqawking bird with wildly flapping wings and oversized jaws
typically stuffed with dead fish?

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:22:46 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:45:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:18:11 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:11:27 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:32:51 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 07:21:52 -0800
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 10:04:01 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

><snip>

>>>>>It is ludicrous to speculate that beings who have invested
>>>>>tremendous resources to come to this planet will have designed
>>>>>vehicles that could crash. A robotic probe that crashes would be
>>>>>make sense because the cargo would not be as valuable, but I
>>>>>assume that they place some value on their lives and also
>>>>>realise the risk they are placing on their entire civilization
>>>>>by allowing their technology to be obtained and backward
>>>>>engineered by potentially hostile humans.

What evidence is there that anybody has designed vehicles that
will never crash?

>>>>>I disagree with this. As our own aviation development advances
>>>>>toward better technology, we have seen some of our most advanced
>>>>>airplanes crash. Planes like the F-16 with fly-by-wire systems
>>>>>have experienced numerous crashes. Army UH-1 helicopters have
>>>>>experienced anomalous EM signals which have caused their
>>>>>electronic systems to go haywire and crash. And these crashes
>>>>>occur despite our familiarity with the environment. Two of our
>>>>>space shuttles did not fare well either.

>>>>>Consider an extraterrestrial craft operating in an alien
>>>>>environment where an unanticipated source of interference could
>>>>>not be handled fast enough to recover. It could happen and may
>>>>>have happened.

><snip>

>>>>I disagree with your disagreement. Advanced alien civilizations
>>>>would not leave behind their crashes, if any, but would retrieve
>>>>them to prevent their technology from getting into other hands
>>>>(like ours). Only aliens who are at about our own level might

>>>not have the technological capability to clean up their crashes.

Truly amazing that anybody claims they know how advanced alien civilizations would behave.. aside from the fact that the wreckage might have been picked up by the locals before the aliens could return .

>>Or just the opposite, aliens much ahead of us know that we >>already have wreckage and have not been able to duplicate the >>propulsion system even for the Earth Excursion Modules. Why >>worry?

>Are you saying that to date in 2005 the Roswell ET spaceship >propulsion has not been successfully duplicated on Earth?

I have not seen any evidence that the mode of propulsion has not only been determined(First step) but duplicated. Why build F-16, F-17, F 18, Mig 29, Mirage aircraft - if we have duplicated the propulsion system of alien flying saucers?

>In other postings I've pointed out the environmental hazards and >other dangers of leaving wreckage behind instead of cleaning up >the messes. Are you saying highly advanced aliens would be >anti-environmentalist and careless about cleanups?

I have no idea how they feel about the environment. It is pretty clear that we Earthlings don't much care.

I am saying that crashes get retrieved quickly enough by the locals so that alien littering would not seem to be a problem. There is an awful lot of space out there without tourists. Stand at the crash locations on the Foster Ranch and in the Plains of San Agustin... very few humans around.I was with a group of Japanese journalists. We drove 54 miles without seeing another person. Note, too, that there are numerous retrieval teams ready to go to crash sites, provide security and haul off wreckage.. ours or theirs.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:40:55 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:48:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Brad Sparkks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 16:57:59 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:48:33 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:08:49 +1000
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

><snip>

>>>>Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
>>>>landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
>>>>recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
>>>>evidence?

><snip>

How would any of us know without appropriate clearances and
need-to-know?

>>With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a
>>multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy,
>>the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

>The "Manhattan Project" (that was never its official name) was
>not set up by the President and run by a committee of top
>interagency directors, generals and scientists. Yes that refutes
>the "Majestic 12" model right there.

Hardly. Vannevar Bush, in his Oral History - at MIT - said that
the Manhattan Engineering District (I think more people
understand Manhattan Project) was co-ordinated by weekly meetings
without secretaries, minutes, or agendas.

Those present were General Groves, Dr. Bush, Dr. Conant and
Secretary of War Henry Stimson - a Republican at that - sounds
very similar to me.

Obviously there was a war on and huge facilities were needed to
make Plutonium and separate Uranium 235. But the idea was still
the same: set up a separate group with access to the President
and not under control of the various military or intelligence
agencies. The NSC would provide an interface. It appears that the
NRO and NSA have some similar characteristics as well.. Many
military personnel are seconded to the NSA, for example.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 20](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:44:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:54:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 09:30:47 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:33:39 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:47:04 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>I think we can guarantee that even if Stan Friedman is not the
>>>only 'serious ufologist' to take Roswell as the crash of an
>>>alien space craft, he is certainly the only such ufologist to go
>>>along with there being two, yes two, crashes on that same day,
>>>i.e. one at a site (one of four postulated in the literature)
>>>near Roswell, and another on the Plains of San Augustin.

>>Lots of garbage is postulated in the literature including a
>>Frank Kaufmann site which had no real support in the first
>>place. Some even postulate the moon is made of green >>cheese.So?

>>>Why not ask for a show of 'hands' on those who believe
>>>there were two UFO crashes within 100 miles of each other
>>>on the same day?

Why not throw darts at a dart board?

>>Ever hear of mid-air collisions? 40% of the more than 800
>>sightings in Bloecher's 1947 Wave report involved more than
>>one UFO being observed at a time.....

>>>By the way, there is not one shred of documentation of any
>>>kind to indicate a second such crash. Not even a press
>>>report. Merely a person who spoke to Stan in 1978
>>>following a lecture he gave. This guy did not recall the date,
>>>and only heard the story from a third party (Barney Barnett),
>>>nearly 30 years earlier. Even Barnett had no memory of the
>>>date. Yet Stan has built a totally fanciful case for a July 1947
>>>occurrence for this event, when there is nothing to show it
>>>happened then, or at any other time.

>>Talk about fanciful!!

>>Try and do your homework, CDA.

>>Don't forget Barnett's boss Fleck Danley, his neighbor Harold
>>Baca, from across the street, and William Leed, military
>>officer, etc.

>>Testimony from circumstantial quite respectable witnesses.

Also add in Alice Knight, niece of Barney and Ruth. Especially
important is the large amount of research, much of it on site,
by Art Campbell.

>>How do you know Barnett had no memory of the date? Out
>>of body contact with the dead? It was his boss who came up
>>with the date after thinking on it. Barney was dead before we
>>started our investigation so we couldn't ask him. There were
>>others like the Datil Postmistress and a rancher, Marvin Ake..

>Nobody has ever come up with a date for the Plains crash.
>Stan should read his own literature. True, someone suggested it
>might have been in the summer of 1947, but that is as far as it
>got.

Early July was stated by Barney's boss, Ruth's Diary points in
that direction as well.

>Certainly no month and day.

Baloney.

>Stan has tried to weave this second
>'crash' into the Roswell legend for his own purposes.

>Stan: There was, I recall, a conference under Michael Swords
>as chairman, on this subject where you tried hard to convince
>other Roswell investigators about this second crash, but they
>did not buy it. You had the worst of the debate.

You obviously weren't there and don't know that to be true.

>It mainly
>revolved around the dubious 1947 date. Among other things,
>the archaeologists were there in 1946 not 47.

Certainly not all bought it... just as not all of us bought the
Kaufmann story. Which archeologists? Buskirk was in the area in
1947. Archeologist Robert J. Drake was there in 1947. I wrote a
detailed rebuttal in 1992. Randle had falsely claimed that 3
archeologists Hibben and Dick among them, had been in the Plains
and had seen nothing in the summer of 1947. Neither one was
there, so of course they hadn't seen anything. Another
Archeologist, Dr. Frank Wilmuth, had told Drake of hearing of
the Plains crash while working at Los Alamos. He was out of town
when I called his home and died less than a month later before I
called back.

>Strange this crash got left out of the MJ-12 briefing, isn't it?

Why strange? It was a "preliminary" briefing. The Plains case
had had no public discussion, no press. An almost intact saucer
would have been much more important than pieces of wreckage. It
would have been relatively easy to transport over to White Sands
or up to Kirtland. That county is the least populated (per
square mile) county in New Mexico... despite plenty of
competition.

CDA, perhaps you mean well by your faulty carping. At least try
and get the facts straight instead of making them up as you go
along. You did the same with with Menzel.. claiming everybody
knew of his intelligence work and giving a reference. The
reference said nothing about Menzel's intensive Postwar work
with the CIA, NSA, and 30 other companies. It noted he had been
in the navy during WW 2. The surprise was the Post WW 2 work

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Richardson

From: **Geoff Richardson** <geoff.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:09:52 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 09:50:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Richardson

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:54:57 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:51:06 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

><snip>

>>Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
>>qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only they
>>know what the silly term means.

>Ufologists - United in their doubts, divided by their convictions.

Who said that?

Geoff Richardson

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:11:23 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:02:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>The idea of radical misperception is not something invented by
>CSICOPERS or even Magonian pelicanists but is something that has
>been discovered by a number of front line investigators over the
>years, as much as a surprise to them as anyone else. Perhaps
>radical misperceptions are one of those new pieces of
>knowledge that can be gained from ufology.

Sorry Peter, this is nonsense. We've seen it demonstrated time and again on this List that people who use this phrase "radical misperception" have virtually no understanding of perception. How can you possibly claim to have discovered new principles of science when you don't even know what the old ones are?

I guess what is happening here, is that people are coming across examples of human perception which are so counterintuitive, and violate their expectations of how perception ought to work in such a fundamental way, that they are inferring that human perception must be susceptible to some sort of spontaneous error-generating mechanism. Unfortunately, if they take the trouble to learn something about the science of perception in the first place, they are likely to find that what is going on can usually (and perhaps always) be explained in terms of well-understood perceptual mechanisms.

If there's one aspect of the Magonian mindset that I find truly bizarre, it's this illogical obsession with "radical misperception". It's a manifestation of the same kind of reasoning that leads people to believe they've discovered cold fusion in a beer bottle.

<snip>

>But UFO reports are just reports of things that are puzzling to
>the witness, and 90-95% are described as IFOs by non pelicanist
>Ufologists. Some British Ufologists feel that the number of (non
>obvious) IFO cases is as low as 2%. Though CSICOP-ers know
>that the null hypothesis is true and Ufologists know that it
>is false, in reality very little of the detailed critical
>investigation that would be needed to resolve the issue has gone
>on. Most UFO investigation is really just the assemblage of
>evidence to bank up the investigators preconceptions and both
>sides spin like Mandelson and Campbell

This is undeniably true. But I think you need to distinguish very clearly between the null hypothesis and "radical misperception" and other psychosocial hypotheses. And regardless of whether the null hypothesis is testable, I think it's clear the psychosocial hypotheses aren't.

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

'Jesus' Said There's No Life Out There

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:24:54 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:06:25 -0500
Subject: 'Jesus' Said There's No Life Out There

Here in Los Angeles on the huge radio station KFI 640am, each Sunday there is actually a "Jesus Christ Show" where people call in and ask "Jesus" questions.

These questions run the gamut from what color was Moses' hair to what was the price of pizza B.C.

Well, today a woman who called in had been upset as she had been up that night listening to Coast To Coast AM with Art Bell.

Art's guest that night was good ol' Timothy Good who put on such a good show there were goosebumps a plenty.

As you can tell Art and Tim had this woman's cage rattled a tad and she calls 'Jesus' to tell him her husband had seen 'alien ships' in formation when he was in the military in New Mexico. I assume it was during WWII.

Here I was waiting for a neat-nifty response from the broadcaster who portrays 'Jesus' as he often has the brightest, to the point answers that blow away confusion and nonsense.

Nope, instead he makes with the wisecracks about UFOs and New Mexico. He did emphasize the definition of UFO and that her husband did not see an alien ship because there is no life outside of Earth.

He ran the gamut as to why no aliens exist and that it's too far to travel, yadda yadda yadda.

By the time he got done I was sweating it out remembering that scene in War Of The Worlds where Uncle Matthew the reverend...

Well you know.

Saturday night's C2C show really rocked. Bell and Good even had a chap, a devout Christian call in and they had a gentlemanly go at it. When done, both sides seemed more enlightened.

Lucky for me I grew up around top theologians and had ties to the orthodox folks back in Europe, Africa, Asia. When I would ask these folks about UFOs, life in space etc. it was no big deal to them. They were more concerned with why Americans were so thick headed to believe that God would be so limited to one planet.

From orthodox Christian, Jew, Muslim, I got the same response.

I've got this odd feeling that this upcoming ABC UFO Special is going to really be something in television history.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of

From: Paul Anderson <paulanderson.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:39:02 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:20:39 -0500
Subject: Re: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:38:06 -0600
>Subject: Re: NASA Statement On False Claim Of Evidence Of Life On Mars

>Man oh man, does this reek or what?

>First Formisano, and now this. Is the fix in, or are these folks
>all wrong now?

>I guess if it doesn't come from O'Keefe's letterhead itself, it
>ain't true after all.

>Boy, the web is getting tangled. But are we being deceived...?

It should be noted that the Stoker/Lemke fiasco is entirely separate from Formisano's work, where he is still scheduled to give his new presentation on Mars methane, formaldehyde and water at ESA's first Mars Express Science Conference in Holland next week on February 24 - see Programme section of web site:

<http://www.congrex.nl/05C05>

The same day as the Peter Jennings program, as it happens. :-)

Also:

<http://www.newscientist.com/article.ns?id=dn7014>

Plus a new update this week regarding Mars' possible past seas or lakes, with additional evidence now from Mars Express that they were apparently more widespread than Opportunity's more localized initial evidence was able to show:

<http://www.newscientist.com/article.ns?id=dn7026>

http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/mars_water_050217.html

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6989486>

Also from Mars Express, a possible current and frozen sea or lake with surface pack-ice - to be published in Nature magazine and discussed at the Lunar and Planetary Science Conference 2005 on March 18:

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/meetings/lpsc2005/pdf/1741.pdf>

<http://tinyurl.com/45klb>

(Google translation of German article)

Paul

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:41:29 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:21:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Groff

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:05:37 -0700
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 22:23:02 -1000
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

><snip>

>>Wendy, can you please clear up my confusion by letting me know
>>what "fezzic" means?

>Sure. It means a person who acts jicky.

I think "fezzic" and "jicky" are perfectly cromulent words and
their usage embiggens us all.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:04:38 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:23:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:41:14 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:39:29 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>Yes, the important thing is hard evidence of crashed UFO
>>hardware. Then we are getting somewhere.

>Frankly James, I am truly impressed with your proclamations
>about perfect infallible aliens for which you provide not a whit
>of any kind of evidence, but then you demand access to hard
>evidence of crashed saucers.! That takeschutzpah. One would
>think you had studied a myriad of alien civilizations, their
>accident rates, travel technology, etc. Witness testimony isn't
>good enough for you. It is good enough to lead to the death
>penalty in Texas .

I respect you Mr. Friedman. You have done much good work in the
UFO area, as well as non-UFO areas.

I am hardly making proclamations. I am stating that
probabilities imply certain things. If I have not stated that
clearly then I am sorry.

I do not see any problem with extrapolating technology based on
our human experiences. If you claim that UFOs are caused by
aliens near our own technology level, then I must counter that
this is very unlikely based on probabilities. It seems odd to me
that you think aliens (if they are the cause of UFOs) have the
same technology level as us. The probabilities imply that if any
aliens are visiting, then they would have been spacefaring for
thousands of years.

I respect some witness testimony when it describes UFO craft
behavior and even alien abductions. But a crashed alien UFO
story, just as dead alien story is much more far fetched than
the "I saw a weird like in the sky last night" story. Therefore,
requesting hard proof doesn't seem too much to ask.

I will concede that if the crashed "UFOs" are actually human
technology then it can likely crash, as we have seen in the
past.

>I think you have been reading too much science fiction. Come on
>out to the real world fallible as it may be.

Sir, I work in the real world of space travel. I do not read
science fiction (although I liked Hitchhiker's Guide). Although
I see an occasional science fiction TV program, I dislike TV in
general and watch no more than 1 hour a day.

In the various technical areas of space travel, I can say,
because I have witnessed it, that the goal is to make the
spacecraft/space suit/space hardware ever more reliable. I think

it is valid to assume a high probability exists that ALL alien races that do space travel would go through this kind of phase. Examining our own current goals (technology roadmaps) I see many references to highly reliable, safe space hardware. In fact, it would be extremely likely that aliens have the reliability "art" down to such an automated method based on real-life historical data that it is cheap to do. The whole point to having spacecraft is to perform a mission. What sense is there to make spacecraft that cannot perform the mission because they are always crashing?

Science fiction would be visitations by non-corporeal entities who really don't need spaceships. I can't guess whether this has happened on Earth.

Consider the continuum of possible alien races. Restructuring galaxies may not be beyond the abilities of high end races. Building new elementary particles from scratch would be easy. Nanotechnology would be ancient history. A race a thousand years beyond ours should be infallible in our eyes at least.

My main question is why do we even see any evidence of UFOs at all given their advanced abilities. They may not care if we see them, but I guess they would not want pieces of them gathered for inspection and use and likely would not design disposable spacecraft and crew.

Just my opinion.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:42:58 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:25:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:22:46 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>What evidence is there that anybody has designed vehicles that
>will never crash?

Technology extrapolations (admittedly very inaccurate) imply that it will eventually become possible to reduce the number of crashes to a very low number. Sure we can't do that now. We are limited by economics, energy, mass, computer speed. But it is safe to assume (highly probable) that the number of alien vehicle crashes on our planet from a race >1000 years in advance of ours would be so low that we would not likely witness one. And even if it should occur, there would be backups to quarantine/recover the crashed ship/crew far superior/faster than anything we could muster.

>>Are you saying that to date in 2005 the Roswell ET spaceship
>>propulsion has not been successfully duplicated on Earth?

>I have not seen any evidence that the mode of propulsion has not
>only been determined(First step) but duplicated. Why build F-16,
>F-17, F 18, Mig 29, Mirage aircraft - if we have duplicated the
>propulsion system of alien flying saucers?

Yes, no evidence. But if there is some way we have the alien technology, via purposeful "crash" or alien charity or some other arcane method, then it seems likely for our government to other aliens, protection against nuclear attacks). Thus, they must continue with prosaic aircraft and spacecraft development programs.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Jennings Explores ABCs Of UFOs - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:50:10 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:27:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Jennings Explores ABCs Of UFOs - Boone

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:22:36 -0600
>Subject: Jennings Explores ABCs Of UFOs

>I knew they'd throw Art Bell into the mix. At least he admits
>that he has crazies on his show. :-)

>-----

>Source: The Washington Post

><http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A26961-2005Feb15.html>

>Jennings Explores ABCs of UFOs

>By Kathy Blumenstock
>Washington Post Staff Writer
>Sunday, February 20, 2005; Page Y06

<snip>

>Executive producer Tom Yellin said the UFO field is "a risky
>thing to report since it doesn't go with the conventional wisdom
>that this stuff is kind of silly, and the whole subject has been
>tainted by the brush of wackiness."

Yeah, sort of like mainstream politics.

>Like Jennings, Yellin initially had reservations about devoting
>a program to UFOs. "I thought it was all a bunch of baloney.
>Even though it has public appeal, you don't want to do something
>that subjects you to ridicule just to get a rating."

Being subjected to ridicule often means mankind has taken a
quantum leap forward to new discoveries. Just ask the Wright
Brothers.

>But Yellin discovered "a tremendous amount of information that
>deserves further examination.

Now this is what I'm looking for. Acknowledgement that there is
something there worthy of attention.

>"The U.S. government and every government has a policy of
>knocking [UFO reports] down, and that is very different from
>covering it up," he said. "The field has been abandoned to kooks
>and amateurs, and we felt it was worth looking at more closely."

Say fellow Kooks and Amateurs, what say we send Yellin a bunch
of e-cards with pics of Mr. Yuck on them. After all the research
he's done for this special his conclusion is that we're all
kooks and amateurs?

Also notice how he focuses on the government thing. Every
government knocking down UFO reports. I hope he covers that with
some stats in the special as that would be awesome. Hope they
asked these government folks why they knocked the UFO reports
down.

Best ,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 14:02:40 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:32:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:31:19 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:48:33 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:08:49 +1000
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>The most important question of all remains unanswered:

>>>>Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
>>>>landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
>>>>recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
>>>>evidence?

>>Do you have any idea how many places there are above and
>>underground for which there is no access without a high level
>>clearance and a need to know? In case you hadn't noticed the USA
>>is a very large country.

>Wholly irrelevant. In fact the UK government has enough space in
>this small country to store alien craft & bodies if it really
>>wanted to. Such as in that tunnel linking Rudloe Manor to
>Whitehall. (ha!)

>But that is not really the point. The point is: Why should the
>US still want to keep such a discovery under wraps after 6
>decades? And how have they managed to keep this awful secret
>for so long when another crash could occur at any time in
>Russia, China, Australia, etc.? Do you think other countries
>have some secret pact with the US to hand over such crashed
>saucers immediately?

>>The last time I checked, New Mexico alone was twice the size of
>>England and Wales combined and NM is only the 5th largest state!
>>There are thousands of square miles one can't even fly over. The
>>amount of space for hiding wreckage and documents is truly
>>enormous.

>What on earth has the size of New Mexico got to do with it?
>See above.

>>>>If it did indeed happen, there must be literally tons of
>>>>research papers on this. Scientists of many disciplines
>>>>would have been involved in the ensuing analysis and
>>>>discussion, perhaps from several countries. Yet we have
>>>>heard from precisely none of them.

>>Why would any rational person expect to? In addition many of the
>>people would have done analysis without knowing the source of
>>the material being examined. Three nuclear weapons labs together
>>have about 10,000 engineers and scientists. At one time there
>>were more than 20,000 people working at Wright Patterson, many
>>in labs with very restricted access.

>>>>Not one written word from anyone directly involved.

>>>>The whole Roswell myth is built on the principle that the
>>>>'truth' can never be revealed because of the need for one country
>>>>to maintain tight secrecy on it. Even when scientists are constantly
>>>>searching for evidence of alien life (as they have been for at least
>>>>50 years), the greatest scientific discovery of all time still has
>>>>to be kept under wraps. And this after six decades.
>>>>I submit that such an idea is utterly incredible

>>It is your naivete that is incredible.

>>Certainly the SETI community is NOT searching for signs of
>>alien life. They are searching for electromagnetic signals from
>>afar and insist on totally ignoring the evidence that aliens are
>>coming here. If aliens are coming there is no need for SETI is
>>there?

>Perhaps among SETI scientists there are a few who do accept
>UFOs as possible ET visitations but are keeping quiet about it.
>However, I would assume the great majority are anti-UFO.

>>While I am at it, I should for the umpteenth time point out that
>>the Twining memo of Sept. 23, 1947, was only classified
>>SECRET. It could not possibly contain TOP SECRET or TS
>>Code word info.

>>Why is that so hard to understand?

>It is not hard to understand. My point is that you have not
>shown that the Roswell crash or any other ET discovery, ever was
>or would be a matter of 'top secrecy'. It is purely an
>assumption, something you have promoted since 1980, something
>that suits your whole 'Cosmic Watergate' fabric. For all you
>know crashes have occurred in other countries before, and after,
>Roswell. Why have we not heard anything from them? Where
>is their hard evidence? Top secret again?

Why should they tell me?

You can't seem to understand that many countries would have the
same reasons for withholding TOP SECRET CODE Word UFO documents
as would the USA. No country wants to get rid of nationalism.
All would like to avoid an Earthling attitude, all would like to
determine the mode of propulsion and other technological
details, none want to upset various religious groups. The
Russians and the US both kept silent about shooting down the
other's reconnaissance aircraft... Until the U-2 incident with
Gary Powers. Nobody wants to admit they can't do anything about
alien intruders in their airspace and abductors of their
citizenry. I suspect that there has been cooperation for example
by Brazil in the Varginha case. Money talks.

I don't suppose you happened to notice that the heavily redacted
NSA affidavit to Federal Court Judge Gesell justifying its
withholding all the NSA UFO documents found in a court ordered
search was, as we found out more than 15 years later, TOP SECRET
UMBRA? I take it you didn't notice that the NSA, when after
almost 20 years of totally withholding their 156 UFO documents,
finally released them, totally whited out except for a line or
two per page, had classified them TOP SECRET UMBRA. Not
confidential, not SECRET, Not TOP SECRET, but TOP SECRET Code
Word. The few CIA UFO documents that I managed to get from them
after 5 years (They had been found by the NSA, but somehow not
by the CIA in their court ordered search) were TS code word.
Some are so informative that one can read all of 8 meaningless
words on a page.

I had a Q clearance for 14 years, wrote and handled hundreds of
classified documents while in industry. I also have been to 20
archives and handled literally thousands of formerly classified
documents and many withdrawal sheets for those that were still
classified... and was denied any access to hundreds of boxes of

archival materials because they were still classified. Just what is your experience with the security system in the USA and with document archives here? The exemptions to FOIA are numerous indeed.

>Instead of telling us about the size of the US airspace, size of
>New Mexico etc. why just not produce the real evidence, the hard
>evidence scientists desperately would love to get their hands
>on? Then we can begin a proper scientific analysis, instead of
>regurgitating the endless anecdotes & rumors.

Frankly this is absurd. If I had it, I would produce it. The fact that I don't doesn't mean it doesn't exist. It means it is very highly classified. The Kennedy Library had 10 file drawers of TS Code word material. Neither of us has access. That is one of loads of places storing classified materials requiring an appropriate security clearance and an appropriate need to know. I have neither.

I am sure the lawyers on this List would agree that most court cases are not decided by hard evidence like DNA, but by testimony, weighed and evaluated by a jury and/or a judge, with defense and prosecution lawyers making their best efforts.

>It seems you have to fall back on the 'above top secret'
>scenario time and again to explain the lack of hard evidence.
>Instead, why not admit the obvious: There aint no hard
>evidence.

>The few claimed bits of Roswell hardware turn out to be either
>fictitious, terrestrial material or just plain junk.

I think Pappy Henderson had pieces of Roswell wreckage and that many others handled such pieces. That does not mean that they don't exist.

>However, I concede something might, just might, turn up one
>day (via a real UFO crash).

>But I, for one, am not holding my breath.

I don't know why you should. You are happy in your ignorance. Enjoy.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:10:00 -1000
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:35:55 -0500
Subject: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

Aloha all,

I wish to further pursue this issue of whistleblower testimony and how important it is to relax the strict evidentiary rules that might be applied to whistleblower testimonies alleging reverse engineering of extraterrestrial vehicles, retrieval of crashed extraterrestrial vehicles, and of secret agreements with extraterrestrial biological entities. An example of such a whistleblower is Bob Lazar who allegedly worked at the secure facility of S4 in the vicinity of Area 51, but had great difficulty in supplying documentary evidence supporting his alleged work at S4 on an extraterrestrial vehicle. He even claimed that the subsequent absence of documentary evidence of his two Master's degrees were a result of these being somehow pulled from the public record. This has led to great criticism from UFO researchers arguing that without documentary evidence of his employment and academic degrees, Lazar's testimony is not credible. In fact, Stanton Friedman claimed "Not one shred of evidence has been put forth to support this story" (see <http://www.v-j-enterprises.com/sflazar.html>). This is not at all accurate. Some evidence was found to support parts of Lazar's story that he was employed as a nuclear physicist at Los Alamos before being relocated to S4. Lazar was able to supply a pay slip substantiating his contractual employment for Naval Intelligence for a short period. In addition investigators associated with George Knapp were able to find a telephone directory for Los Alamos that included Lazar's name, and even employee corroboration that Lazar had worked at Los Alamos. Also, Lazar was able to supply the name of the individual for doing background security checks that was confirmed by George Knapp. For discussion of evidence supporting Lazar see: <http://www.karinya.com/travel2.htm>). A furthermore source of corroboration was John Lear who alleged that Lazar was able to take Lear and their two wives to view the testing of a reverse engineered saucer. This incident apparently sparked Lazar's termination as an employee at S4, and supports Lazar's claims that he knew of the testing schedule of the craft that were reverse engineered from the retrieved ETV.

Applying strict evidentiary rules to Lazar's testimony may be insufficient to substantiate his allegations due to the absence of key documents. Critics such as Stanton Friedman have concluded that Lazar is "bunk". However, if one relaxes these strict evidentiary rules on account of the special security procedures applying to Lazar's alleged employment, we discover three things. First, that a program involving extraterrestrial related technologies would be so highly classified that knowledge of these is to very few individuals with a demonstrable 'need to know'. Second, projects involving alleged extraterrestrial vehicles are so highly classified, that draconian security procedures are involved. Third, it is possible that security procedures are in place that involve the removal of public records that might support the testimony of such witnesses.

What I will do in what follows is show how the kind of program that Lazar allegedly worked in would be at the very least a Waived Unacknowledged Special Access Program where knowledge of this program was strictly limited to a few with a 'need to know'

and where Congress exercises no effective oversight of the program. I also will argue that the Security Manager for such classified programs has extraordinary power to determine security procedures without any effective Congressional Oversight. This would make it possible for the Security Manager of the classified program Lazar allegedly worked in to arrange for the removal of public records substantiating Lazar's employment, and the intimidation of witnesses who could corroborate Lazar's testimony.

The first point to consider here is that such whistleblower testimonies would be in reference to highly classified programs in the US that are regarded as deep black. Indeed these programs are so black that only the chairs of defense and intelligence committees are apprised of their existence, without being given any details or documents. It is clear that deep black programs allegedly involving extraterrestrial entities or vehicles would at the very least qualify as one of these special access programs. These are highly classified and it is a federal crime to discuss such programs and 'whistleblowers' are subject to significant legal penalties and can not claim whistleblower protection in revealing any wrong doing with these programs. So here is a brief overview of Special Access Programs that is extracted from a larger report I did on the CIA's black budget.

Note: numbers in parenthesis refer to footnotes in the Report)

Source: <http://www.exopolitics.org/Report-Black-Budget.htm>

Conventional Oversight System for the CIA's and DoD's Classified Programs <?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

This conventional oversight system for highly classified intelligence activities and/or covert projects concerns Controlled Access Programs (CAPs) of the intelligence community or Special Access Programs (SAP) of the DoD. CAPs/SAPs are programs that have additional security measures attached to them over and above the normal classificatory system (confidential, secret, top-secret) attached to most classified information and programs. (93) CAPs/SAPs are divided into two classes 'acknowledged' and 'unacknowledged' as described in a 1997 Senate Commission Report: "Publicly acknowledged programs are considered distinct from unacknowledged programs, with the latter colloquially referred to as "black" programs because their very existence and purpose are classified."(94)

A 'waived' CAP/SAP is so sensitive that only eight members of Congress (the chairs and ranking members of the four intelligence [or defense] committees divided between the House of Representatives and Senate) are notified of a waived CAP/SAP without being given any information about it. (95) This would enable them to truthfully declare no knowledge of such a program if asked, thereby maintaining secrecy of this CAP/SAP. If unacknowledged CAPs/SAPs are 'black programs', then 'waived' unacknowledged CAPs/SAPs are 'deep black'. The most secret of the intelligence and covert operations conducted by the CIA are 'deep black' CAPs.

CAPs are funded through the 'official' black budget and in theory are subject to both Executive and Congressional oversight. (96) In practice though, Congressional oversight in the case of waived acknowledged CAPs is nominal as revealed by the 1997 Senate Commission Report. President Clinton's Executive Order 12958 issued on April 17, 1995, reformed how CAPs/SAPs would in future be created and oversight established. The main component of the Executive Order was that only the Director of Central Intelligence or the Secretaries of State, Defense and Energy (or their principal deputies) could create a CAP/SAP. CAPs/SAPs would be kept to an "absolute minimum"; and would be created when "the vulnerability of, or threat to, specific information is exceptional," and their secrecy cannot be protected by the normal classification system. (97)

As far as oversight was concerned, the key clause in Executive Order 12958 was an effort by the Clinton administration to coordinate oversight through a central executive office (Information Security Oversight Office) that would be responsible to the National Security Council (NSC) and annually report to the President. (98) The President's effort to centralize and coordinate oversight features of CAPs/SAPs was

resisted by both the Defense and Intelligence communities. While in theory, oversight coordination occurs in the Information Security Oversight Office set up in the NSC that issues an annual report to the President; the power to approve or terminate a CAP/SAP lies with the respective intelligence community and DoD committees and executive officers. In general, Executive Office oversight of CAPs/SAPs has been described as "nothing more than a sop used to placate anyone who questions the propriety of an administration's covert action policy." (99)

Oversight of CAPs/SAPs is performed by a committee comprising officials from the Intelligence Community, the Controlled Access Program Oversight Committee (CAPOC); and a similar committee in the DoD, the Special Access Program Oversight Committee (SAPOC). (100) CAPOC reviews CAPs and Sensitive Compartmented Information (intelligence data) in the intelligence community annually and can recommend their 'compartmentation' or termination. (101) It is however, only the Director or Deputy Director of the CIA that has the authority to "create, modify, or terminate controlled access programs." (102) :

"While CAPOC provides more direct oversight and coordination of CAPs, it is not ultimately the body that oversees the CIA's most secret projects conducted in collaboration with the military intelligence community. The exclusion of some CIA CAPs from CAPOC is indicated in the following Directive from the Director of the CIA (DCI): "The DCI or DDCI may waive review by the CAPOC for programs covered by equivalent oversight mechanisms, or when review by the CAPOC is unnecessary to carry out the DCI's responsibilities." (103). Essentially, if the DCI deems it unnecessary for CAPOC to provide oversight information of a CAP, then CAPOC plays no role in monitoring the program.

While the DCI is legally obliged to verbally notify Congress of the CIA's most sensitive CAPs without providing specific budgetary or operational details, there is no independent way of confirming if he indeed is doing so. Similarly, the DCI could similarly withhold information of the CIA's most sensitive CAPs to the National Security Council's 'Information Security Oversight Office' (ISOO).

The extent to which authority is vested in the different security agencies is the way in which program managers of CAPs/SAPs have the authority to come up with their own rules concerning access and security. A 1994 Commission Report stated:

The special access system gave the program manager the ability to decide who had a need-to-know and thus to strictly control access to the information. But elaborate, costly, and largely separate structures emerged. According to some, the system has grown out of control with each SAP [CAP] program manager able to set independent security rules. (Joint Security Commission Redefining Security: A Report to the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence (Washington, D.C., February 28, 1994) <http://www.fas.org/sqp/library/jsc/chap2.html>)

(End of Extract)

There are a few important points that can be drawn from the above extract. First, knowledge of a waived Special Access Program (SAP) is strictly limited and only the Defense and/or Intelligence Committee chairs in both houses of Congress are apprised of these without being given any detailed information. This means that while Congress is de jure exercising oversight of these programs as prescribed by the US Constitution, it is de facto exercising no oversight at all. Basically, the SAP Program Managers are free to run these and the only effective oversight comes from committees within the military-intelligence establishment. Most revealing is that the program managers of SAPs have the power to decide who has a 'need-to-know' and implement their own "independent security rules". Basically without any real congressional oversight system in place, the program managers of SAP's can implement draconian security procedures. These procedures would be entirely lawful due to the de jure oversight exercised by Congress. So in theory, the security manager of the SAP can arrange for the removal of public records such as University degrees and employment record. This would be entirely legal and any University Registrar or Employer that refused to comply with such a request would be violating a lawful request for the removal of public information that violates national security. This would be a federal offense

and demonstrates the legal mechanism that could be used for the removal of the public records that Lazar alleges were withdrawn in his case. Also, the employment slip that Lazar possessed that associated him with the Naval Intelligence points to the program he worked on being a Special Access Program under the purview of Naval Intelligence.

In conclusion, the Bob Lazar case is very important since I believe it demonstrates how a whistleblower will have extraordinary difficulty in substantiating his/her allegations due to the removal of public documents that support their credibility. My recommendation is that taking into account the extraordinary security power of the managers of SAPs such as Lazar's the rules of evidence are considerably relaxed so we can properly evaluate the implications of their testimony rather than getting into debates over the conclusiveness of the evidence supporting testimonies such as Lazar's. Despite my respect for Stanton Friedman's intellect and fidelity to detail, I strongly disagree with his evaluation of the Bob Lazar case, and conclude that Lazar is a genuine whistleblower revealing important information concerning a waived Special Access Program at S4.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO -

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:10:44 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:38:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO -

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 20:51:48 -0800
>Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:39:39 -0500
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO -

>I can only speculate why Dr. Mack may be left out of the
>program.

>From my point of view it would be possible that they decided to
>not including him despite all his work in the subject because he
>had lost his professional objectivity and detachment by wrapping
>it all up within his own spiritual concepts.

Well that is surely a speculation, as you concede. I'd turn your assumption around though and say that John explored the spiritual concepts that his subjects were reporting to him because he was interested in these areas. If he hadn't been interested in that, he wouldn't have studied it. Similarly other researchers ignore this area because they are not interested and don't want to hear about it. Both sets of people are being objective, they're reporting what people describe to them. But it is true that tv tends to find spiritual matters, or philosophy for that matter, difficult to present.

This debate won't be settled here. But about the ABC program, they may include any number of people and be critical of them - and there are surely many more people in this field much more embarrassing than Mack.

People set themselves up for this kind of critical review. Mack set himself up for criticism from people who don't believe there's anything spiritual about the experiences. He was comfortable with that. Similarly, I can only hope that Greer is comfortable with being criticised for conducting those "let's pay to run around at night waving flashlights, convincing ourselves that bright stars are ufos" escapades - because we know Jennings filmed one of those too. I'm using only two examples of things I feel are in contrast (your own examples may well differ). But my point applies to everything or everyone:

Probably everyone has something that can be held up to ridicule. We can only hope that whatever is being held up to ridicule is at least possibly true.

And with that I think I'll just await the broadcast.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:21:57 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:38:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Reason

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>>Secondly, because while your Venus explanation may be
>>falsifiable under the specific conditions you mention, the
>>hypothesis belongs to a set of similar hypotheses which is
>>indefinitely large, and one cannot falsify indefinitely large
>>sets by sequentially eliminating their individual members.
>>Unless there is a falsification condition for the entire set,
>>the set itself is indefinitely elastic and hence unfalsifiable.

>That argument implies all UFO reports have a common trigger and
>stand and fall together. We can only deal with cases on a case
>by case basis (I argued to the contrary back in the 1970s but I
>was wrong)

This is a non-sequitur which I'm not even going to try and
figure out.

>Have you never had the experience of searching high and low for
>something then a bit later finding it in front of your nose,
>which might suggest that things in the environment can fall out
>of ones visual experience (or that the boggarts teleported the
>object away and returned it just to annoy you)

All right, that's it. Peter, there's really no point in
continuing this conversation if you're determined to go on
reinventing the wheel and then insisting that it should be
octagonal. Just check out the literature on selective attention
and visual search.

>I suspect many of your points would apply equally well to much
>mainstream science, and that issues of falsifiability etc are
>indeed much more complicated in practice than theory.

You don't need to suspect that, Peter, it's self-evident.

Cathy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 14:26:31 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:40:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 12:13:14 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 18:31:28 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 13:33:38 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>About the accident hypothesis - there are some sources
>>describing very light craft, electrically powered, charged like
>>a capacitor (presumably aboard the mother ship). Maybe such
>>craft are vulnerable to a lightning bolt, for instance. I also
>>read somewhere that there was a powerful experimental radar in
>>the area of Corona at the time but I am afraid it's a dubious
>>rumor. Any idea about that?

>One thing we do know is that a powerful radar tracking system
>was on at White Sands because a V-2 rocket was scheduled for
>launch the morning of July 3, 1947. Snipped...

It was aimed to the north

>because all launches were to the North. It could have
>interfered with propulsion or guidance systems or both and
>caused a brief but deadly mid air collision.

>Ironically the article describing the use of such a system was
>right next to the article on the front page of the Alamogordo
>News of July 10 describing the staged launch of such a combo
>under the headline "Fantasy of Flying Disc Explained Here" with
>3 pictures.

First I think we have been brainwashed by old science fiction
movies about how indestructable these objects might be. That and
the tired old theory that we are being watched closely because
we are the most dangerous species in the universe.

However, I have no doubt that these vehicles are much more robust
in nature than our own, which incidentally are much tougher than
they used to be at least in the military application. But I
doubt their indestructability. There is so much we don't know
about the capability and the construction of these things that
it's nearly impossible to state one way or the other just
whether they, or one model versus the other, are.

And Stan, it amuses me to see the use of the word "fantasy" at
such an early stage in a newspaper at the outset of the
publicly known portion of the phenomenon. It's like they had
the disinformation networks in place long before the Robertson
panel.

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger

The present day use of word "fantasy" is softer and implies a genre in books and movies about unicorns and swan-mays, trolls and faries. However back in the 40s the word was a little harder hitting and deprecatory, implying a psychological state of mind, one of detachment and loss of reality grounding in a person.

Full marks for the deterrent effect of its use.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 14:05:27 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:45:00 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: William Matchen <heyzeus321.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 14:46:28 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:17:27 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:46:23 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>I sent an e-mail the the Metropolitan Washington Airports
>Authority and asked if any flights arrived or departed from
>ronald reagan national airport on Feb 10, 2005 at 3:15 am.

>Here's the response I got:

<snip>

>Thank you for your inquiry concerning flights on February 10,
>2005. According to the operations log for the 10th of February
>there were no arrivals, or departures, around 3:15 A.M. There
>were two arrivals after midnight (12:15 A.M. and 1:11 A.M.) then
>none until after 6:00 A.M.

<snip>

Hi William!

Below is the follow-up e-mail I sent to UFO UpDates immediately
after my original e-mail with the explanation that this UFO was
very likely a commerical airliner.

My follow-up e-mail was not posted on the UFO UpDates List but I
did forward it to all those that replied to my original e-mail.
Errol Bruce-Knapp also made reference to my follow-up e-mail
with the new helicopter explanation on 'Strange Days... Indeed',
a radio program about UFOs which is heard all over the world.

Hello again everyone!

I just noticed that the time of this UFO sighting was a.m. and
not p.m. as I had mistakenly thought.

Although passenger air traffic is not as frequent at this very
early time over Washington, D.C., my reasoning for coming to
this conclusion still stands, except this time I propose it was
a police or military helicopter instead. I had seen very many
such helicopters flying overhead late at night and had heard
them too flying low over my hotel room in the early hours of the
morning. This was not surprising to me at the time since my
hotel was located down the road from the Pentagon and just a few
miles south of location from where this picture with the UFO was

taken.

On 'SDI', regular-contributor Victor Viggiani suggested that since Washington, D.C. is a no-fly zone (especially after 911), that this UFO could not have been an airliner or helicopter. I have close-up pictures of the central core of Washington, D.C. that includes the same buildings and memorials seen in the picture with the UFO which I took from the above from my Air Canada flight which departed from nearby Reagan National Airport that shows this is not a valid belief. If it was Victor or I flying a Cessna, we could have easily landed in the Mall or even on the White House lawn in a minute or two - too little time to prevent us from doing so since Andrews AFB is nearby but not close enough and I do not think they would deploy defensive missiles - if they have any - to shoot us down over such a highly populated area.

There are two noteworthy incidents involving aircraft in this very busy air corridor where the picture of the UFO was taken. One of these is the January 13, 1982 Air Florida Boeing 737 crash into the 14th Street Bridge over the Potomac River (which passes near the Pentagon south of the river and just east of the White House north of the river) which killed nearly everyone on board including several drivers on the bridge. The other is the September 12, 1994 Cessna 150 which crashed in the south lawn of the White House killing the pilot.

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](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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:16:57 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:50:16 -0500
Subject: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean

Hello all:

I put up a new UFO sightings map, this one is for the Indian Ocean. This is probably the second largest expanse of ocean waters without a single sighting (Reunion Island excepted).

Events in the surrounding lands, Indian subcontinent, Africa, Australia... make a visual contrast.

<http://www.larryhatch.net/INDIANOC.html>

Best wishes

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 14:03:17 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:57:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

>From: Lyle Michel <courtroomevidence456.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:47:21 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>Rosewell involved at least two craft of an extraterrestrial
>origin! There are buckets full of eyewitnesses to the event! If
>you are confused about what consitutes courtroom type evidence I
>suggest you look it up in a legal dictionary or on the Internet!

>To believe that the crash of extraterrestrial vehicles in the
>area of Roswell New Mexico did not happen in 1947 is on par with
>the extraterrestrials trying to figure out whether earthlings
>need to eat in order to live!

>I hope this will make sense to most of you!

Hi Lyle,

I'm sure Stan Friedman would be interested in seeing your
buckets.

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 15:41:07 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:59:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:01:28 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:57:43 -0400
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>>><http://www.ufoinfo.com/sightings/chile/041000.shtml>

>>Rather than lens flare the more apt description is a reflection
>>off the camera's own lens retainer or the edge of the lenses
>>themselves. The light source was probably something above the
>>photographer's position.

>>The explanatory note with the URL above is skimpy in detail as
>>to just how the reflection occurred. But if they were able to
>>re-create the shot using the original camera, there's not much
>>doubt. If this had been a lens flare there would likely have
>>been more than one image in the shot. The problem with camera
>>lenses is that they have two sides and thickness.

<snip>

>I would have to agree. I too wish there was more information at
>the site noted.

>My first impression, as posted here, was a reflection from a
>light source behind the camera, like you said.

>Only after reading the info at the site did I have to rethink.

>But yes, a lens with a filter or even just the lens itself
>provides ample sources for reflection, totally aside from
>typical lens flare.

>At any rate, this case shows everyone how easy it is to get some
>truly remarkable images of something that isn't really "there".

Hi Kyle and Don!

The single cropped picture with the UFO (see the web site above)
cannot alone be used to come to a conclusion as to whether this
image is a real object or a lens flare. When you look at the
original uncropped pictures found in the web site below (click
first on 'Ir A Galeria' and then on 'Anterior' or 'Siguiete' to
see them all), then we can clearly see the location of the light
source which produced this lens flare UFO.

<http://tinyurl.com/57hgx>

If the close-up picture of the UFO was not just the cropped
corner of the original photo, then I agree with you that this
curved and nearly centered and symmetrical UFO-like image could

have been produced by a bright light source just outside the picture and possibly also be a reflection off the curved lense mount or rounded edges of the lens(es). Light reflected off non-optical surfaces or the ground edges of lenses are more likely to produce diffused looking blobs rather than the much sharper looking images from light reflecting off one or more lens surfaces.

For this reason, when trying to analyze pictures with images suspected to be UFOs (especially those "BLURFOS" which are being captured in ever growing numbers by people trying out their powerful new zoom video and digital cameras and who are honestly puzzled by the strange images they recorded that they didn't notice at the time) it is important to work with the entire picture. It is only too easy for some mischievous person to submit a cropped corner of a picture of what looks like a large UFO which others will unwittingly add to their UFO web sites or include in their annual UFO survey as proof of unexplained material objects in the skies over certain places.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:05:04 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:15:36 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>From: William Matchen <heyzeus321.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 14:46:28 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>I sent an e-mail the the Metropolitan Washington Airports
>>Authority and asked if any flights arrived or departed from
>>Ronald Reagan National Airport on Feb 10, 2005 at 3:15 am.

>>Here's the response I got:

><snip>

>>2005. According to the operations log for the 10th of February
>>there were no arrivals, or departures, around 3:15 A.M. There

><snip>

>Not surprising. Of course the source of the unexpected lights
>could have been a helicopter that didn't land at Reagan or even
>some private plane.

This being the case Bruce, where's the scrambling of jets? Would
this not have been radar identified as a target at Andrews or
even Reagan IA?

It should be in the logs for a primary/transponder radar contact
whether it arrived or departed. It's still under RRIA's control
center.

Would Bush have been up and about in Marine One?

Any other chopper or aircraft would have had to have clearance
to first be in the Control Zone and secondly be in the no-fly
zone. A double-whammy.

Any indication that RRIA Center was being coy? I'm damn sure
they know about the television image of the thing.

There are still questions to be answered. I trustingly assumed
that this was an airliner. But this changes things.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:47 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:07:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Ledger

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:55:11 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:51:06 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 21:14:22 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

><snip>

>>Time for another Jerry Clark conjugation:

>>- I make light-hearted banter.
>>- You make weirdly defensive responses.

>>And it's not for me to say whether any of the women involved
>>with sceptics groups in Britain are or are not Pelicanists.
>>Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
>>qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only they
>>know what the silly term means.

If I may jump in.

Dick Hall wasn't even active on this List when that word was
coined.

Myself, Larry Hatch and Robert Gates were. And so was Jerry.

Errol can likely find the first exchange when it began with
James Easton, Bruce Maccabee and myself about the Ken Arnold
sighting. That was in the Spring or Summer I think of 1998. I
looked it up once and lost that part of the thread when I
changed computers.

Its meaning then and now refers to one who runs with an
insupportable theory [usually a pet theory], no matter how
ludicrous, and against all reason to debunk a UFO sighting. Oft
times the Pelicanist's theory is more off-the-wall than that of
the UFO report itself making it easier-for the reader-to
subscribe to the UFO theory than the proposed debunking of it,
which is self defeating for the Pelicanist when you think about
it.

The word pelican should not, in context, be confused with that
appellative for an old pilot. They use the term affectionately to
describe another aged pilot whom they might know, referring to
him [and her-if they dare] as an old Pelican.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:51:08 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:10:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:01:28 -0600
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:57:43 -0400
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:47:18 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>><snip>

>>>Thanks to the web site below which was brought to our attention
>>>by Kyle King in a recent post to UFO UpDates, I think we can now
>>>safely conclude that this very interesting structured UFO in the
>>>picture(s) was simply an honest misrepresentation of an IFO. To
>>>continue to promote this UFO in public as a TRUFO would not only
>>>be dishonest but it would do damage to the credibility of all of
>>>us who study UFOs (or more accurately, UFO reports).

>>><http://www.ufoinfo.com/sightings/chile/041000.shtml>

>>>Rather than lens flare the more apt description is a reflection
>>>off the camera's own lens retainer or the edge of the lenses
>>>themselves. The light source was probably something above the
>>>photographer's position.

>>>The explanatory note with the URL above is skimpy in detail as
>>>to just how the reflection occurred. But if they were able to
>>>re-create the shot using the original camera, there's not much
>>>doubt. If this had been a lens flare there would likely have
>>>been more than one image in the shot. The problem with camera
>>>lenses is that they have two sides and thickness.

>>>I would have to agree. I too wish there was more information at
>>>the site noted.

>>>My first impression, as posted here, was a reflection from a
>>>light source behind the camera, like you said.

>>>Only after reading the info at the site did I have to rethink.

>>>But yes, a lens with a filter or even just the lens itself
>>>provides ample sources for reflection, totally aside from
>>>typical lens flare.

>>>At any rate, this case shows everyone how easy it is to get
>>>some truly remarkable images of something that isn't really
>>>"there".

Yeah, too bad Kyle. This looked good. If as John Rimmer
suggested that this was quite far away and the reason why its

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

reflection didn't show up in the water, then the object would have been a bit of a monster.

Beware of lights in the night sky-at least on film.

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:45:42 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:20:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:40:55 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 16:57:59 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 22:48:33 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>From: Robert Frola <ufologist.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 08:08:49 +1000
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 19:48:20 -0000
>>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>>>Where is the official documentation that an alien craft crash
>>>>>landed in New Mexico in the summer of 1947, and where are the
>>>>>recovered bodies and wreckage? In short, where is the real
>>>>>evidence?

<snip>

>How would any of us know without appropriate clearances and
>need-to-know?

For the same reason that any earth-shattering discovery that is shocking to the core of a person's being would become known - it would have a visible, noticeable impact on the people involved and on the policies they formulate that can be discerned openly, and outside security-controlled channels. The more shocking the secret discovery the less able to control the visibility and keep the secret.

>>>With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a >>>multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy, >>>the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

>>The "Manhattan Project" (that was never its official name) was >>not set up by the President and run by a committee of top >>interagency directors, generals and scientists. Yes that refutes >>the "Majestic 12" model right there.

>Hardly. Vannevar Bush, in his Oral History - at MIT - said that >the Manhattan Engineering District (I think more people >understand Manhattan Project) was co-ordinated by weekly meetings >without secretaries, minutes, or agendas.

It was never called the "Engineering" district either, again another semi-popular misnomer. The Manhattan "project" (lower case to indicate I am using the popular name and am not saying this was the official name, which it wasn't) was run by General Groves, not by the various coordinating and policy and review committees that Groves dictated to with an iron fist. Groves would order the committees, set their dates of meeting and run their activities, to get their rubber stamps of approval, unless it was a purely scientific issue that he needed advice on. Groves was a hard-driving force to be contended with, as he had shown himself to be with his direction of the building of the Pentagon in record time.

>Those present were General Groves, Dr. Bush, Dr. Conant and
>Secretary of War Henry Stimson - a Republican at that - sounds
>very similar to me.

This sounds like what was called the Top Policy Committee, which did not run the day-to-day affairs of the Manhattan project - which were run by Gen. Groves. Where in the alleged orders setting up MJ-12 is there a single person put in charge like a General Groves?

>Obviously there was a war on and huge facilities were needed to
>make Plutonium and separate Uranium 235. But the idea was still
>the same: set up a separate group with access to the President
>and not under control of the various military or intelligence
>agencies. The NSC would provide an interface. It appears that the
>NRO and NSA have some similar characteristics as well.. Many
>military personnel are seconded to the NSA, for example.

The Manhattan project was not set up or created by the President, contrary to the MJ-12 model, where MJ-12 was allegedly created by order of the President. Moreover the Manhattan project is not enmeshed in controversy over government-inspired document forgeries as MJ-12 is. MJ-12 arose from an AFOSI document forgery operation that fabricated phony "government" UFO documents beginning with the Ellsworth AFB hoax in 1978 which even the National Enquirer would not buy. This same AFOSI agent improved his document forgery skills until finally he brought in the DIA-SAC Colonel to help do a better job of manufacturing UFO documents. This same AFOSI agent claimed in a Jan 5, 1988, interview that the DIA man had forged the MJ-12 documents.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 21](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 23:01:05 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:23:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:44:37 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 09:30:47 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>Also add in Alice Knight, niece of Barney and Ruth. Especially
>important is the large amount of research, much of it on site,
>by Art Campbell.

>>Nobody has ever come up with a date for the Plains crash.
>>Stan should read his own literature. True, someone suggested it
>>might have been in the summer of 1947, but that is as far as it
>>got.

>Early July was stated by Barney's boss, Ruth's Diary points in
>that direction as well.

>>Certainly no month and day.

>Baloney.

Sorry but have I overlooked something?

I have searched "The Roswell Incident" and your own book "Crash at Corona", and cannot find any mention of a day & month for the Plains of San Augustin crash. Here is your story as I see it:

1. You give a lecture in Minnesota in Oct 1978.
2. A Mr Maltais speaks to you afterwards, relating the story of a friend Barney Barnett, who came across a "large metallic object" and bodies in the past (no date known), and location inexact. Barnett told Maltais about it in Feb. 1950.
3. You interview Fleck Danley (Barnett's boss) in 1979, Barnett himself being deceased. Danley cannot recall the year at first but eventually comes up with: "It had to have been sometime in the early summer of 1947". Nothing more precise than this. Also he does not mention any bodies.
4. You later speak to a few surviving second- and third-hand witnesses who likewise have no knowledge of the date. Location is only approximate.
5. You examine Barnett's wife's diary, which merely shows his trips and areas of operation for 1947. It certainly does not mention any sighting of a crashed saucer or bodies. (Don't you wish it did!)

Have I missed anything of substance here?

Danley never said "early July". He did not give a month, still less a day. I checked both the UK & US editions of the Moore-Berlitz book and they agree. In Moore's later papers he

discards the story as an unsubstantiated tale.

So again I ask: Who named the date (i.e. day & month), please? Even if you could establish that a second crash did occur in 1947 (which you certainly cannot) , where, repeat where, is the evidence, even anecdotal evidence, that it occurred on the same day as Roswell? It is, quite simply, non-existent.

Incidentally, "early summer" implies June to me, but I suppose you could stretch it a bit.

>>Stan has tried to weave this second
>>'crash' into the Roswell legend for his own purposes.

>>Stan: There was, I recall, a conference under Michael Swords
>>as chairman, on this subject where you tried hard to convince
>>other Roswell investigators about this second crash, but they
>>did not buy it. You had the worst of the debate.

>You obviously weren't there and don't know that to be true.

>>It mainly
>>revolved around the dubious 1947 date. Among other things,
>>the archaeologists were there in 1946 not 47.

>Certainly not all bought it... just as not all of us bought the
>Kaufmann story. Which archeologists? Buskirk was in the area in
>1947. Archeologist Robert J. Drake was there in 1947. I wrote a
>detailed rebuttal in 1992.Randle had falsely claimed that 3
>archeologists Hibben and Dick among them, had been in the Plains
>and had seen nothing in the summer of 1947. Neither one was
>there, so of course they hadn't seen anything. Another
>Archeologist, Dr. Frank Wilmuth, had told Drake of hearing of
>the Plains crash while working at Los Alamos. He was out of town
>when I called his home and died less than a month later before I
>called back.

I did read this conference report some years ago and recall that you were in a minority of one, maybe two, on this second crash. However, I am not digging it up again to check.

Buskirk, as I recall from an article by Tom Carey, was in Arizona, not New Mexico in '47. You did surmise that he might have made a quick hop to the Plains, and therefore could possibly have been there, but this is pure surmise and means nothing. For example: what did Buskirk's own diary or notes show? Obviously nothing. Once again, the crucial evidence is just not there.

This is likely to my 'farewell' on this subject.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:56:01 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 07:46:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:49:20 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>Of course, you're partly right - there is a null hypothesis for
>>UFO studies, which is that every UFO report can be explained
>>using only known entities. And that null hypothesis certainly
>>can be falsified, and frequently is, or we would have no UFO
>>reports to begin with (if we disregard the CSICOPian position,
>>which is in fact completely unfalsifiable).

>But UFO reports are just reports of things that are puzzling to
>the witness, and 90-95% are described as IFOs by non pelicanist
>Ufologists.

To restrict the definition to "just reports of things that are
puzzling to the witness" is to miss the key issue, where the
"rubber meets the road" in UFO investigation. The key issue is
this: does the sighting _puzzling_ to the analyst_, or can some
acceptable explanation be found during the investigation of the
claims made by the witness. I like to use a special term to
indicate sightings which have been investigated and no
reasonable identification has been proposed by the analyst(s).
An investigated sighting for which "experts" (analysts with at
least some training in identifying phenomena from sighting
descriptions) are unable to find a reasonable explanation is a
TRUFO sightings (TRue UFO).

Every sighting starts as a UFO - puzzling to the witness (the
Condon definition, for example). (If a hoax, then the witness
pretends to be puzzled.) Only a "select few" sightings make it
through investigation and analysis to become TRUFO sightings
which remain unexplained.

It is in the collection of TRUFO sightings (5%? of UFO
sightings) that one may find evidence of ET visitation or
perhaps a new natural - read that, "unintelligent" - phenomenon.
(Many years ago a sighting of a glowing ball moving around in
the vicinity of a thunderstorm might have been classed as a
TRUFO sighting. Such a sighting nowadays would possibly be
attributed to a "new class" of physical phenomena, ball
lightning. The possibility that ball lightning was a "real"
phenomenon and not simply an afterimage in the eyes of a
witnesses has only been acceptable to science for the last 30
years or so. Before that ball lightning sightings were
classified with "UFOs.")

An example of UFO vs TRUFO is contained in the nearly-year-old
Mexican DOD sighting. You will recall that there was first a
radar sighting that lasted many minutes. Then strange lights
appeared on a forward looking infrared. The totality of "the
sighting" was presented to the news media as "proof" of UFOs.

The video was shown "everywhere" as evidence of invisible (to human eyesight) UFOs flying around. Initially there were some skeptical suggestions, but no one really knew what had happened. After a long and arguou investigation (<http://brumac.8k.com>; scroll down the first page a short distance) it turns out that the widely publicized infrared lights were probably heat sources on the ground (oil field fires?) and the radar target remains unexplained. (Only a reflight or special experiments by the Mexican DOD could provide evidence that would dispute the oil fire explanation.)

Hence

- infrared lights went from UFOs to (likely) IFOs.
- radar target went from UFO to TRUFO.

>Some British Ufologists feel that the number of (non-obvious) IFO cases is as low as 2%.

I suppose this implies that "non-obvious IFO cases" constitute the percentage that others might classify as TRUFOS. That is 100 UFOs = 98% IFOs and 2% "non-obvious IFOs".

In the Battelle Memorial Institute study of 1947-1952 sightings - published by the USAF in 1955

3,201 sightings of 2199 "objects" were analyzed - there was a division as follows:

K = known (IFOs) 70%

U = Unknown (probable or likely TRUFOS) 20%

I.I. = Insufficient Information (can't be sure it was an IFO) 10%

Of course, TRUFO sightings will also be argued... with new explanations being proposed as old ones fall by the wayside. A sighting classified as TRUFO (after investigation) remains a TRUFO sighting unless some previously unproposed explanation is found to be reasonable. On the other hand it remains a TRUFO sighting if, eventually, there are no more conventional explanations and if it appears that no conventional explanation could ever be found for the sighting. Of course, this last criterion is quite stringent in that it "predicts" the future: no conventional explanation will ever be found. Very few sightings have this level of evidence. One that I would suggest is New Zealand, Dec. 1978.

>Though CSICOP-ers know
>that the null hypothesis is true and Ufologists know that it
>is false, in reality very little of the detailed critical
>investigation that would be needed to resolve the issue has gone
>on. Most UFO investigation is really just the assemledge of
>evidence to bank up the investigators preconceptions and both
>sides spin like Mandelson and Campbell

The above statement underestimates the level of investigation that has happened in some cases. I will agree that most UFO sightings don't receive sufficient investigation... there just isn't the man/womanpower available to tackle everything. But some sightings have been investigated thoroughly... often requiring years of (sporadic if not continuous) activity. And the results of the investigations are argued both ways until either there is a final agreement or there is an agreement to disagree.

In the famous Arnold case, some may recall the heated dispute in the UpDates (and other) email lists about 6 years ago when the pelican hypothesis was put forth. T

This was about the 8th explanation presented over the then-52 year period since the Arnold sighting.

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 19:18:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 07:48:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>>I think of pelicanists not as casual dismissers (as, for
>>>example, most skeptical scientists and journalists are) but as
>>>persons who know the subject and are active within the UFO
>>>community. The original pelicanist was James Easton, who
>>>proposed, then fiercely defended, the scientifically
>>>unsustainable idea that Kenneth Arnold observed not aircraft of
>>>some sort but pelicans. Pelicanist interpretations tend to be
>>>extraordinary claims masquerading as prosaic explanations.>

><snip>

>>>From that point of view, we have to consider that the Klass
>>proposal in 1997 that Arnold saw meteors was also a
>>'pelicanism'.

>I am convinced that Arnold saw daytime meteor fireballs,
>does that make me a "pelicanist" too? There is nothing
>"scientifically unsustainable" about that.

I suppose it depends upon how "fiercely" you defend that
particular proposed explanation.

>Arnold could not make up his mind about whether he saw tiny
>objects flashing light in front of the mountain(s) or behind
>them, and in his first published interview with the morning
>Chicago Tribune (which beat the afternoon East Oregonian) he
>said specifically the objects "went behind Mt. Rainier."

I don't know how you can say that he couldn't "make up his mind"
based on what was published in a paper (reported could have
gotten it wrong, especially when there are several sources
including Arnold's letter to the Air Force that say they were on
the west side of the mountain. In his first radio interview
(June 25) he said:

"They didn't fly in a conventional formation that's taught in our army.
They seemed to kind of weave in and out right above the mountaintops,
and I would say that they even went down into the canyons in several
instances, oh, probably a hundred feet, but 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."

>Since the objects were not seen continuously but only on
>scattered occasions about once every 9 seconds or so, they could
>"miss" the entire mountain in between, in one of those 9-second
>gaps of not being visible, and Arnold would not know it.

Where did you get 9 sec between flashes? Is this assumed to be regular?

>However, you would have to actually read Arnold's descriptions
>of the exact appearance and stop fixating on the popular
>misconception of Arnold seeing "flying saucers" when he
>describes "thin black lines" and "intense blinding flashes."

>Arnold measured the angular size of the objects at closest
>approach, which converts to 2.8 arcminutes, barely above minimum
>angular resolution for the human eye of about 1 arcminute, but
>under these conditions of objects moving at high velocity (about
>2 degrees per second) the resolution in the lateral direction of
>motion would seriously degrade, making it physically impossible
>for Arnold to have seen details of any alleged convex-tailed
>bat-shape or half-moon shape.

>I believe optical experiments that model the actual conditions
>of the objects' high speed motion instead of static
>visualizations where you get to stare at the object on a card
>(or whatever) for as long as you want, minutes and minutes if
>need be, until you "see something," would bear out this
>impossibility-to-see shapes.

Before discussing this hypothesis further you should indicate how far away you think the meteors were or how high they were.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

From: Simon Hicks <slh.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 09:07:54 +0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:12:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:18:56 -0600
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Simon Hicks <slh.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 09:37:53 +0800
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 13:59:10 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

><snip>

>I find this supportive of the thesis that there was nothing
>revealed that the govt. didn't want revealed, if you accept
>that they are powerful enough to prevent such things.

Kyle,

I agree that your idea is quite reasonable speculation. In fact, I wouldn't be surprised if the people behind the DP agreed with you as well.

One thing I'd be interested to hear your opinion on is this...

Daniel Sheehan. He seems to be risking a lot (in a professional sense) if he were found guilty of perpetrating a fraud. De-barring at the least. Yet his testimony was pretty wild e.g. he stated that he saw photographs of crashed saucers.

What is your take on that?

Regards

Simon

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Scottish UFO Wave Caused By Video Phones?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 20:12:29 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:15:52 -0500
Subject: Scottish UFO Wave Caused By Video Phones?

I told you guys to keep an eye peeled for even more wackier UFO stories than usual as the Jennings ABC UFO Special comes around.

Wouldn't surprise me that 5 minutes into Jennings' broadcast Bin Laden surrenders.

IAJJ... short for It's A Joke Jerry so I don't get anymore of those peanut gallery pseudo psychiatric cracks from Mr. Clark.

Best,

Greg

SOURCE: The Sunday Mail - Glasgow, Scotland

<http://tinyurl.com/66xmy>

02-20-05

Phone Home

Is this really a picture of a UFO over Stirling? A flying saucer-shaped trick of the light being shot by video phones?

By George Mair

THE dramatic rise in the number of flying saucers reported over Scotland is caused by... video phones.

The illusion of an extra-terrestrial force is sparked by the phones being pointed into the sun.

This creates an image of a blurred object that appears to hover before flashing a 'ray gun' into the ground.

Steve Bird, 36, spotted what he thought was an alien craft last Tuesday, as it apparently hovered around 40ft in the air.

He was walking on the Dumyat hill, overlooking the Wallace Monument, near Stirling, when he captured what he thought was incredible footage on his mobile phone.

It shows a blurred shape remaining static in the sky as light sweeps below.

Salesman Steve, of Cornton, Stirling, said: 'I decided to walk to the summit of Dumyat because it was such a nice morning.

'It was around 10.30am when I stopped for a rest near the top and decided to take my phone out to capture the view over Stirling on video.

'I pressed the record button and, within seconds, spotted this shape on the screen.

'It hovered in the sky, about 100 metres away from where I was standing, then tilted and flew off to the left. Then it was gone.

'When I put the phone down, I had to sit down on a rock to compose myself.

'I was shocked and could hardly sleep that night for thinking about it.

'It was the shape you normally associate with flying saucers, with a ridge around the middle.'

Steve's view is backed by Scotland's self-styled UFO expert, Ron Halliday, who has been investigating paranormal phenomena for more than 20 years.

He confirmed a string of reports based on phone videos. The Stirling University-based expert, who is also chairman of Scottish Earth Mysteries Research, said: 'The shape of the UFO is consistent with other alien sightings across the world.'

We asked researchers to get to the bottom of the UFO mystery.

Gordon Ridley, senior lecturer in photography at Glasgow College of Printing, said: 'I believe the footage came about due to sensor burn-out when the picture was taken into the sun.

'The limited sensor in a camera phone cannot cope with the brightness and a solid black blob appears in the image in the middle of the bright area.

'The rays coming down can be explained by the flares created from photographing into the sun, causing the sensors to overload.'

Mr Ridley's views are shared by Sunday Mail picture editor Andy Hosie.

He said: 'The flare is caused by sunlight shining directly into the lens. The blurred shape stays static and is probably due to some sort of burn-out with the camera.

'But the fact these are 'low quality' images which are very difficult to analyse adds to the intrigue.'

Scotland is regarded as one of the world's UFO hotspots.

Bonnybridge, just 10 miles from Stirling, has the highest number of reported UFO sightings in Britain, with dozens of unexplained phenomena every year.

Residents there have also claimed the greatest variety of spaceships, describing everything from flying saucers to hovering cigars.

Locals have previously campaigned for their town to be twinned with Roswell, in New Mexico, where - it was claimed - a spaceship came down in 1947 and was taken to a secret military base.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:49:41 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:21:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>>I think of pelicanists not as casual dismissers (as, for
>>>example, most skeptical scientists and journalists are) but
>>>as persons who know the subject and are active within the
>>>UFO community. The original pelicanist was James Easton, who
>>>proposed, then fiercely defended, the scientifically unsus-
>>>tainable idea that Kenneth Arnold observed not aircraft of
>>>some sort but pelicans. Pelicanist interpretations tend to
>>>be extraordinary claims masquerading as prosaic
>>>explanations.

><snip>

>>From that point of view, we have to consider that the Klass
>>proposal in 1997 that Arnold saw meteors was also a
>>'pelicanism'.

>I am convinced that Arnold saw daytime meteor fireballs,
>does that make me a "pelicanist" too? There is nothing
>"scientifically unsustainable" about that.

My definition of pelicanism is not someone proposing a hypothesis which may later turn out to be untenable, but irrationally clinging to it when it becomes obvious it is ridiculous after being analyzed. The whole Easton pelican hypothesis for the Arnold sighting was, of course, the classic original "pelicanism," not because Easton proposed it, but because he refused to abandon it when it should have become blindingly obvious to anybody of average intelligence that it was impossible. Another recent example of pelicanism on this list was the balloon hypothesis for Socorro.

Poor theories abound in all disciplines. Even very informed, scholarly people make mistakes, often because they are unaware of all the facts or misinterpret them. One mark of a good scholar is recognizing when one of their hypotheses has completely fallen apart, admit it, then either thoroughly rethink it or abandon it altogether.

Concerning the Arnold case, I think we can stipulate from the outset that if the objects passed in front of Mt. Rainier then the objects could not have been meteors because they would have been much too low and flying much too slow. Let us now examine what Arnold described.

>Arnold could not make up his mind about whether he saw tiny
>objects flashing light in front of the mountain(s) or behind
>them, and in his first published interview with the morning
>Chicago Tribune (which beat the afternoon East Oregonian) he
>said specifically the objects "went behind Mt. Rainier."

The Chicago Tribune story was the only one that ever claimed Arnold said the objects passed behind Rainier. All other quotes from Arnold are of the objects clearly passing in front of Rainier and of him seeing the outline of the objects against the background snow. E.g., Arnold's first radio interview from either June 25 or June 26:

"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."

That's not a newspaper quote. That's direct out of Arnold's own mouth. Why would he say he saw something passing across the face of Rainier when it was behind Rainier?

Arnold's written statement to AAF intelligence on July 12 (included a drawing):

"They were approaching Mt. Rainier very rapidly [from his left and north of Rainier]. These objects being quite far away, I was unable for a few seconds to make out their shape or their formation. Very shortly they approached Mt. Rainier, and I observed their outline against the snow quite plainly."

How could he observe their outline against the snow if they flew behind Mt. Rainier?

Bill Bequette story, Pendleton East Oregonian, June 26:

"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."

If they had disappeared behind Mt. Rainier, why would he refer to "an intervening peak"? Instead he would have said simply that he estimated the distance because they disappeared behind Mt. Rainier proper.

AP story, June 26, Portland Oregon Journal, has the same quote as Bequette story, but note what immediately follows:

"[He added] that 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, Arnold related."

"He also said they flew on the west sides of Rainier and [Mt.] Adams, adding this would make it more difficult for them to be seen from the ground."

So again, the "intervening peak," and then, if there were any doubt, he adds they flew on the west side of Rainier, the same side he was on, i.e., in front of Rainier, not behind it.

INS story, Portland Oregonian and Austin Statesman, July 11:

"I observed them not only with the sun shining on them but also as black objects against the snow and ridges of Mt Rainier_ and Mt. Adams."

How could he see them as black objects against the snow and ridges of Mt. Rainier if they flew behind Rainier?

The story then followed with this quote:

"I reckoned the saucers were 23 miles away," he said, "because they flew behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier_. I can show on the map exactly where the peak is and where I was."

Again, he does not say he gauged the distance because they flew behind Rainier, but because they flew behind "one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier." He would not have to use a small subpeak of Rainier to gauge distance if they flew and disappeared behind the far more massive Rainier.

Finally lets compare all the above quotes to the Chicago Tribune quote:

"I counted nine of them as they disappeared behind the peak of Mount Rainier."

All it takes to make this quote consistent with the many contrary Arnold statements is to change the article "the" to "a" or maybe "one of the." Thus he saw them disappear behind a peak of Mt. Rainier, or he saw them disappear behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier. (Compare, e.g., with the INS quote, "they flew behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier."

In other words, the reporter simply misquoted Arnold as he wrote down notes over the telephone. To believe otherwise is to believe the Chicago Tribune reporter was the one and only one to quote Arnold correctly, with even Arnold misquoting himself in a written statement and in a still surviving taped radio interview.

Time after time, Arnold clearly described the objects flying in front of Mt. Rainier, and that alone rules out meteors, period.

Other descriptions from Arnold's sighting also clearly rule out meteors.

Meteors do not intermittently flash in the sun.

Glowing meteors do not look like thin dark lines or black objects.

Meteors are not described as weaving like the the tail of a kite, i.e., maneauvering.

Meteor sightings do not last nearly 3 minutes (longest ones I've ever heard of are all under 1 minute).

Meteors leave trails; these objects did not. (An unheard of train of large meteors lasting 3 minutes would have left an unmistakable smoke trail. Where was it?)

A spectacular chain of meteors of very long duration like this far on the other side of Mt. Rainier would have undoubtedly been seen by a very large number of people over hundreds of miles, as is the case of other spectacular meteor fireballs of much shorter duration. There is not one single witness to a meteor fireball sighting anywhere in Eastern Washington or Idaho. Why not?

>Since the objects were not seen continuously but only on
>scattered occasions about once every 9 seconds or so, they
>could"miss" the entire mountain in between, in one of those
>9-secondgaps of not being visible, and Arnold would not know >it.

This handwaving argument is not only not very convincing, but also becomes academic considering Arnold clearly indicated the objects flew in front of Rainier.

Why did he repeatedly say in various ways that he saw them flying in front of Rainier and could see them outlined against the backdrop of ice and snow? How could they simultaneously be invisible and visible?

When Arnold gave specific numbers, like 23 miles, this was yet another way that he indicated that the objects passed in front of Rainier. Where he got such estimates was indicated in other statements about the objects disappearing behind "one of the peaks" of Rainier, meaning he was bracketing the distance between a subpeak and Rainier, But if the objects simply disappeared behind Rainier, there was nothing which he could use to bracket the distance. All he could tell from this was that they were beyond Rainier, but he wouldn't be able to tell how far away they were.

However one looks at Arnold's testimony, it was Arnold saying he saw the objects passing in front of Rainier, not behind it.

>However, you would have to actually read Arnold's descriptions
>of the exact appearance and stop fixating on the popular

>misconception of Arnold seeing "flying saucers" when he
>describes "thin black lines" and "intense blinding flashes."

I am reading Arnold's descriptions. All of them but one have him saying he saw the objects flying in front of Rainier. This whole theory that he saw a chain of meteors is a logical house of cards built up from one single newspaper quote, when it is patently obvious from reading all of Arnold's descriptions that the Chicago Tribune misquoted him.

>Arnold measured the angular size of the objects at closest
>approach, which converts to 2.8 arcminutes, barely above
>minimum angular resolution for the human eye of about 1 >arcminute,

There are several questionable assumptions in this statement and one somewhat misleading one. First the misleading one.

The minimum angular resolution for the human eye is not 1 arcminute. 1.0 minarc is considered low normal and corresponds to a 20/20 letter on an eyechart. Most normal healthy adults test better than 20/20. Usually at least half test 20/15 (0.75 minarc) and better acuities are known, but usually not tested for in a doctor's office because of time. Astronaut Gordon Cooper was tested at 20/12 or 0.6 minarc. I am also about 20/12. So is one of my sons. (When he was much younger, I once tested him at 20/8, or 0.4 minarcs, the true limit of human resolution acuity, about the width of a cone photoreceptor at the center of the retina. Such acuities, however, are very rare.)

I think it is a reasonable assumption that Kenneth Arnold was probably on the higher end of normal visual acuity judging by the keenness of his observations, i.e., probably 20/15 or maybe better, or at least 0.75 minarc acuity, like a big chunk of the population.

A second point has to do with how big something has to be to discern a simple shape and how does this compare to one's eyechart acuity? Letters on an eyechart are purposefully designed 5 times bigger than the black lines and the white gaps that make them up. Thus for a 20/20 letter, say an 'E', the black lines are 1 minarc wide as are the white gaps between them, and the overall letter size is 5 minarcs. If one's acuity is 20/15, one is resolving lines separated by 0.75 minarc

(To give yourself a feel for what this means in linear measure, a 20/20 letter at 20 feet is about 9 mm high, with the lines and gaps a little thinner than 2 mm.)

One's eyechart acuity is based not only on one's ability to resolve the individual lines, but also one's ability to make out the basic shape of the letter. If one couldn't discern the basic shape then one couldn't distinguish similar letters from one another, such as 'A', 'R' and 'H'. Thus saying somebody is 20/15 or 0.75 minarc acuity on a letter eyechart is also saying they can distinguish shapes only 5 times bigger than this, or 3.75 minarc.

Now to the questionable assumptions. Brad's statement that Arnold's objects were no larger than 2.8 minarcs is not a statement of unquestionable fact, but based on implicit assumptions that even he may not realize he is making.

Arnold's testimony actually provides not one but two estimates of object angular size. Resolving the differences between the two I believe gives a better estimate of what the true angular size was.

First the larger estimate. Arnold stated that when the objects passed in front of Rainier and went into profile, they looked like thin black lines which he could barely make out, and that the ratio of the length to the thickness of the lines was about 20 to 1.

Being able to just barely see them on edge gives us a rough estimate of their angular thickness. The length/thickness ratio gives us a rough estimate of their angular size.

It is very possible to detect thin black lines on a high contrast white background that are much thinner than one's letter chart acuity. The former is a detection task of an

isolated line; the latter a resolution task of 2 closely spaced lines. They are different acuity tasks.

Under ideal lab conditions, some test subjects can just detect thin black lines of only 2 arc seconds! That's over an order of magnitude better than the best resolution acuity.

It is possible, however, to estimate thickness by the described contrast of the line, i.e. by how black or grey it appears. A line thickness near one's resolution acuity or bigger will appear blackish. The thinner the lines get, the greyer and fainter it appears until it gets so faint it finally disappears.

Arnold stated that the objects looked like thin black lines in profile. Thus they were close in thickness to Arnold's resolution acuity. Guessing about 0.75 minarc for Arnold's acuity (20/15) and lowballing the thickness a little bit, my guesstimate is that the objects were at least 0.5 minarc thick in order to be seen as dark or black. Remember this is a low-ball estimate.

The object's angular size can then be estimated by multiplying the angular thickness by the 20:1 ratio of length to thickness. That would be 10 minarc (mindful, again, that this might be underestimating the size as the thickness might very well be larger than the low-balled 0.5 minarc).

I think Arnold's estimated 20:1 ratio could be seriously in error. It is extremely hard to accurately estimate such extreme ratios. In fact, when Arnold drew a picture of the objects on his written AAF statement the ratio was closer to 10:1. If that were the case, then the object might have an angular size of only 5 minarc. Again note this is a conservative estimate. It could have been larger.

What is the second way of estimating size? Arnold also stated that he compared the objects' size to that of a DC-4 north of his position using his cowling tool. Arnold detailed what he did in his AAF statement:

"I observed them quite plainly, and I estimate my distance from them, which was almost at right angles, to be between twenty to twenty-five miles. I knew they must be very large to observe their shape at that distance, even on as clear a day as it was... In fact I compared a zeus fastener or cowling tool I had in my pocket with - 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 at the furthest engines on each side of the fuselage of the DC-4."

This distance between the outer engines of a DC-4 is about 60 feet. Arnold estimated the distance to the DC-4 at 15 miles or about 80,000 feet. That gives an angular separation between engines of about 2.5 minarc by my reckoning. That I suspect is where Brad is getting his slightly larger 2.8 minarc figure from.

But how cast in stone is that number? It disagrees by a factor of 2 with the low-balled estimate from Arnold's other observational data on size, and it is not hard to see where very substantial error could have come from.

One is Arnold's estimate of the plane's distance. That could easily be in error by 25 or 30% one way or another. Since Arnold's second number is so much smaller than the first even when low-balled, likely he overestimated the distance by a bit.

A second likely large source of error is in his ability to accurately compare sizes by comparing two targets, particularly when they were of a size approaching his limits to resolve them. He would have to hold his cowling tool at a constant distance from his eye and move back and forth between one tiny target and another switching from near focus to distance, and all the time with his plane vibrating while he was trying to make his judgments. This would have been an extremely difficult perceptual task and errors on the order of 50% or more seem very likely.

Thus I can see very easily where he could easily have underestimated on the angular size on the second acuity task by

a good factor of 2. That would boost the angular measure up to at least 5 minarcs, in line with the first low-balled estimate based on a different measure.

Here is a summary of the above argument. Arnold provided two different perceptual estimates of size. One leads to a much larger estimate of size than the other. Both are subject to large plausible sources of error. Thus one method of estimating size isn't necessarily better than the other. To resolve the differences, I am assuming the sources of error lead to an overestimate by a factor of 2 on the high side and an underestimate by a factor of 2 on the low side. This results in a size estimate of about 5 minarcs for both, which I think provides a better estimate of size than relying on either method alone.

If Arnold had acuity of 20/15 or 0.75 minarc resolution, then 5 minarcs represents a size about 7 times bigger than Arnold's acuity. It is very easy to make out basic shapes at this point. It's like the line above your maximum resolution line on an eye chart--it's much easier to read. You are not very likely to confuse similarly-shaped letters. It is the type of crude resolution of shapes one gets from an old 7x7 dot matrix printer.

Arnold initially described the objects as rounded in the front, chopped in the back and coming to a point, and slightly longer than wide. (He drew this shape for the AAF in his letter.) Later he described one of the objects as looking like a crescent-shaped flying wing, also coming to a point in the back.

Here is how a 7x7 dot matrix printer might represent such shapes. (Remember that text "pixels" in computer text mode are not square on UFO Updates - there are 10 characters/inch horizontally and only 6 char/inch vertically, so the shape is going to be stretched out vertically and distorted by a factor of about 1.7)

```
 000      000
00000    00000
0000000  0 0 0
0000000
0000000
 000
 0
```

Below I've stretched the shapes horizontally to 11 elements to try to compensate for the distortion:

```
 00000      00000
000000000  000000000
00000000000  0 0 0
00000000000
00000000000
 00000
 0
```

See, there are Arnold's two described craft shapes as represented in low-resolution. It can be done.

(Note: I've left out the eye and brains' own "anti-aliasing" methods which would make the edges look smoother and more rounded than the above crude matrix figures would indicate. E.g., Arnold also drew a picture of the object in profile, with the center thicker than the 2 ends, which he showed as coming to a point. How could he resolve such detail if the thickness of the object was at or less than his resolution acuity limit? Technically he couldn't. But his brain might perceive the object tapering like that if the line was dark in the center and greyed out towards the ends. In other words, the brain might interpret it getting greyer towards the ends because it was getting thinner, instead of an alternate interpretation of the thickness remaining unchanged while the object contrast decreased away from center.)

>but under these conditions of objects moving at high velocity
>(about 2 degrees per second) the resolution in the lateral
>direction of motion would seriously degrade, making it
>physically impossible for Arnold to have seen details of any
>alleged convex-tailed bat-shape or half-moon shape.

There are several mistakes in this statement as well. To start, the angular velocity of 2 deg./sec is badly overstated (this doesn't really matter in the end, but still should be pointed out). Even if we round up Arnold's high end measured estimate of speed of 1700+ mph to 1800 mph (or 1/2 mile per second), use a convenient 24 miles for the distance of objects flying in front of Rainier, then the angular speed is closer 1.2 deg/sec, not 2 deg/sec. (Had we used Arnold's low-end estimate of 1200 mph, the angular speed would have been only 0.8 deg/sec.)

Would this cause the resolution to seriously degrade? No, not at all. We can easily track such motions. The angular size and velocity would be no different than a plane 1/4 the size at 1/4 the distance, or something like a 45 foot Sabre jet flying 450 mph at 6 miles.

Readers should ask themselves based on their own experience whether the resolution of a jet plane flying 6 miles overhead at a comparable angular speed seriously degrades? I think the obvious answer is no. Planes at this angular speed are not exactly streaking along and are very easily tracked.

>I believe optical experiments that model the actual conditions
>of the objects' high speed motion instead of static
>visualizations where you get to stare at the object on a card
>(or whatever) for as long as you want, minutes and minutes if
>need be, until you "see something," would bear out this
>impossibility-to-see shapes.

The ability to visually track moving objects and keep them accurately centered in our vision is called smooth pursuit. My textbooks say smooth pursuit has been experimentally found to be operative up to 100 deg/sec, and accurate up to 30 deg/sec, over 20 times faster than what Brad claims would cause shapes to not only seriously degrade but become impossible to make out.

The lab experiments were carried out long ago and refute Brad's assertions. If one doesn't want to accept this, one could easily simulate the Arnold situation using a low-resolution shape moving on a computer screen. E.g., if the monitor has a typical dot pitch of 28 mm/dot, a 7 dot shape would cover about 2 mm. 1.2 deg/sec angular velocity would represent about 1.2 cm/sec on the monitor if you viewed it at arm's length. That would take about a dozen seconds to scroll from one side of a 17 inch monitor to the other, not exactly blindingly fast. I suspect we have all easily tracked slowly scrolling letters and shapes like that on a monitor.

Not a computer geek? Try the following less exact but quick and dirty experiment. Pick up a book with tiny print, like in a footnote, about the size that you can read with a little effort when held at arm's length. (That means it is approaching the limits of your acuity.) Move it at Arnold-type angular speed of 1.2 cm/sec or about 1/2 inch/sec. Any trouble now reading it? Move it 10 times faster, about 5 inches/sec. Become impossible to read even 10 times faster? Try it. Still readable, isn't it? How much more does one need to know?

I think the problem here is not pelicanism, but another common one. Even the best people can make serious mistakes when they argue outside their own fields of expertise (of which Brad Sparks has many BTW).

I often blunder myself when I try to argue outside of my own knowledge bubble, which is why I try to make it a rule not to wade into arguments of about which I know little. I have more than once kicked myself for not heeding that rule.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:43:49 -1000
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:26:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Goldstein

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:05:37 -0700
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 22:23:02 -1000
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 17:38:17 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Rich Reynolds <rrrrgroup.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 16:39:13 -0500
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

><snip>

>>Wendy, can you please clear up my confusion by letting me know
>>what "fezzic" means?

>>Thanks,

>Hi Josh,

>Sure. It means a person who acts jicky.

>Wendy

Hi Wendy,

Ha ha you have stumped me again. Are these words from the colloquial language of your region, your personal language, or space alien language? It makes me feel zimmy.

Josh

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Alien Autopsy Info Request - Morton

From: Dave Morton <Marspyrs.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 00:00:10 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:29:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Alien Autopsy Info Request - Morton

>From: Philip Mantle <philip.nul>
>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:10:59 -0000
>Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 09:48:44 -0500
>Subject: Alien Autopsy Info Request

>Dear Colleagues,

>I am preparing a chapter on my new book on the alien autopsy
>film. The chapter in question concerns comments on the film from
>the medical profession. Unfortunate one of my floppy discs
>containing a lot of this information has been corrupted, so I've
>had to start all over again.

>I'd therefore like to ask if you have any information either for
>or against the authenticity of the alien autopsy film from
>anyone within the medical profession.

>Your assistance with this request is greatly appreciated.

>Many thanks,

>Philip Mantle
>www.beyondroswell.com

Philip -

If you're running Windows, here's some software which may
recover the data on your floppy disk. These programs work on
floppies and hard drives.

Physical problems: Spinrite.

<http://www.grc.com/>

I've used it and it works. Expensive, but there's nothing else
like it that I know of.

Logical problems (deleted files, etc): Restorer.

<http://www.bitmart.net/unformat&uneraseFAQ.shtml>

I've used that one as well, and it works.

I'm running Windows XP/Pro.

Dave Morton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Canadian UFO Sightings Hit Record Pace

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:32:18 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:32:18 -0500
Subject: Canadian UFO Sightings Hit Record Pace

Source: The London Free Press - London, Ontario

<http://tinyurl.com/4mv46>

02-21-05

Canadian UFO Sightings Hit Record Pace

WINNIPEG - There were no little green men to be seen but there were plenty of strange occurrences in the night sky last year. A national survey by Ufology Research of Manitoba shows a record 882 UFO sightings were recorded in Canada in 2004 - an average of more than two a day and up 31 per cent from the previous year.

Included in the reports of unidentified flying objects were disc-shaped crafts, spectacular fireballs and a large black triangular object moving through the sky.

Chris Rutkowski, research co-ordinator for the UFO tracking group, said the results show that people still have a fascination with what's going on above.

"People are curious about the universe," Rutkowski said yesterday. "People continue to report observing unusual objects in the sky and some of these objects do not have simple or obvious explanations."

Rutkowski said he's not exactly sure what caused the increase, although sightings have been growing steadily.

For a while that could be attributed to popular TV shows such as the X-Files or significant events such as the millennium, he said, but now it might simply be due to more UFO reporting sites on the Internet.

Ontario led with 254 sightings, British Columbia was second with 247 and Manitoba was third with 112.

Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Quebec all had a record number of sightings.

Figures show that more than 5,000 UFO sightings have been officially reported in Canada since 1989. Witnesses include pilots, police and individuals with good observation capabilities, Rutkowski said.

In most cases, a sighting can be explained, he added. More often than not it's a satellite, a piece of flaming asteroid or some kind of military training exercise.

But in 2004, about 15 per cent of all UFO reports remained a mystery. Even when only the most high-quality cases are considered, seven per cent still weren't 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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Aliens: Why They Are Here By Bryan Appleyard

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:38:01 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:38:01 -0500
Subject: Aliens: Why They Are Here By Bryan Appleyard

Source: The Times Online -- London, UK

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,923-1488817,00.html>

02-19-05

Aliens: Why They Are Here By Bryan Appleyard
reviewed by Mark Henderson

Take me to your leader

Aliens: Why They Are Here
By Bryan Appleyard
Scribner
ISBN 0 743 25685 9

It is an unfortunate law of ufology that potential audience grows in inverse proportion to credibility and intellectual rigour. Rational explanations for strange phenomena, alas, never sell as well as the X-Files. The principal market for alien investigations has always been those who want to believe rather than to understand. Such people do not much enjoy having their misconceptions debunked.

By this token, Bryan Appleyard's *Aliens: Why They Are Here* will probably do well. This cultural history of little green men and their anal probes purports to be an intellectual tour de force that makes sense of the modern obsession with extraterrestrials. It certainly covers plenty of ground: virtually every celebrated sighting and abduction is here, along with an exhaustive survey of the science fiction. But it is largely devoid of the sceptical analysis without which such an enterprise cannot work. There is little to discomfit its likely readers.

Appleyard starts from the premise that whether or not aliens have visited us, they represent a genuine, important cultural phenomenon that begs to be better understood. This is reasonable enough: delusional beliefs have furnished psychologists and philosophers with plenty of useful insights into the human condition.

Aliens, both fictional inventions and those that people claim to have encountered, often reiterate similar themes. Human beings are a failed race, selfish, aggressive creatures bent on destroying the unique planet with which they have been blessed. Alien discourse seems to reflect our deepest concerns, and Appleyard is most interesting when musing on what this might reveal. Our fascination with visitors from other worlds is rooted in malaise about mankind's place in the Universe, and the meaning of consciousness in a post-religious age. Figures such as the replicants of *Blade Runner* and Gort from *The Day the Earth Stood Still* might be alien in origin, but the problems they highlight are distinctly human.

Where Appleyard sticks to interpreting inventions, he is on

solid ground. The trouble is he does not accept that ET is entirely invented. =93This book is about fictional creation and real experience and, on the credibility of the latter, it passes no judgment,=94 he writes. This is a critical weakness that undermines the intellectual foundations of his project.

Without passing judgment on what is true and what is imagined, it is impossible to reach meaningful conclusions about the significance of the alien phenomenon. Appleyard tells us again and again that as people genuinely believe they have encountered aliens, this makes their experiences culturally =93real=94. To ask whether they literally happened, he thinks, misses their point. But this will not do. A delusion, honestly believed, is still a delusion. We can certainly ask interesting questions about what generated the delusion, and about the cultural and social influences that gave it a particular form. But these questions are very different from the ones we would want to ask of someone who had actually been beamed aboard a UFO.

This leads to constant irritation. We are told, for example, that Dr Roger K. Leir, a Californian podiatrist (foot specialist), has acquired a collection of alien devices implanted into those who have been abducted. Has he really? Erich von Daniken, who believes human beings were created by aliens mating with primates between 100,000 and 40,000 years ago, =93cannot be refuted any more than Darwin could be=94. Is the recent discovery of Homo sapiens fossils from 195,000 years ago not sufficient proof? Appleyard=92s refusal to evaluate outlandish claims just makes him look foolish. The danger of too open a mind, it is often said, is that your brain can fall out.

He acknowledges the psychosocial explanation for alien sightings and abductions, but refuses to engage with it. These experiences are generally =93recovered=94 under deep hypnosis, a technique that psychologists such as Elizabeth Loftus have exposed as virtually worthless for providing reliable evidence. Appleyard, indeed, has himself been hypnotised into =93remembering=94 an alien apparition he accepts was probably not there. But he will not go with the simple explanation to which the evidence leads: that aliens are a culturally specific manifestation of perceptual errors to which the human mind is prone. Occam=92s razor is not in his toolbox.

A wealth of sceptical literature is essentially ignored, and with it many of the most convincing explanations for what the believers think they have seen. A quick glance at his bibliography makes this plain. There is no mention of Michael Shermer, the psychologist who has drawn compelling analogies between alien abductions and medieval witch crazes and angelic apparitions. The only look-in for the great Carl Sagan comes through the Robert Zemeckis film version of his sci-fi novel Contact. Stephen Webb=92s brilliant Where is Everybody?, which attempts to answer the celebrated question posed by Enrico Fermi about the existence of other advanced civilisations, is also passed over. He does cite the most indefatigable debunker of UFOs, Philip Klass, but always with a sneer. The overwhelming impression is that Appleyard has done only the homework that suits his purpose.

Instead, we get a sympathetic treatment of the theories of the late John Mack, a psychologist who thought that those abducted by aliens were on to something. Mack argued, and Appleyard agrees, that alien experiences are products of a =93third realm=94 that naturalistic science cannot handle. His belief that =93we are connected beyond the Earth at a cosmic level=94 is quoted approvingly. =93Scientism=94 =97 Appleyard likes this pejorative for seeking rational explanations of strange phenomena =97 impedes understanding of what Mack calls =93beings, creatures, spirits, gods . . . that have through the millennia been intimately involved with human existence=94.

The problem with this New Age mush is that rational inquiry works. Our knowledge may be incomplete, but science builds it cumulatively, providing ever better approximations of the truth. Newton improved on Aristotle, and Einstein on Newton, and Einstein will not be the last word. But this does not mean, as Appleyard states, that =93goblins and Greys with huge black eyes . . . remain as real as quantum theory or the second law of thermodynamics=94. The latter provides predictions of the world that stack up when confronted with data. The evidence for the former is pure anecdote.

A cultural history of aliens that accepts this, and tries to explain why so many people who do not appear mentally ill believe they have seen things they have not, would be an interesting project. But Appleyard has not taken it on. He has instead chosen to write an anti-Enlightenment diatribe that is profoundly unsatisfying.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Is Anyone Out There?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:40:59 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:40:59 -0500
Subject: Is Anyone Out There?

Source: RedNova.Com

<http://www.rednova.com/news/display/?id=129333>

02-19-05

Is Anyone Out There?

"Spirit finds Peace."

From a spiritual perspective, that statement sums up what most religions hope to help their adherents accomplish.

But this week there is a tangible reality in the statement that raises spiritual questions in a place few now look for answers about evolution and Creation - questions that have puzzled holy men and heathens for most of human history.

"Spirit finds Peace" is the headline of a story in Tuesday's online edition of Astrobiology Magazine, www.astrobio.net, and refers to one of two Martian rovers, dubbed "Spirit," locating "an unusual fragmented rock called Peace (that) appears to have been cemented by some action" the NASA rover has yet to fully analyze.

"If the sulfate-rich interior (of the rock) represents Epsom salts, or magnesium sulfates, then the discovery may hint at a percolating water history near the Columbia Hills" on the surface of Mars.

And if you find water on another planet, you may well find indications of life - at least in some form recognizable to Earthlings.

Such a finding would not only open a vast array of new endeavor and research for scientists, but many believe it would widen the religious debate - particularly in the Judeo-Christian tradition - over God's role in the formation of life not only on Earth but throughout the cosmos.

While visions of little green men and UFOs often follow the suggestion of life on other planets, most scientists working in the emerging field of astrobiology - the search for the beginning of life on Earth and in space - believe the likelihood of finding evidence of simple life forms like microbes on other worlds is not only possible, but probable, even within their lifetimes.

So confident are they about the potential for finding life elsewhere that NASA astrobiologists have held discussions about the social implications of their work.

"Whether the first confirmed detection (of life) is fossilized or alive, microbial or intelligent, it is extremely important for us to be highly knowledgeable about likely reactions," reads a statement on a NASA's Ames Research Center Web site.

"We would be foolish and negligent if we did not study such reactions well ahead of time and make state-of-the-art preparations for major discoveries. Carefully prepared plans should be in place very soon," says the statement from a 1999 conference, "because evidence of extraterrestrial life could be found at any time."

Such a finding "may stimulate a worldwide resurgence in religious activity," they wrote, adding that "some of the needs of humanity as a whole may require the kind of nonscientific solutions provided by religion."

Among those actively looking for such life are researchers at the University of Arizona in Tucson, who are the recipients of a three-year grant from the Templeton Foundation to host a series of research lectures on "Astrobiolgy and the Sacred: Implications of Life Beyond Earth."

Nick Woolf, professor of astronomy at the University of Arizona, said he can't imagine any of the processes that go on routinely in nature "working without some continuous maintenance of what is sometimes called the laws of physics, sometimes called Mother Nature and sometimes called God.

"Something has to keep this consistency that we have in the universe, and if anything, I find it rather odd that people who tend most to think there is a God also tend to think that maybe he doesn't understand what he's doing" in that they believe he is "accessible to the whims of individuals who ask for what they want."

What does make sense to him is a divine force that "is involved in the continuous working of all that is around me - one that knows and has organized everything, has set it up at the start to be just right and to stay that way."

Asked if he expects to have help finding life on other worlds through praying to God, he replies, "that's not what I'm expecting."

Yet he believes it is "highly probably that life has evolved elsewhere." He's particularly intrigued by planets recently discovered beyond our solar system - the first in 1995, and more than 140 others since. Based on sheer statistical likelihood among the billions of planets projected to exist in the universe, many astrobiologists believe they will eventually find other Earth-like planets orbiting at a comfortable distance around stars much like our sun.

Examining the natural processes at work on Earth, they believe some form of life could be "produced by the same inexorable rules working from the beginning" here, Woolf said. "If it can happen once, it presumably can happen again. There's a very good reason for looking."

Woolf and his colleagues have reason beyond mere personal interest for considering the religious aspects of the search for life on other worlds. In 1993, officials from the Vatican Observatory - located in or near Rome since 1891 to observe the heavens - completed construction of the Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope on Mount Graham, Ariz., in cooperation with University of Arizona astronomers at the Steward Observatory.

It was the first of a planned collaborative project that will see the construction of some of the world's most sophisticated telescopes there. A plaque dedicating the first device reads, in part, "May whoever searches here night and day the far reaches of space use it joyfully with the help of God."

Vatican astronomers spend several months each year working in Arizona and publish their research results in international journals. Jesuit George Coyne is director of the Vatican Observatory and believes it's "madness" to think humans are alone in the universe.

Though he was traveling this week and unavailable for comment, he told a newspaper in Milan called Corriere della Sera in 2002 that "the more we study the stars the more we become aware of our own ignorance," insisting there is not necessarily a conflict between the biblical accounts of Creation and those

championed by scientists.

Coyne spends part of the year at the Vatican's astrophysical research center at Castelgandolfo near Rome, which houses a rare collection of antique books by Copernicus, Galileo, Newton and Kepler in addition to a unique meteorite collection being studied for clues to the early history of the solar system.

Woolf, who is also director of the NASA Astrobiology Institute's Tucson node, says one of the most difficult challenges astrobiologists face in moving their work forward is communicating with scientists in other disciplines. Different terminology and ways of thinking make some uneasy with a topic that treads close to religion for many.

"We're working on a range of activities including things that try to reach into the minds of people in other areas."

Lecture topics on "Astrobiology and the Sacred" this year will include a minority view within astrobiology that life will not be found outside our solar system; a new study on teaching evolution, and views of life from a Buddhist monk and a Jewish rabbi.

Upcoming

ABC Television will air a report next week dealing with questions about whether intelligent life from other worlds has visited Earth. "UFOs - Seeing is Believing," is the topic of a two-hour Primetime special report by Peter Jennings to air Thursday, Feb. 24, at 7 p.m. Mountain time. Jennings conducted more than 150 interviews for the report, including scientists leading the search for life beyond Earth.

This is the first in a three-part series in the Religion-Ethics section on how religion plays into the search for extraterrestrial life.

- Coming Feb. 26 - Whether for religious or other reasons, skeptics say there can be no other life in the universe.
- March 5 - Religion, the Creation and the evolving view of God's role in the cosmos.

E-mail: carrie.nul

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:47:18 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:47:18 -0500
Subject: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

Source: About.Com

<http://tinyurl.com/6de4u>

Skeptical Inquirer magazine - January/February 1996

Special Report

A Surgeon's View: Alien Autopsy's Overwhelming Lack of Credibility
Joseph A. Bauer, M.D.

Alien Autopsy: Fact or Fiction The remarkable aspect of the alleged Roswell alien saucer crash is that in nearly 50 years of tenacious efforts to legitimize the event by scores of believers and supposed witnesses and participants, not a single, solitary bit of tangible, credible evidence has been found to support such a fantastic and significant event. Despite the reports of extensive debris found in the field at this alleged crash site; despite the many who allegedly handled material fragments with amazing qualities; despite hearsay that the alien bodies and craft were spirited away with unheard-of government efficiency and conspiratorial secrecy to locations that remain mysterious and unproven; despite all these exceedingly unlikely occurrences, no one has surfaced with a hint of convincing, supportive evidence; not even a tiny piece of that mysterious material scattered so widely and handled by so many has surfaced for examination. Didn't anyone slip a fragment into his or her pocket? And now, perhaps to mark the event's upcoming 50th anniversary, someone is apparently trying again to prove this was really an extraterrestrial event -- this time with an alien autopsy film.

I recognize that it is far easier to create a hoax than to unmask one. But the question "Why?" effectively exposes the bizarre scenarios depicted in the autopsy film as blatant fabrications.

Why introduce a film now, when alleged mortal fear of repercussions from the government supposedly silenced all witnesses for decades? If the film is authentic, why didn't someone cash in on it in a big way, decades ago, selling it to the highest bidder in a worldwide auction by an agent assuring anonymity of the source? Other than placing a period clock and telephone in the scene, why didn't the filmmaker use some rudimentary special effects to give the autopsy scenario at least the appearance of being more than the clumsy gropings of veiled, amateur actors impersonating medical investigators?

Considering that an alien autopsy would have been a unique event, the maker of this film should have attempted at least to give the appearance of the event being authentic and credible. Why not use a group of actors trained in instrument handling? Why not progress through a systematic autopsy process, rather than just slash and cut out viscera? And wouldn't it have been better to show the need to take many days or weeks to unravel and comprehend the allegedly unrecognizable, misplaced internal

organs? But none of these essential procedures was observed, indicating that the autopsy was not authentic, but was contrived by low budget, poorly advised nonprofessionals.

There was no systematic progression of the autopsy, starting from a careful examination and penetration of organs and orifices, particularly since alien lore predicates extraordinary eyes, lack of ears or hearing, imperforated oral cavities and questionable need for gastrointestinal tracts, and no genital or anal structures. Next, skilled unroofing of the body cavities would have been followed by surgically precise and detailed dissection, delineating interrelationships, continuity, and formations of the various unknown internal organ systems, during which time decomposition of the body would need to be prevented by some preservation or embalming process. Indeed, there might have been a rare -- no, unprecedented and unparalleled -- opportunity to study an alien corpse; but it was not an autopsy that was needed, but rather, a systematic, lengthy, detailed, precise, anatomic dissection and microscopic study of a well-preserved body by a team of specialists of the various, presumably strange, organ systems. No less than that was done in the initial evaluations of the newly discovered Coelocanth. (When a carcass of this primitive fish, thought to be extinct, was first dredged from the depths of the Indian Ocean off Madagascar, ichthyologists worldwide were involved in its dissection, study, and preservation.)

Instead, the dramatic and graphic autopsy -- performed with far less diligence and skill than a routine autopsy -- was staged by the filmmaker in two scenes. First, the anonymous, hooded figures stand around ineptly trying to occupy their hands, clearly devoid of the rudimentary skills of manual examination of a body, generally expected of any physician, clinical pathologist, or other medical professional. This is followed by tentative, insecure incising, with the operator's face peering down close to the body from which he or she wants to be shielded by wearing the protective suit. Scene two shows the body open; the same inexperienced, unskilled hands are groping around randomly and unsystematically, and without efforts to recognize or analyze organ structures, relationships, or continuity. The bizarre body contents are blindly chopped out and tossed into pans. Ironically, since the external body structure appears so humanlike, the real question is, why should these internal organs be so unrecognizable?

An autopsy is done to determine a disease process, a deviation from the norm, or the cause of death. When the norm is unknown, as would be the case with an alien body, then a careful anatomic dissection is needed with frequent samples being taken for microscopic examination. Anatomical dissection consists of precise steps of delineation, tracing the continuity and relationship of each fold, loop, or bulge to adjacent structures, particularly if the anatomy is unknown and unrecognized as claimed here.

This poorly performed autopsy may have botched a golden opportunity to learn much about this corpse. But it is consistent with an ill-designed hoax. Observation of how ineptly the instruments are held and used is also revealing, and distinguishes a skilled medical professional from an actor. Scissors, for example, are not held with the forefinger and thumb awkwardly pointing off sideways, as was done in the film. Instead, the ring finger and thumb are placed in the scissors' holes, the middle finger stabilizes, and the index finger is used to direct the scissor tip precisely. Dissection should be done with judicious irrigation and sponging of obscuring fluids (none was seen in the film); dissection is done with direct vision of the knife or scissor points and not by blindly cutting, as depicted. The chopping out and removal of body contents would have totally distorted the functional and structural relationships of organs and destroyed the functional anatomy.

The peculiar headgear of these hooded operators is also enigmatic. Presumably, the hoods were intended to protect against microbes, vapors, or other alien toxins. But as shown, the hoods would cause rapid asphyxia from anoxia and accumulation of exhaled carbon dioxide. Where are the pumps and hoses necessary to supply fresh air to the operators? Without a circulating air supply, the visors would also have become rapidly fogged by condensation, and vision would be obscured.

The lack of a detectable air supply suggests that the hoods used for this film were sufficiently porous for air exchange to occur freely, and thus would provide no protection against toxic gases or microbial contagion. All these observations are also most consistent with an ill-designed theatrical mock-up, rather than an actual autopsy of a potentially contagious, decomposing, alien corpse.

The mode of photographic documentation also raises countless questions: Why did a professional photographer repeatedly, if not intentionally, go out of focus and usually position himself or herself behind the actors to obscure the view at the most crucial moments -- such as when the cranium (head) was opened? Why was the removal of the skullcap not seen, nor the in situ appearance of the brain? Why was a movie camera chosen for documentation (since movie cameras were known to have a focus problem) when efficient 35 mm still cameras with close-up lenses and color film were available at the time and commonly used for medical/surgical/pathological documentation? Furthermore, why was the camera operator allowed to take away and keep a film, when, according to testimony presented, an otherwise high level of secrecy was exercised and enforced with mortal threats? Why did the camera operator not ship this roll back to the military, as he or she did with the other rolls of film, instead of notifying the military to pick it up; and why did the military -- incredibly -- allow the camera operator to keep this top secret film? Of course a movie camera poorly focused and poorly positioned would be the choice of someone intending to tantalize, mislead, and not reveal any information in the course of hoax.

Only two conclusions are possible from this film: Either this is the work of beginners attempting to create a hoax to resuscitate the corpse of Roswell crash lore; or, if the film is intended to portray an actual autopsy of an unusual humanoid body (a proposition untenable and entirely unsubstantiated), then it is a documentation of the crime of the millennium -- the brutal butchery, devastation, and destruction of unique evidence and an unparalleled opportunity to gain some understanding about this deformed creature, regardless of its origin.

I hope that this critique will not guide someone to produce a more believable alien autopsy film.

About the Author

Joseph A. Bauer is a surgeon in Cleveland, Ohio, and a member of South Shore Skeptics.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

UFOs Over Hornopiren Chile

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 09:56:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:50:41 -0500
Subject: UFOs Over Hornopiren Chile

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
February 21, 2005
SOURCE: Diario El Llanhuique (Puerto Montt)
DATE: February 21, 2005 UFO FLEET OVER HORNOPIREN

Eyewitnesses saw UFO flying over Cerro Hornopiren for over 60 seconds.

Around 15:00 hours Walter Jara and his cousin Luis Aguilar saw a UFO for over a minute over Cerro Hornopiren. According to Jara's account, the UFO flew over the summit before his startled eyes, and a few seconds later, he gathered his wits and managed to take a digital photo of the object.

Jara said that at the moment of the photograph he was not aware of the flying objects that flew over the perimeter vertically. He was surprised a few minutes later. At first, he thought that it could have been a spot on the camera lens.

But after keeping the UFO in sight for 60 seconds, his perception and that of his cousin were changed.

According to his story, the flying saucers were not visible in plain sight. However, when he zoomed the camera lens, he was able to see them clearly. It was a moment of wonder and amazement, said Jara. "The day was clear and cloudless. The object oscillated vertically in the sky. I don't think it was a bird because they move differently."

He added that the UFO was grey in color and oval-shaped.

Jara's friend Fernando Garces said that his family lives in Hornopiren and has never seen any object with the characteristics mentioned by Walter Jara. The Meteorology Office attached to Puerto Montt's Tepual Airport discarded the possibility that weather balloons could be involved, since these are launched at 8:00 and fly over the area for a maximum time of 2 hours. According to weather official Gast=F3n Mu=Floz, by eleven o'clock the balloons have burst.

Translation (c) 2005 Scott Corrales, IHU.
Special thanks to Liliana Nunez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:52:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:04:38 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:41:14 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

James, we seem to agree on many things.

1. I have for decades been stressing that technological progress comes from doing things differently in an unpredictable way. The future is NOT an extrapolation of the past. I am certainly not saying aliens are at our level of technology. I very frequently point out that Zeta 1 and Zeta 2 Reticuli are sunlike stars that are a billion years older than the sun and are only 1/8th of a light year apart are only 39 light years from here and would have had a greater incentive for star travel than we do.

2. Yes, all designers of advanced propulsion systems stress reliability and safety. And all such systems have occasional accidents. The shuttle is far more advanced than a horse and buggy, a ford or chevrolet, a 747; redundancy is built in.. But 2 have had fatal accidents. We have no idea how many flying saucer accidents or crashes there are per thousand miles travelled. They may do much better than 747's. It is of interest that the earth excursion modules are the ones that seem to crash as opposed to the interstellar mother ships.

3. We must judge by the evidence.. 2 saucers , at least, crashed in NM in July 1947. Whether we understand the causes is besides the point. Murders have been committed where we have no idea of why. But they happened. I can't expect visiting aliens to know so much about us and our planet that all contingencies can be taken care of. Maybe the pilots need more sleep. Maybe they had jet lag from the long trip. Maybe somebody forgot to brief them on our lightning storms. Maybe a vital part was overstressed when they swerved to avoid a missile...

4. Don't forget that old reports about this planet may have misled the aliens who were taken aback by new and unplanned technological progress on our part that never would have happened had there not been WW 2. There was a tendency on the part of the USA to think that the Russians post WW 2 were just a bunch of dumb peasants without ivy league educations. But they put up the first satellite, the first animal, the first man, the first rocket around the moon. It took a while for us to catch up.. Do notice the enormous difference in our technology between 1937 and 1947.

I do not believe we can make judgements about alien perfection other than to say they are not perfect.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:59:54 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:54:01 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:10:00 -1000
>Subject: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>Aloha all,

>I wish to further pursue this issue of whistleblower testimony
>and how important it is to relax the strict evidentiary rules
>that might be applied to whistleblower testimonies alleging
>reverse engineering of extraterrestrial vehicles, retrieval of
>crashed extraterrestrial vehicles, and of secret agreements with
>extraterrestrial biological entities. An example of such a
>whistleblower is Bob Lazar who allegedly worked at the secure
>facility of S4 in the vicinity of Area 51, but had great
>difficulty in supplying documentary evidence supporting his
>alleged work at S4 on an extraterrestrial vehicle.

I've gotta hand it to Michael Salla. It was just last night I was scouring the web on some research and his website came up. Some fine work to be had there. It wasn't full of hot air and had none of the character assassination nonsense.

I'm glad you've touched on the Bob Lazar story. I'm aware that many top people think he's full of baloney but I'm not convinced yet. If Lear was with him on an outing, is Lear a liar too?

Why is it so many people I know who are no where near interested in UFOs so sore at Lazar? Seems like he's rubbed some mugs the wrong way.

That gets my attention.

Finally, whistleblowers. We all know probably one of the #1 causes of death outside of disease is pulling the covers off a bunch of crooks. Soon as guy stands up, it's like every chimp and his uncle is ready to take him down. There's little or no documentation regarding Lazar? I could believe it. I've seen it happen and attempted.

Bottom line is, history will prove him out or it won't. He's either on the level or he isn't. We'll see, but I for one am not going to count him out yet. I've seen too much jealousy and backbiting already.

What we need to do as a culture is make things safer for people to come forward and expose the crumbs who favor money over the lives of their fellow beings.

Just look. We've got a 'Witness Protection Program' here in the U.S. That's a damned shame that we're so crime ridden and so incompetent when it comes to fighting crime that we have to go overboard to protect the victims and witnesses.

I could go on and on about crime in the U.S. don't even get me started.

Best ,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 09:14:59 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:56:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Connors

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 10:41:29 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:05:37 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 22:23:02 -1000
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>>Wendy, can you please clear up my confusion by letting me know
>>>what "fezzic" means?

>>Sure. It means a person who acts jicky.

>I think "fezzic" and "jicky" are perfectly cromulent words and
>their usage embiggens us all.

Hi Terry,

A fellow blabblesnorkum! That's scary...

Actually, fezzic is a slang term denoting a person whose train of thought is scattered beyond all recognition. There are political leaders who are fezzic... George W. being the most brilliant and current example at being unable to form a simple cohesive thought and jicky when he opens his mouth to speak.

Jicky is a slang term used mostly in the Lubbock, TX area. The term denotes a person whose intellectual attainment rose to the level of complete chaos and speaks in a fragmented manner.

But then again, Lubbock, TX is known for their wee-wee lights too.

Wendy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Warren

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 08:39:53 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:59:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Warren

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:04:38 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:41:14 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:39:29 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

Gentlemen,

Pardon me for interjecting, but I couldn't stand it anymore!
James, not to be rude but I'm wondering if what your seeing on
your computer screen is coming up in a "foreign language." I
thought what Stan was saying was flawlessly clear, but allow me
to translate:

>>>Yes, the important thing is hard evidence of crashed UFO
>>>hardware. Then we are getting somewhere.

>>Frankly James, I am truly impressed with your proclamations
>>about perfect infallible aliens for which you provide not a whit
>>of any kind of evidence, but then you demand access to hard
>>evidence of crashed saucers.! That takeschutzpah. One would
>>think you had studied a myriad of alien civilizations, their
>>accident rates, travel technology, etc.Witness testimony isn't
>>good enough for you.It is good enough to lead to the death
>>penalty in Texas .

>I respect you Mr. Friedman. You have done much good work in the
>UFO area, as well as non-UFO areas.

>I am hardly making proclamations. I am stating that
>probabilities imply certain things. If I have not stated that
>clearly then I am sorry.

>I do not see any problem with extrapolating technology based on
>our human experiences. If you claim that UFOs are caused by
>aliens near our own technology level, then I must counter that
>this is very unlikely based on probabilities. It seems odd to me
>that you think aliens (if they are the cause of UFOs) have the
>same technology level as us. The probabilities imply that is any
>aliens are visiting, then they would have been spacefaring for
>thousands of years.

Therein lies the problem - if aliens are akin to humans then one
could "logically" extrapolate technology based on "our"
experiences - since there isn't enough data to substantiate that
mindset, then making projections from that ideology is not
feasible!

Stan never indicated that he thought aliens were at the same
technological level as us. Again not having any data to work

with about an extraterrestrial civilization there are no probabilities.

>I respect some witness testimony when it describes UFO craft >behavior and even alien abductions. But a crashed alien UFO >story, just as dead alien story is much more far fetched than >the "I saw a weird like in the sky last night" story. Therefore, >requesting hard proof doesn't seem too much to ask.

>I will concede that if the crashed "UFOs" are actually human >technology then it can likely crash, as we have seen in the >past.

>>I think you have been reading too much science fiction. Come on >>out to the real world fallible as it may be.

>Sir, I work in the real world of space travel. I do not read >science fiction (although I liked Hitchhiker's Guide). Although >I see an occasional science fiction TV program, I dislike TV in >general and watch no more than 1 hour a day.

>In the various technical areas of space travel, I can say, >because I have witnessed it, that the goal is to make the >spacecraft/spacesuit/space hardware ever more reliable. I think >it is valid to assume a high probability exists that ALL alien >races that do space travel would go through this kind of phase.

You cannot assume anything - that's the message that you don't seem to be comprehending. Also, amongst the myriad of things we don't know about our visitors, the vehicles involved near Roswell and or others may not have been "space faring" vehicles at all! Their purpose could just be for "inner-planetary" (opposed to "interplanetary") travel only.

>Examining our own current goals (technology roadmaps) I see many >references to highly reliable, safe space hardware. In fact, it >would be extremely likely that aliens have the reliability "art" >down to such an automated method based on real-life historical >data that it is cheap to do.

There isn't any data to measure to be able to say anything is likely.

>The whole point to having spacecraft is to perform a mission. >What sense is there to make spacecraft that cannot perform the >mission because they are always crashing?

Who says aliens make sense?

>Science fiction would be visitations by non-corporeal entities >who really don't need spaceships. I can't guess whether this has >happened on Earth.

>Consider the continuum of possible alien races. Restructuring >galaxies may not be beyond the abilities of high end races. >Building new elementary particles from scratch would be easy. >Nanotechnology would be ancient history. A race a thousand years >beyond ours should be infallible in our eyes at least.

"Assuming" aliens are like humans, carbon based, societal, religious, emotional etc., and advance in the same manner.

>My main question is why do we even see any evidence of UFOs at >all given their advanced abilities. They may not care if we see >them, but I guess they would not want pieces of them gathered >for inspection and use and likely would not design disposable >spacecraft and crew.

>Just my opinion.

The point James is that in order to form a theorem about "anything" much less an extraterrestrial race, there has to be data to draw from; unless you've learned something the rest of us haven't, (if so please share) any theorem, assumption, idea is not viable!

Respectfully,

Frank Warren

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 16:46:27 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:01:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Hall

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 14:03:17 -0600
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Lyle Michel <courtroomevidence456.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:47:21 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>Rosewell involved at least two craft of an extraterrestrial
>>origin! There are buckets full of eyewitnesses to the event! If
>>you are confused about what consitutes courtroom type evidence I
>>suggest you look it up in a legal dictionary or on the Internet!

>>To believe that the crash of extraterrestrial vehicles in the
>>area of Roswell New Mexico did not happen in 1947 is on par with
>>the extraterrestrials trying to figure out whether earthlings
>>need to eat in order to live!

>>I hope this will make sense to most of you!

>Hi Lyle,

>I'm sure Stan Friedman would be interested in seeing your
>buckets.

>Kyle

Now there is a 'believer'! I'm still reeling from all those
exclamation points!!!

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:04:48 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:39:54 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:10:00 -1000
>Subject: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>I wish to further pursue this issue of whistleblower testimony
>and how important it is to relax the strict evidentiary rules
>that might be applied to whistleblower testimonies alleging
>reverse engineering of extraterrestrial vehicles, retrieval of
>crashed extraterrestrial vehicles, and of secret agreements with
>extraterrestrial biological entities. An example of such a
>whistleblower is Bob Lazar who allegedly worked at the secure
>facility of S4 in the vicinity of Area 51, but had great
>difficulty in supplying documentary evidence supporting his
>alleged work at S4 on an extraterrestrial vehicle. He even
>claimed that the subsequent absence of documentary evidence of
>his two Master's degrees were a result of these being somehow
>pulled from the public record. This has led to great criticism
>from UFO researchers arguing that without documentary evidence
>of his employment and academic degrees, Lazar's testimony is not
>credible. In fact, Stanton Friedman claimed "Not one shred of
>evidence has been put forth to support this story" (see
><http://www.v-j-enterprises.com/sflazar.html>). This is not at
>all accurate. Some evidence was found to support parts of
>Lazar's story that he was employed as a nuclear physicist at
>Los Alamos before being relocated to S4.

Michael this is flat out wrong. Read my brief piece again. I noted Lazar's name in the LANL phone book. It is followed by K/M which means he worked for Kirk Meyer NOT for Los Alamos. I talked to the Personnel Dept. giving them the name of a physicist I knew had worked there and had a high level clearance as well as Bob's. They found my guy, not Bob. The listing certainly doesn't indicate he was a nuclear physicist. He was a technician working at the Meson Accelerator facility.

I checked at least 5 different offices at MIT: The Registrar, the Physics Dept., the guy who keeps commencement lists, the guy who keeps track of MS theses, (Bob was a total no show) and perhaps of most interest the Legal counsel. He said there is no way for the government to wipe out all records. I checked his high school and found he was in the bottom third of his high school class with only one science course. MIT says no admission with that low a class ranking.

Bob falsely claimed Bill Duxler taught him Physics at Cal Tech. Duxler never taught at Cal Tech, but did have Bob registered in his class at Pierce Jr. College in So. California at the same time he was supposedly going to MIT 3000 miles away. If you can go to MIT, you don't go to Pierce. Long commute, too.

The tax form showed under \$1000.; a week's pay for a scientist. One doesn't get a high level clearance in a week.

>Lazar was able to supply a
>pay slip substantiating his contractual employment for Naval
>Intelligence for a short period. In addition investigators
>associated with George Knapp were able to find a telephone
>directory for Los Alamos that included Lazar's name, and even

>employee corroboration that Lazar had worked at Los >Alamos.

See above re Phone book.

At Los Alamos is not the same as for Los Alamos. A technician is not the same as a scientist.

>Also, Lazar was able to supply the name of the individual for
>doing background security checks that was confirmed by George
>Knapp. For discussion of evidence supporting Lazar see:
><http://www.karinya.com/travel2.htm>). A furthermore source of
>corroboration was John Lear who alleged that Lazar was able to
>take Lear and their two wives to view the testing of a reverse
>engineered saucer. This incident apparently sparked Lazar's
>termination as an employee at S4, and supports Lazar's claims
>that he knew of the testing schedule of the craft that were
>reverse engineered from the retrieved ETV.

How in the world can anybody claim that the bright object, which might have been one of the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles being tested, was reverse engineered from the retrieved ETV?

>Applying strict evidentiary rules to Lazar's testimony may be
>insufficient to substantiate his allegations due to the absence
>of key documents. Critics such as Stanton Friedman have
>concluded that Lazar is "bunk". However, if one relaxes these
>strict evidentiary rules on account of the special security
>procedures applying to Lazar's alleged employment, we discover
>three things. First, that a program involving extraterrestrial
>related technologies would be so highly classified that
>knowledge of these is to very few individuals with a
>demonstrable 'need to know'.

Where is there any evidence that Bob had a demonstrated need to know or a high level security clearance or was a scientist? Guys who operate Brothels have trouble with security clearances.

I take it Bob lost his diplomas, lost his Master's Thesis, was unable to get a transcript of his high school record... the request was prepared by George... but never, somehow, received by Bob. Gene Huff, Bob's buddy, asked me what it would take to convince me. I suggested a resume, copies of diplomas, copies of papers, membership in professional groups, listings in alumni directories. I sent him copies of my stuff. None were provided for Bob. Others have checked MIT yearbooks. Nothing.

>Second, projects involving alleged
>extraterrestrial vehicles are so highly classified, that
>draconian security procedures are involved. Third, it is
>possible that security procedures are in place that involve the
>removal of public records that might support the testimony of
>such witnesses.

We are talking 5 years minimum at MIT. The legal counsel said it would be impossible. Why wasn't the record at Pierce JC deleted???

>What I will do in what follows is show how the kind of program
>that Lazar allegedly worked in would be at the very least a
>Waived Unacknowledged Special Access Program where knowledge of
>this program was strictly limited to a few with a 'need to know'
>and where Congress exercises no effective oversight of the
>program. I also will argue that the Security Manager for such
>classified programs has extraordinary power to determine
>security procedures without any effective Congressional
>Oversight. This would make it possible for the Security Manager
>of the classified program Lazar allegedly worked in to arrange
>for the removal of public records substantiating Lazar's
>employment, and the intimidation of witnesses who could
>corroborate Lazar's testimony.

How about the records at MIT and CIT? What would be the purpose of removing these even if it were possible? Loads of people with very high level security clearances still have their degrees noted. One can't get GPA's without permission of the subject, but attendance and degrees can indeed be verified. Even the witness protection programs don't remove records of past degrees. Names are changed... perhaps new records inserted.

<snip>

>(End of Extract)

>There are a few important points that can be drawn from the
>above extract. First, knowledge of a waived Special Access
>Program (SAP) is strictly limited and only the Defense and/or
>Intelligence Committee chairs in both houses of Congress are
>apprised of these without being given any detailed information.
>This means that while Congress is de jure exercising oversight
>of these programs as prescribed by the US Constitution, it is de
>facto exercising no oversight at all. Basically, the SAP Program
>Managers are free to run these and the only effective oversight
>comes from committees within the military-intelligence
>establishment. Most revealing is that the program managers of
>SAPs have the power to decide who has a "need-to-know" and
>implement their own "independent security rules". Basically
>without any real congressional oversight system in place, the
>program managers of SAP's can implement draconian security
>procedures. These procedures would be entirely lawful due to the
>de jure oversight exercised by Congress. So in theory, the
>security manager of the SAP can arrange for the removal of
>public records such as University degrees and employment >record.

I see nothing in what you have written about security procedures for special access programs that has anything to do with the ability to remove public records of university degrees, theses, etc. And it doesn't explain how Bob could be taking a course at Pierce while attending MIT.

>This would be entirely legal and any University Registrar or
>Employer that refused to comply with such a request would be
>violating a lawful request for the removal of public information
>that violates national security.

It is difficult to imagine how public information violates national security... by definition. Furthermore it has nothing to do with how attendance at a University and its awarding a degree somehow can be construed as National Security Information. I know there are other listers who have had a security clearance besides me. Maybe they can correct me. Bob is not on any commencement lists... period. He of course never mentions a BS degree (he clearly qualifies for a Degree in B.S) though he couldn't have gotten an MSc without one.

>This would be a federal offense
>and demonstrates the legal mechanism that could be used for
>the removal of the public records that Lazar alleges were withdrawn
>in his case. Also, the employment slip that Lazar possessed that
>associated him with the Naval Intelligence points to the program
>he worked on being a Special Access Program under the
>purview of Naval Intelligence.

Funny that employment on a special Access program is shown on a Tax slip! It must have been written in invisible ink. I couldn't find it.

>In conclusion, the Bob Lazar case is very important since I
>believe it demonstrates how a whistleblower will have
>extraordinary difficulty in substantiating his/her allegations
>due to the removal of public documents that support their
>credibility. My recommendation is that taking into account the
>extraordinary security power of the managers of SAPs such as
>Lazar's the rules of evidence are considerably relaxed so we can
>properly evaluate the implications of their testimony rather
>than getting into debates over the conclusiveness of the
>evidence supporting testimonies such as Lazar's. Despite my
>respect for Stanton Friedman's intellect and fidelity to detail,
>I strongly disagree with his evaluation of the Bob Lazar case,
>and conclude that Lazar is a genuine whistleblower revealing
>important information concerning a waived Special Access
>Program at S4.

Quite extraordinary.. even without considering his lack of knowledge of physics (ask Jacques Vallee). and so many indications that he has lied about all aspects of his background and was not employed by LANL.

Michael, do you have your diplomas?

Bob is a liar. He hasn't sued for Libel because the best defense against libel is truth. He doesn't know the meaning of the word.

There are genuine whistleblowers... Lazar is not one of them. Neither was Michael Wolf Kruvant. Don't forget all conmen are good liars. They get a lot of practice and they often take people in.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

The Black Vault Major Renovation & Addition

From: John Greenewald - The Black Vault <john.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 09:45:27 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:43:41 -0500
Subject: The Black Vault Major Renovation & Addition

The Black Vault Newsletter
February 20, 2005

In This Issue:

The Black Vault Undergoes Major Renovation
Almost 30,000 pages added to the archive

With increase in size, comes increase in cost - Help Support The
Black Vault!

The Black Vault Undergoes Major Renovation

<http://www.blackvault.com>

The Black Vault has undergone a major renovation.

The site has been completely redesigned! To see it, simply head
on over to the site, and see whats new!

Still look the same? Logout on your account, and you will see.
If you like it, log back in, and head to your account section.
Darkside-x is the new default theme, if you would like to
change it. If you like the other default theme, it's still
there! Just select Clan-mts from the list to change it back.

A feature of The Black Vault is that you can change the look and
feel of the entire site with the click of a button. Though, my
new design is the preferred viewing method!

Almost 30,000 pages added to the archive
<http://www.bvalphaserver.com/article12785.html>

The Department of Defense, in Washington, D.C., has a reading
room where you can enter to access documents previously released
under the Freedom of Information Act. There are 18 CDs in total,
and contain thousands of pages of material on various subjects.
Problem is, you have to go to Washington, D.C. to read them.
Well, The Black Vault has changed that!

At the URL above, you will find links to the entire collection.

With increase in size, comes increase in cost - Help Support
The Black Vault!

<http://www.bvalphaserver.com/modules.php?name=Donations>

http://www.bvalphaserver.com/ecommerce/index.php?main_page=index&cPath=10

With the incredible increase in size to The Black Vault, and
only massive amounts more to come, the costs rise as well to
support The Black Vault on my end.

I need your help! At this link:

<http://www.bvalphaserver.com/modules.php?name=Donations>

You can support The Black Vault via PayPal to help pay for server charges which are a couple hundred dollars a month, and help pay for the documents themselves (large collections are waiting to be purchased!)

I can not express how much even a little donation of \$5 helps!

You can donate via other methods at the online store located here:

http://www.bvalphaserver.com/ecommerce/index.php?main_page=index&cPath=10

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

New Einstein@home Program Ready To Roll

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:43:57 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:46:16 -0500
Subject: New Einstein@home Program Ready To Roll

Now this is the kind of project that makes science fun.

Like the SETI.nul project it allows you to use your computer to process data. Makes a guy feel like he's up there with the big shots in physics.

Sure, I know there are some who disagree with SETI but what the heck, it's still fun and a way for us regular stiffs to get a crack at participating and learning.

Source: <http://einstein.phys.uwm.edu/>

News

Thank you for your interest in Einstein.nul!

Einstein.nul is a program that uses your computer's idle time to search for spinning neutron stars (also called pulsars) using data from the LIGO and GEO gravitational wave detectors. Einstein.nul is a World Year of Physics 2005 project supported by the American Physical Society (APS) and by a number of international organizations.

After several months of testing, we are now 'throwing open the doors' for general participation. If you would like to take part, please use the Create account link to create an account, and follow the instructions. Einstein.nul is available for Windows, Linux and MacOS X computers.

This first production run of Einstein.nul carries out a search for pulsars over the entire sky, using the most sensitive 600 hours of data from LIGO's third science run, S3.

Bruce Allen,
Professor of Physics
U. of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

Einstein.nul Leader for the LIGO Scientific Collaboration

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:51:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:48:02 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>T.o: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:10:00 -1000
>Subject: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>I wish to further pursue this issue of whistleblower testimony
>and how important it is to relax the strict evidentiary rules
>that might be applied to whistleblower testimonies alleging
>reverse engineering of extraterrestrial vehicles, retrieval of
>crashed extraterrestrial vehicles, and of secret agreements with
>extraterrestrial biological entities. An example of such a
>whistleblower is Bob Lazar who allegedly worked at the secure
>facility of S4 in the vicinity of Area 51, but had great
>difficulty in supplying documentary evidence supporting his
>alleged work at S4 on an extraterrestrial vehicle. He even
>claimed that the subsequent absence of documentary evidence of
>his two Master's degrees were a result of these being somehow
>pulled from the public record. This has led to great criticism
>from UFO researchers arguing that without documentary evidence
>of his employment and academic degrees, Lazar's testimony is not
>credible. In fact, Stanton Friedman claimed "Not one shred of
>evidence has been put forth to support this story" (see
><http://www.v-j-enterprises.com/sflazar.html>). This is not at
>all accurate. Some evidence was found to support parts of
>Lazar's story that he was employed as a nuclear physicist at Los
>Alamos before being relocated to S4. Lazar was able to supply a
>pay slip substantiating his contractual employment for Naval
>Intelligence for a short period. In addition investigators
>associated with George Knapp were able to find a telephone
>directory for Los Alamos that included Lazar's name, and even
>employee corroboration that Lazar had worked at Los Alamos.
>Also, Lazar was able to supply the name of the individual for
>doing background security checks that was confirmed by George
>Knapp. For discussion of evidence supporting Lazar see:
><http://www.karinya.com/travel2.htm>).

The fact that there is a record merely shows that he worked
there (and on fast cars). That's a "far cry" from being able to
demonstrate that he was transferred, at the request of Edward
Teller, to work at S-4 on a program that only a handpicked few
would know about.

>A furthermore source of
>corroboration was John Lear who alleged that Lazar was able to
>take Lear and their two wives to view the testing of a reverse
>engineered saucer. This incident apparently sparked Lazar's
>termination as an employee at S4, and supports Lazar's claims
>that he knew of the testing schedule of the craft that were
>reverse engineered from the retrieved ETV.

As I recall, this was a night time venture into the desert to
see moving "lights in the sky" which Lazar claimed were ET
vehicles, but could not be confirmed.

>Applying strict evidentiary rules to Lazar's testimony may be
>insufficient to substantiate his allegations due to the absence
>of key documents. Critics such as Stanton Friedman have
>concluded that Lazar is "bunk". However, if one relaxes these

>strict evidentiary rules on account of the special security
>procedures applying to Lazar's alleged employment, we discover
>three things. First, that a program involving extraterrestrial
>related technologies would be so highly classified that
>knowledge of these is to very few individuals with a
>demonstrable 'need to know'. Second, projects involving alleged
>extraterrestrial vehicles are so highly classified, that
>draconian security procedures are involved. Third, it is
>possible that security procedures are in place that involve the
>removal of public records that might support the testimony of
>such witnesses.

The story he told of working at S-4 is not the only reason to question what he has claimed. The physics that he describes of how craft traveled from one point to another and the famous element 116 all range from highly questionable to "bunk." For this reason some have suggested that Lazar did work there but was "set up" to provide disinformation for the masses.

However, as far as I am concerned Lazar's story is just that and I wouldn't use it as a basis for the formulation of any exopolitical policy without the following introducing the all-powerful "if":

If Lazar's story is true, then we might have some particular exopolitical consequences.

As for the rest of Dr. Salla's post, the description of SAP/CAP/ etc. is all very interesting but one wonders what to do with it. My own opinion is that we will never get the straight story from the government until we have found it out on our own... at which point the government may say, "Oh yeah, we knew that all along!"

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:56:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:50:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Gehrman

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 23:01:05 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:44:37 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

CDA, Stan, EBK, List,

I've thought for some time that Barney's observations took place at the AA crash site on Sunday, June 1st, 1947. The crash site (Nogal Canyon) is located in an area visited by rock-hounds and geologists; Barney may have heard rumors that something had occurred (a Russian spy plane?) and was inquisitive or he was just there for a Sunday outing.

His diary reads:

May 31 - Barnett in Socorro, working on house with Lopez.

June 1 - Barnett ill - took medicine (it's not clear if he went out and came home ill which seems logical if he'd just seen three aliens and the craft)

June 2 - Barnett by house several times (suggesting he stayed in Socorro but in and out of office.)

The Roswell crash took place on the night of July 2nd., 1947. The craft seemed to have exploded in mid-air because the port side had a huge hole in it that looked like it had exploded from inside out. (see MP's story:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2000/apr/m01-002.shtml>

I believe the debris from this blast fell on the Foster ranch and was found by Mac the next day. The remainder of the craft landed about 30 miles west of Hwy. 285 and probably near the north arm of the Gallo arroyo, south of Hwy 247.

It was recovered by July 4th and the bodies and remains of the craft were flown to other military bases.

One interesting note: I tried to find this crash site by using the MP's directions and the help of an informant who knew where Schmidt and Cary thought the site was located. I felt that the site would resemble the AA crash site and be covered with the cristobalite or something similar so it would be easily identifiable.

Using topo maps, we tentatively identified the area that we intended to explore. After renting a 4x4, my brother and I started our search. Only one problem; the road into the area had a locked gate.

It should have been public access, but it was denied. None of

the other roads were locked.

We tried to go across country but fences and arroyos blocked our way. I found that frustrating but interesting; next time we plan to rent a helicopter.

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 14:57:35 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:52:15 -0500
Subject: Re: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean - Ledger

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:16:57 -0800
>Subject: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean

>I put up a new UFO sightings map, this one is for the Indian
>Ocean. This is probably the second largest expanse of ocean
>waters without a single sighting (Reunion Island excepted).

>Events in the surrounding lands, Indian subcontinent, Africa,
>Australia... make a visual contrast.

><http://www.larryhatch.net/INDIANOC.html>

Hi Larry,

It certainly is notable for its scarcity of activity. Even allowing for the AT routes and marine waterways, historically you would expect a greater volume of reports.

Only a few years ago I recall a thread about the almost complete lack of reports coming out of India, the second largest population base in the world. Look at the reports now. But this is a bit different as you have noted due to the lack of even small island groups [at least those with even a small population] in this vast ocean.

Your bringing this up might shake out a few for your U base.

Best,

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 12:59:55 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:53:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 15:41:07 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:01:28 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:57:43 -0400
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>Hi Kyle and Don!

<snip>

>For this reason, when trying to analyze pictures with images
>suspected to be UFOs (especially those "BLURFOS" which are being
>captured in ever growing numbers by people trying out their
>powerful new zoom video and digital cameras and who are honestly
>puzzled by the strange images they recorded that they didn't
>notice at the time) it is important to work with the entire
>picture. It is only too easy for some mischievous person to
>submit a cropped corner of a picture of what looks like a large
>UFO which others will unwittingly add to their UFO web sites or
>include in their annual UFO survey as proof of unexplained
>material objects in the skies over certain places.

Hi Nick,

As I have posted on a number of images such as you describe, I
can only agree.

As I said several times in this thread, the reflection idea (the
reflection from a light source behind reflecting off something
in front of the camera) was my first impression.

After seeing the full image, I still felt the same way.

Only after reading that the image had been reproduced at the
same place and time of day with the same camera, with no mention
of a window being in between, did I have to rethink.

What you have noted about full images versus cropped portions is
absolutely spot on, and raises the point that sometimes people
"enhance" or crop the image without realizing that it weakens
their case. Or conversely, they intentionally do so to elevate
the apparent "strangeness" of the image for other less honorable
reasons.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 14:05:21 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:55:30 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:29 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:15:36 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

<snip>

>>Not surprising. Of course the source of the unexpected lights
>>could have been a helicopter that didn't land at Reagan or even
>>some private plane.

>This being the case Bruce, where's the scrambling of jets? Would
>his not have been radar identified as a target at Andrews or
>even Reagan IA?

>It should be in the logs for a primary/transponder radar contact
>whether it arrived or departed. It's still under RRIA's control
>center.

>Would Bush have been up and about in Marine One?

>Any other chopper or aircraft would have had to have clearance
>to first be in the Control Zone and secondly be in the no-fly
>zone. A double-whammy.

>Any indication that RRIA Center was being coy? I'm damn sure
>they know about the television image of the thing.

>There are still questions to be answered. I trustingly assumed
>that this was an airliner. But this changes things.

Could be a military or police 'copter. If it were it was closer
to the camera than the cars, at a low altitude (few hundred
feet) and definitely not over DC proper.

Might even have been one of those "black helicopters" for all we
know.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 15:25:09 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:58:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:45:42 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:40:55 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>How would any of us know without appropriate clearances and
>>need-to-know?

>For the same reason that any earth-shattering discovery that is
>shocking to the core of a person's being would become known
>it would have a visible, noticeable impact on the people
>involved and on the policies they formulate that can be
>discerned openly, and outside security-controlled channels.
>The more shocking the secret discovery the less able to control
>the visibility and keep the secret.

This is an interesting assertion with no evidence provided at
all.

I think one could make the exact opposite case namely that the
more shocking the secret discovery, the less likely the kind of
responsible people who have appropriate clearances would be to
let out anything. We are not talking about Joe Public.

>>>>With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a
>>>>multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy,
>>>>the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

>>>The "Manhattan Project" (that was never its official name) was
>>>not set up by the President and run by a committee of top
>>>interagency directors, generals and scientists. Yes, that refutes
>>>the "Majestic 12" model right there.

Not at all. Surely FDR authorized Manhattan? The TF memo (think
of Forrestal as the 1947 equivalent of Simpson) says to
Forrestal "per our recent conversation on this matter you are
hereby authorized to proceed with all due speed and caution upon
your undertaking". (Notice he didn't say "my undertaking"). "
ultimate disposition should rest solely with the Office of the
President following appropriate discussions with yourself, Dr.
Bush and the DCI".

The President had to authorize dropping the A bomb. Ike had to
authorize each U-2 flight. President had final say on
disposition of MJ-12 stuff... similar. Ike wasn't running the U-
2 program, he was authorizing. Truman nor FDR ran the Manhattan
Project.

>>Hardly. Vannevar Bush, in his Oral History - at MIT - said that
>>the Manhattan Engineering District (I think more people
>>understand Manhattan Project) was co-ordinated by weekly
>>meetings without secretaries, minutes, or agendas.

>It was never called the "Engineering" district either, again
>another semi-popular misnomer. The Manhattan "project" (lower
>case to indicate I am using the popular name and am not saying
>this was the official name, which it wasn't) was run by
>General Groves, not by the various coordinating and policy and
>review committees that Groves dictated to with an iron fist.
>Groves would order the committees, set their dates of meeting
>and run their activities, to get their rubber stamps of
>approval, unless it was a purely scientific issue that he needed
>advice on. Groves was a hard-driving force to be contended
>with, as he had shown himself to be with his direction of the
>building of the Pentagon in record time.

No doubt that Groves was a hard driving force... however as I
noted.....

>>Those present were General Groves, Dr. Bush, Dr. Conant and
>>Secretary of War Henry Stimson - a Republican at that - sounds
>>very similar to me.

>This sounds like what was called the Top Policy Committee,
>which did not run the day-to-day affairs of the Manhattan project
>which were run by Gen. Groves. Where in the alleged orders
>setting up MJ-12 is there a single person put in charge like a
>General Groves?

Forrestal was authorized to proceed. We don't know the inner
structure other than Bush and Twining working together
(Twining's Pilot/aide told me he often saw them together.) As I
mentioned, 4 big guys met regularly. This was not the Top Policy
Committee.

>>Obviously there was a war on and huge facilities were needed to
>>make Plutonium and separate Uranium 235. But the idea was still
>>the same: set up a separate group with access to the President
>>and not under control of the various military or intelligence
>>agencies. The NSC would provide an interface. It appears that the
>>NRO and NSA have some similar characteristics as well.. Many
>>military personnel are seconded to the NSA, for example.

>The Manhattan project was not set up or created by the
>President, contrary to the MJ-12 model, where MJ-12 was
>allegedly created by order of the President.

The Manhattan project was authorized by FDR. MJ-12 was
authorized (TF does not say created or set up-- it does say per
discussions).

>Moreover the
>Manhattan project is not enmeshed in controversy over
>government-inspired document forgeries as MJ-12 is. MJ-12
>arose from an AFOSI document forgery operation that
>fabricated phony "government" UFO documents beginning with
>the Ellsworth AFB hoax
>in 1978 which even the National Enquirer would not buy. This
>same AFOSI agent improved his document forgery skills until
>finally he brought in the DIA-SAC Colonel to help do a better
>job of manufacturing UFO documents. This same AFOSI agent
>claimed in a Jan 5, 1988, interview that the DIA man had forged
>the MJ-12 documents.

And we are supposed to believe these tales told by a forger?

And you can throw out all my refutations concerning attacks on
the original EBD, TF, CT documents? Remember I am convinced that
almost all the Tim Cooper documents are indeed fakes based on
the detailed evidence I found and lay out for readers..

Brad , I don't understand why you can't speak more plainly...
you know, provide names and evidence... details.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:26:55 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:00:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:51:08 -0400
>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:01:28 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:57:43 -0400
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

>>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 12:47:18 -0500 (Eastern
>Standard Time)
>>>>Subject: Re: Incredible UFO Photo Taken in Northern Chile

<snip>

>Yeah, too bad Kyle. This looked good. If as John Rimmer
>suggested that this was quite far away and the reason why its
>reflection didn't show up in the water, then the object would
>have been a bit of a monster.

>Beware of lights in the night sky-at least on film.

Hi Don,

Agreed and agreed. And it would strain credibility to suggest
that such an enormous "lit" craft would have gone unnoticed by
all but this lone cameraman. Especially as it was not
"whooshing" through the sky but just hovering there.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:54:58 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:02:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Clark

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:47 -0400
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:55:11 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>>Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
>>>qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only they
>>>know what the silly term means.

<snip>

>Its meaning then and now refers to one who runs with an
>insupportable theory [usually a pet theory], no matter how
>ludicrous, and against all reason to debunk a UFO sighting. Oft
>times the Pelicanist's theory is more off-the-wall then that of
>the UFO report itself making it easier-for the reader-to
>subscribe to the UFO theory than the proposed debunking of it,
>which is self defeating for the Pelicanist when you think about
>it.

The definition of pelicanism, which I elucidated in a recent
post, is quite simple, and as Don shows above, its meaning is
hardly obscure or arcane.

I coined the neologism "pelicanist" in the awareness that
"skeptic" and "debunker" finally don't mean all that much. Every
thoughtful ufologist, including one inclined to suspicion or
conviction that puzzling sighting reports may be attributable to
an unknown, presumably nonearthly intelligence (ET or
otherwise), is skeptical of many things claimed about UFOs; if
active in research and investigation, he or she has surely done
a fair amount of debunking him- or herself. There is, after all,
much to be skeptical about, and much that is eminently
debunkable.

"Pelicanism," on the other hand, addresses a psychosocial
phenomenon heretofore not reducible to a single phrase. It
defines the practice of ascribing any explanation, however
scientifically unsustainable, illogical, or fantastic, to a UFO
event or experience, in a desperate effort to deny that anything
seriously anomalous may be going on. That is why I have
suggested that pelicanists are advancing extraordinary claims
masquerading as prosaic explanations.

Ideally, if what were at issue disinterested truth-seeking, even
those who identify themselves as skeptics (or "sceptics") would
disdain this practice just as sober proponents blast careless,

loose-thinking UFO advocates in their midst.

Unfortunately, as we have seen, what passes for "skepticism" as an active (as opposed to the outsiders' casual) position in the UFO controversy is often in practice an ideological stance, to be defended, as ideological turf always is, at all costs. Thus, the complaints we hear are addressed not to the practice of pelicanism, but to the phrase itself - as well, inevitably, to the one who initially drew attention to the emperor's feathery dress.

Finally, of course, the phrase was meant to be amusing, taking off from a fairly recent, rather egregious case of the sort of excess described above. Those who whine that it's "no longer funny" were - here's a shock - not amused in the first place.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 15:50:05 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:04:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 14:42:38 -0600
>Subject: Re: Dr. John Mack Cut From Jennings' ABC UFO Special

>>>We have just received the unbelievable news that John Mack's interview
>>>for the Peter Jennings special will not be present in the finished
>>>piece. It was John's last-ever interview before his death, and the
>>>only interview he'd granted for a major program in many years.

>The UFO subject is a complicated one, with all sorts of aspects,
>and in two hours it simply can't be done justice. Decisions of
>editing and emphasis must be made. From my reading of various
>items about Peter Jennings and his show today, I have the
>impression that the documentary will focus on a handful of
>hard- evidence cases, involving multiple witnesses and documentation
>by tracking instruments. Agree or disagree with that approach (I
>happen to agree with it and would have done the same, given, for
>one thing, the time constraints), it is a perfectly defensible
>one - even a potentially positive one for those advocating the
>need for scientific UFO study - and requires no alarmist reading
>whatever.

And I'd add something very simple. I've been a journalist for more than 20 years (or used to be one; seems like my life is moving on, but that's another story). Journalists very often do many more interviews than they can actually use in what they write or put on TV. I've dropped all sorts of things from stories I've written. Dropped important people, dropped killer quotes. All because of one simple thing - you have to think of what's good for the entire story. Sometimes you drop the single best thing you've got, because it wouldn't fit into the approach you realize you have to take in the story as a whole.

Once I did a piece for the Wall Street Journal on what then was the hottest topic in classical music - a planned merger of the New York Philharmonic and Carnegie Hall. I had all sorts of minor insights on that story, and a modest amount of inside information, but the best thing I developed was the story of the only other large-scale merger of classical music institutions ever to occur in the last generation or so - a story that involved the Utah Symphony and Opera, and which no major journalist apparently had looked into, probably because it happened in Utah, not New York or San Francisco. It shed some fascinating light on the Philharmonic and Carnegie Hall; it showed with stunning clarity how you ought to do a merger of cultural institutions, and thus by implication showed how badly the Philharmonic and Carnegie Hall had planned their epoch-making deal (which in fact was never consummated).

And you know what? There wasn't any room to talk about Utah in my piece, since first I had to tell the main story, and by the time I'd finished with that (which included showing how they hadn't thought their situation through very well), I was out of space. Just one of those journalism things.

Come to think of it, I myself was dropped from a story recently. Guy in Houston interviewed me for an hour on the phone, about the Houston Symphony's search for a music director. And when I read

the story, I wasn't in it, even though I might have known more about orchestras than almost anybody else the writer talked to. But still I didn't give him the main things he needed.

That's how it goes, and nobody - without very specific evidence - should ever read anything much into these omissions.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 16:35:57 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:06:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:04:38 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:41:14 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:39:29 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>Yes, the important thing is hard evidence of crashed UFO
>>>hardware. Then we are getting somewhere.

>>Frankly James, I am truly impressed with your proclamations
>>about perfect infallible aliens for which you provide not a whit
>>of any kind of evidence, but then you demand access to hard
>>evidence of crashed saucers!

<snip>

>I do not see any problem with extrapolating technology based on
>our human experiences. If you claim that UFOs are caused by
>aliens near our own technology level, then I must counter that
>this is very unlikely based on probabilities. It seems odd to me
>that you think aliens (if they are the cause of UFOs) have the
>same technology level as us. The probabilities imply that is any
>aliens are visiting, then they would have been spacefaring for
>thousands of years.

>I will concede that if the crashed "UFOs" are actually human
>technology then it can likely crash, as we have seen in the
>past.

<snip>

>My main question is why do we even see any evidence of UFOs at
>all given their advanced abilities. They may not care if we see
>them, but I guess they would not want pieces of them gathered
>for inspection and use and likely would not design disposable
>spacecraft and crew.

You just contradicted yourself and violated Occam's Razor within the space of a few paragraphs. First you demand that aliens must be extremely advanced (because of alleged probability arguments). Then you complain that we wouldn't "see" such "advanced" aliens. Obviously the fact we "see" them (if they really exist and are seen as UFO's, which I'm assuming only for sake of argument here), and they don't have adequate stealth, is because we only can see those who are near our 21st century level of technology in the first place. And Occam's Razor demands that you start with the simplest hypotheses first, beginning with ETH for the lowest levels of technology that could visit us, not always injecting the highest levels of technology ("aliens are like magic") whenever you want to win an

argument .

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 16:53:00 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:07:23 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:10:00 -1000
>Subject: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>I wish to further pursue this issue of whistleblower testimony
>and how important it is to relax the strict evidentiary rules
<snip>

There in a nutshell is your entire agent provocateur program of disinformation. You want the UFO community to "relax" its already too lax standards (or lack of standards). Accepting your siren call to leap off the cliff would result in the total destruction of the UFO research community. To accept your bogus disinformation "whistleblowers" according to your phony "political science methodology" is in reality a hocus pocus verbiage that means nothing but acceptance of lunatics and crackpots mixed in with hapless legitimate witnesses whose credibility will be destroyed by being associated with them - as intended.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 17:04:05 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:09:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 14:26:31 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 12:13:14 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>One thing we do know is that a powerful radar tracking system
>>was on at White Sands because a V-2 rocket was scheduled for
>>launch the morning of July 3, 1947. Snipped...

>>It was aimed to the north
>>because all launches were to the North. It could have
>>interfered with propulsion or guidance systems or both and
>>caused a brief but deadly mid air collision.

<snip>

>First I think we have been brainwashed by old science fiction
>movies about how indestructable these objects might be. That and
>the tired old theory that we are being watched closely because
>we are the most dangerous species in the universe.

>However,I have no doubt that these vehicles are much more robust
>in nature than our own, which incidentally are much tougher than
>they used to be at least in the military application. But I
>doubt their indestructability. There is so much we don't know
>about the capability and the construction of these things that
>it's nearly impossible to state one way or the other just
>whether they, or one model versus the other, are.

<snip>

Well I don't buy the idea that a bunch of old WWII radars, SCR-584's, CPS-4's and CPS-5's, at White Sands which were in use all over the country would have interfered with anything, certainly not alien spacecraft, and only "brought them down" in NM but nowhere else in the US where the same radars were used. Once again this is desperate Special Pleading type argument, begging that special exceptions be piled onto exceptions, so that this old Frank Scully story of the superpowerful radars that brought down the "magnetic" saucers can be recycled once again.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 17:19:49 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:10:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 23:01:05 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:44:37 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>Sorry but have I overlooked something?

>I have searched "The Roswell Incident" and your own book "Crash
>at Corona", and cannot find any mention of a day & month for the
>Plains of San Augustin crash. Here is your story as I see it:

>1. You give a lecture in Minnesota in Oct 1978.

>2. A Mr Maltais speaks to you afterwards, relating the story of
>a friend Barney Barnett, who came across a "large metallic
>object" and bodies in the past (no date known), and location
>inexact. Barnett told Maltais about it in Feb. 1950.

Notice that Barnett first told this crashed-saucer story right
after the nationwide publicity given to the Frank Scully-
inspired crashed saucer stories in Jan 1950. And the stories
were very similar.

>3. You interview Fleck Danley (Barnett's boss) in 1979, Barnett
>himself being deceased. Danley cannot recall the year at first
>but eventually comes up with: "It had to have been sometime in
>the early summer of 1947". Nothing more precise than this. Also
>he does not mention any bodies.

<snip>

That is not quite correct. All Danley said that Barnett had said
was that in the Summer of 1947 Barnett had come in one day and
said he had "seen a flying saucer." There was absolutely nothing
about any crash. It was a Daylight Disc sighting, to use the
Hynek classification of UFO sightings. Only in 1950 did Barnett
come up with an undated allegation about a crashed saucer
which has nothing to do with his alleged Daylight Disc sighting.
If it did have something to do with his 1947 sighting then he
should have said so. It cannot just be assumed so.

Bill Moore in two papers in 1982 and 1985 admitted that he and
Stan had gone overboard in accepting the Barnett story and had
been unjustified in connecting it with Roswell, especially
because the Barnett story was "undated." These papers Stan later
listed with himself (Stan Friedman) as coauthor (though at other
times denying that) in his Bibliography lists of key papers.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Randle

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 18:07:35 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:23:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Randle

All -

First let me say that I have been lurking here, periodically for the last several weeks. My other obligations have been reduced and I have the time needed to get back into the UFO game (and yes, I used the word 'game' on purpose.

So, on with the show...

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:44:37 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 09:30:47 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>Stan has tried to weave this second 'crash' into the Roswell legend for his own purposes.

>>Stan: There was, I recall, a conference under Michael Swords as chairman, on this subject where you tried hard to convince other Roswell investigators about this second crash, but they did not buy it. You had the worst of the debate.

>You obviously weren't there and don't know that to be true.

>It mainly revolved around the dubious 1947 date. Among other things, the archaeologists were there in 1946 not 47.

>Certainly not all bought it... just as not all of us bought the Kaufmann story.

Let's talk about Frank for just a moment. The instant I learned that he had lied to us, I worked to get the whole story out. With Mark Rodeghier, I put together an article for IUR laying out the documented evidence that Kaufmann had lied about his military background, and had forged documents to support this.

But where did Frank Kaufmann originate? Walter Haut gave me the name. Once, standing outside a bank building on Main Street in Roswell with Haut and Don Schmitt, I asked Haut about Kaufmann. Haut told us that anything said by Kaufmann was "golden". I won't ask the obvious question here.

I am distressed that some still accept the Kaufmann story as the truth, suggesting he might have been a disinformation agent and that he "knew too much" to have invented the tale. Well, Kaufmann's story should be rejected. He had no inside knowledge. He enjoyed his role as the insider and it did get him on national television... But his story should become a footnote.

And speaking of footnotes, let's just take a moment to talk about Gerald Anderson. He provided four or five different locations for the crash, changed his testimony each time new information was found, forged, at least, two documents and admitted lying. He is on the SEALs' Wall of Shame for having claimed to be a SEAL when he was not. Yes, I know that some claim he had "inside" knowledge, but he is just another who injected himself into the story and his tales should be rejected as well. Like Kaufmann he should be a footnote to the story.

>Which archeologists? Buskirk was in the area in 1947.

But not in New Mexico. Buskirk said so and the evidence we have supports that. No reason to believe otherwise, unless is it remembered that it was Anderson who supplied the name of his high school anthropology teacher. Yes, I have verbal confirmation from the school but then I called the Fund for UFO Research to tell them (back in 1991) and they called Stan who called Anderson who called the school and threatened to sue them. But who really cared about putting Anderson in the classroom with Buskirk? We put him in the same school. No only that, Buskirk checked with the school and learned that Anderson had been in his class for one semester but took French the next. The Identikit sketch of Buskirk Anderson produced showed Buskirk as he appeared when Anderson was in his class ten years after Anderson claimed to have seen him on the Plains.

>Archeologist Robert J. Drake was there in 1947.

At least Kaufmann and Anderson claimed to be first-hand witnesses. Drake, at best, is second hand. He didn't see anything himself but heard the story from a cowboy. An unidentified cowboy so that we have not only second-hand testimony, we have it coming from an anonymous source. Maybe the unknown cowboy heard the tale from someone else... or maybe he doesn't exist.

Drake claimed that he was returning to Albuquerque with three other men, all of whom he identified and all of whom were interviewed and all of whom said they had not talked about the UFO crash during that ride as Drake claimed. At that point Drake said they didn't discuss it.

>I wrote a detailed rebuttal in 1992. Randle had falsely
>claimed that 3 archeologists Hibben and Dick
>among them, had been in the Plains and had seen
>nothing in the summer of 1947. Neither one was there,
>so of course they hadn't seen anything.

Can no one in ufology ever simply make a mistake? Does it always have to be a FALSE CLAIM (yes, the capitalization is mine)?

Actually, they were on the Plains in the summer of 1947, and were actually there in July. Dick (if I remember correctly and I just don't want to look it up) said he got there in late July, some time around the 20th. Anderson said that the recovery was still going on as late as the 22nd, so there should have been something to see... but of course, Anderson was lying, his location was (locations were) false and this argument is an attempt to divert attention from the real issue, which is the lies told by Anderson. It makes no difference when Dick and Hibben were there because it is clear that Anderson was not the witness to a UFO crash.

>Another Archeologist, Dr. Frank Wilmuth, had
>told Drake of hearing of the Plains crash while
>working at Los Alamos.

Would this be the same Drake who said that three others would corroborate his tale of the drive back to Albuquerque, but did not? Why should we assume that Wilmuth would have confirmed it?

>He was out of town when I called his home and
>died less than a month later before I called back.

Sad, but completely irrelevant. Wilmuth has confirmed nothing, could not now confirm anything, and leaves Drake with the same hole in his credibility which is no independent corroboration. Yet we keep hearing about how he died before you interviewed him when the real point is that he died before you interviewed him.

So that leaves just a couple of questions...

Do you really think there is anything that Gerald Anderson can tell us that he didn't just invent?

Do you really think that Drake's second-hand story (at best second hand) is of any value?

For the Plains of San Agustin (please note here the proper spelling) is there any evidence other than the tired tale of Barney Barnett and the second-hand stories that are derived from him?

Isn't it fair to say that Ruth Barnett's diary provided no support for the claim of a crash on the Plains, but does, very nicely, demolish the tale told by Anderson? As a secondary consideration, it proves that Anderson's diary is a forgery.

And finally, did you ever talk to Fleck Danley, and more importantly, did you talk to him prior to the publication of The Roswell Incident?

Okay, that was more than a couple but they are relevant.

KRandle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 21:01:39 -1000
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:27:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Goldstein

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:11:23 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>If there's one aspect of the Magonian mindset that I find truly
>bizarre, it's this illogical obsession with "radical
>misperception". It's a manifestation of the same kind of
>reasoning that leads people to believe they've discovered cold
>fusion in a beer bottle.

Hi Cathy,

I appreciate your expertise in the science of perception but I feel I must caution you against making disparaging statements against those Listerions who have "discovered cold fusion in a beer bottle". Jerry Clark and John Rimmer, despite their huge feathered differences, recently attested to their beer bottle cold fusion, both English and domestic. In addition Larry Hatch seems to have expertise in this area and may attest to his experience even if it is only with a burp or two.

Josh Goldstein

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

X-Conference 2005 Press Release - 02-22-05

From: **Stephen Bassett** <ParadigmRG.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 07:55:09 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:30:42 -0500
Subject: X-Conference 2005 Press Release - 02-22-05

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

X-Conference 2005 Press Release - February 22, 2005

Washington, DC - The 2-hour ABC News Special, Peter Jennings Reporting UFOs: Seeing is Believing, airs in two days at 8pm EST, Thursday. Several of the researchers and activists featured in this special presented at the 2004 X-Conference or will present at this years conference, April 22-24, 2005, at the Hilton Washington, DC North/Gaithersburg Hotel. More information at: www.x-conference.com.

Articles about this important broadcast are appearing in major newspapers across the country. The ABC Special has been scheduled against two blockbuster programs, Survivor (CBS) and The Apprentice (NBC). Given such competition, should the ABC ratings be strong, more such network specials and documentaries could be forthcoming. This will be easy for ABC as PJ Productions has several hundred hours of interviews already completed. Many important researchers such as Richard Dolan (2004 and 2005 speaker) have yet to be interviewed. It is possible the glass ceiling has finally been crashed, and the major American television networks have at last discovered the biggest news story in history. More info at: www.hypemakers.net/abcnews/index.php?code=3D2015

The X-Conference is a unique event which focuses on the political, governmental and social aspects relating to extraterrestrial-related phenomena. It is produced by PRG as part of the ongoing activist movement seeking to end the government imposed truth embargo. Approximately 28 lecturers and panelists will present.

New for this year:

Melinda Leslie -If and when disclosure takes place, there is going to be some unpleasantness. The public needs to prepare for this. They should expect to learn things that will disturb them - not just about extraterrestrial intentions and actions, but the intentions and actions of their government. The political process will and must inevitably encompass abduction/experiencer phenomena. (PRG intends to devote an entire conference to this issue in the future.) Within that context the most explosive aspect is the matter of military/intelligence driven abductions, and Melinda Leslie may be the leading researcher on that in the nation. Ms. Leslie is a perfect example of the power and nobility within the citizen/science/activist process which took over as the government of the United States withdrew from the "public" investigation process and went underground. She is a citizen who found herself on the front line and chose to step up rather than wilt. She attempted to explore not only her circumstance but the circumstance of others. She chose a very tough path and has paid a price. Melinda Leslie has investigated "covert intelligence" involvement in abductions for 12 years, conducting over 40 interviews of experiencers and researchers of this troubling phenomenon. For many years Melinda was the director of two experiencer support groups and the director of a monthly lecture series for nine years, presenting nearly 100

speakers. Melinda was Associate Producer of the 1994 UFO Expo West conferences, has lectured on her area of expertise at numerous conferences and been a guest on many radio and television talk shows.

Returning from last year:

Paola Harris - is an Italo-American photojournalist and investigative reporter in the field of extraterrestrial-related phenomena research. She is also a widely published, free-lance writer, especially in Europe. She has studied extraterrestrial-related phenomena since 1979 and is on personal terms with many of the leading researchers in the field. From 1980-1986 she assisted Dr. J. Allen Hynek with his investigations and has interviewed many top military witnesses concerning their involvement in the government truth embargo. She is a long time collaborator with Dr. Roberto Pinotti, Director of the Centro Ufologico Nazionale (CUN). In 1997, Ms. Harris met and interviewed Lt. Col. Philip Corso in Roswell, New Mexico and became a personal friend and confidante. She was instrumental in having his book *The Day After Roswell*, for which she wrote the preface, translated into Italian. She consequently brought Colonel Corso to Italy for the editorial group *Futuro*, publisher of *Il Giorno Dopo Roswell*, and Corso was present for many TV appearances and two conferences. She returned to Roswell in the summer of 2003 for the American debut of her book, *Connecting the Dots=80=A6making sense of the UFO Phenomena*, published by Granite Press.

Because of her international perspective on extraterrestrial related phenomena and her work with Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Paola has consulted with many researchers about the best avenues for planetary disclosure with emphasis on the "big picture" and stressing the historical connection. She is a close friend of Monsignore Padre Corrado Balducci and assisted in filming the Italian witnesses, including the Monsignore, for the Disclosure Project's May 9, 2001 press conference at the National Press Club. She was instrumental in bringing to Italy Robert Dean, Dr. Steven Greer, Linda Moulton Howe, Dr. Richard Boylan, Russell Targ, Travis Walton, Derrell Sims, Helmut Lamner, Michael Lindemann, Nick Pope, Bill Hamilton, Carlos Diaz and Dr. John Mack. Her new non-profit association, *Starworks Italia*, will continue to bring speakers to Italy and promote disclosure and expolitical dialogue world-wide.

Paola has been interviewed by Jeff Rense, George Noory, Hilly Rose, Mike Murphy, Bob Hiernomous and Jim Hickman, among others, and is a regular on the Tony Gill Radio Show, American University Radio out of Springfield, Massachusetts. She has been a speaker in many conferences in Italy, San Marino, Belgium and Germany and has appeared many times on Italian TV. She has written for *Nexus*, *UFO Magazine*, *Notizario UFO* and *Dossier Alieni*, among others publications. Paola lives in Rome and has a Masters degree in Education. She teaches history and photojournalism at the American Overseas School of Rome.

Robert Wood, PhD - PRG considers the work being done on the MJ-12 documents of great importance. The father and son team of Bob and Ryan Wood have emerged as the leading researchers in this area. They will return to the X-Conference to jointly present the history, status and most recent developments regarding these documents. Robert and Ryan are the co-directors of the Crash Retrieval Conference held annually in Las Vegas and now in its third year. It must be noted that Robert Wood's 50+ years of contribution to extraterrestrial-related phenomena research extends well beyond the MJ-12 document. Bob has a Bachelor of Science in Aeronautical Engineering from the University of Colorado and a Ph.D. in physics from Cornell. He enjoyed a 43-year career at McDonnell Douglas managing research and development projects and has spent over thirty years privately investigating extraterrestrial related phenomena. He began research into the *Majestic-12 Documents* in 1995. Dr. Wood is considered a disclosure witness because he worked in a senior capacity as an aerospace engineer at McDonald Douglas. In testimony provided to the Disclosure Project, he stated he was involved in a specific project at McDonald Douglas to study the propulsion systems of UFOs. In addition, he confirms the existence of similar projects within the aerospace industry and gives his assessment of the extraterrestrial nature of the phenomenon. He also confirms the extreme secrecy surrounding the subject.

Ryan Wood is a successful businessman and entrepreneur. His extraterrestrial-related phenomena research efforts have centered on documents, their authenticity, and related validation. He manages the content of www.majesticdocuments.com, has completed a television documentary titled, The Secret, with Dr. Robert M. Wood, along with publishing two books and a CD-ROM dealing with the Majestic documents and their authenticity. Other related projects include papers titled: "Ufology: In Search Of Leadership," "Abductee Blood Analysis," and "Fundraising: The Motherlode of UFO Membership." As an investigator with MUFON he has chosen to specialize in the strategic problems such as: unquestionable proof, improved media acceptance and a dramatic ten-fold membership increase.

Ryan earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics and Computer Science from California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo in 1978. Following graduation he began a product marketing career at Intel Corporation, marketing and computer sales at Digital Equipment, engineering management at Toshiba, then marketing and sales at two Silicon Valley start-ups. From 1989 - 1996 he was an independent consultant, focusing on improving client business success primarily through better promotion, customer service, product communication, and sales. For the last five years, until present, he has been the director of business development and sales at an energy conservation company. A veteran of numerous product introductions, Mr. Wood has developed and executed advertising and promotion campaigns, direct mail programs, and telemarketing in both consumer businesses (900 numbers, world-wide-web, lottery software) and industrial products (energy conservation, document imaging, medical imaging, semiconductors, and computer systems).

Other speakers already announced include: Walter H. Andrus, Jr., Comdr. Graham Bethune, Stephen Bassett, Robert Brown, David Coote, Jim Courant, Don Daniels, Paul Davids, Richard Dolan, Ann Druffel, Robert Durant, Stanton T. Friedman, John Greenewald, Jr., Dr. Lynne Kitei, MD, Charles James Hall, Michael S. Heiser, PhD, Bruce Maccabee, PhD, Jaime Maussan, Michael Salla, PhD, Richard Sauder, PhD, John F. Schuessler, David Sereda and Alfred L. Webre, JD.

Full speaker information is posted in the Speaker section at:

www.x-conference.com.

Contact:
Stephen Bassett
202-215-8344

Paradigm Research Group
E-mail: ParadigmRG.nul
URL: www.paradigmclock.com
Cell: 202-215-8344
4938 Hampden Lane, #161
Bethesda, MD 20814

2nd Annual Exopolitics Expo - The X-Conference
Hilton Washington DC North/Gaithersburg - April 22-24, 2005
www.x-conference.com
Tapes/DVDs available at: www.lostartsmedia.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:54:53 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:32:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Boone

>Source: [About.Com](#)

><http://tinyurl.com/6de4u>

>Skeptical Inquirer magazine - January/February 1996

>Special Report

>A Surgeon's View: Alien Autopsy's Overwhelming Lack of Credibility
>Joseph A. Bauer, M.D.

Hats off to Dr. Bauer for exposing that nonsense.

That film reminded me of some sort of scam to flush out real witnesses. (Y'know, staged film, bandwagoners claiming it's what they saw back in the '40s and '50s then wait and expose the film as a fraud.)

See? All skeptics aren't bad. Dr. Bauer did what a real scientist is supposed to do without the childish character assassinations and low-brow wisecracks.

We need more Dr. Bauers round these parts.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

Daniel Sheehan [was: Applying Uncertainty]

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:05:55 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:35:17 -0500
Subject: Daniel Sheehan [was: Applying Uncertainty]

>From: Simon Hicks <slh.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 09:07:54 +0800
>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 11:18:56 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Applying Uncertainty Principle To UFO Research

<snip>

>Daniel Sheehan. He seems to be risking a lot (in a
>professional sense) if he were found guilty of perpetrating a
>fraud. De-barring at the least. Yet his testimony was pretty
>wild e.g. he stated that he saw photographs of crashed saucers.

>What is your take on that?

Hi Simon,

Sheehan's story sounds very credible until the very moments that matter.

He was told that he could not take notes, and left his briefcase with the gentlemen outside, and was accompanied by other men while examining the data.

He was nonetheless not only allowed to take a yellow pad into the room, but was not under direct surveillance for the entire time he was looking at the data.

On leaving the room, he was asked what he had under his arm, and replied that it was the yellow pad he had carried in with him. At this point, the pad was examined in a cursory fashion, and returned to Sheehan.

If Sheehan was not allowed to take notes, why was he allowed to take a "note" pad? If he had a "note" pad with him on exiting, why was he not searched for "notes", since if he took a yellow pad into the viewing area, and had indeed taken notes, he would certainly have removed them from the pad and hidden them on his person, as he was told beforehand that notes weren't allowed?

If the reason he was accompanied to the viewing room was to prevent removal of data or note-taking, why was he unobserved for sufficient time to allow tracing the symbols he described?

In my view, there are two reasonable explanations for this rather odd sequence of events, and at least one unreasonable explanation...

Reasonable #1... The entire event was a disinformation ploy to seed Sheehan with UFO data, and he was allowed several opportunities and methods to violate the rules he was given. As the story is told, he could not only have traced the symbols, he could have taken actual data, written copious notes and secreted them on his person, etc. While I find this explanation unlikely, since I cannot see a good reason for such a scenario, it is

nonetheless reasonable. I don't know why the government does half the things it does. On a good day.

Reasonable #2... Sheehan made up the more controversial aspects of the story. This would explain the apparent laxity exhibited by the men tasked with ensuring the security of the viewing, as they would know that there was nothing truly explosive to which he would have access, and therefore no reason to take the rules terribly seriously. I find this highly likely, particularly in light of his frustrated attempts to become an astronaut, and his rather thinly veiled contempt for those who favored others over him for such duty. This is someone who would dearly love to be the one to find "the smoking gun". He wanted to be an astronaut so he could meet other civilizations, after all.

Unreasonable... Sheehan was granted extreme access to the most sensitive data in the government's possession vis a vis the UFO question, and yet they allowed him opportunity upon opportunity to take notes, trace images, even purloin data, in direct violation of the rules set forth. In my view, if this unreasonable scenario was true, such data would have found its way into the public domain in any number of ways in light of such lax security over what would seem to be extremely sensitive data. Why have security involved at all?

While I cannot state categorically that Sheehan is not telling the truth, I find the first two scenarios above far more compelling than the third.

Such incompetence in security would be treasonous, if the data were truly as sensitive as Sheehan describes.

Of course, this is just my opinion. I could be wrong.

An intriguing story nonetheless, and I'd be very interested indeed in seeing the chipboard from Sheehan's yellow pad. <g>

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 8

From: John Hayes <John.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 20:56:23 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:03:57 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 10 Number 8

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan.nul>

=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 10, Number 8
February 23, 2005
Editor: Joseph Trainor

E-mail: Masinaigan.nul
Website: <http://www.ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

MORE UFOs REPORTED IN CALIFORNIA

On Sunday, February 13, 2005, at 1 a.m., eyewitness Sue Hatfield reported, "I was lying down in bed, watching TV. The TV is near the window. I looked out the window and saw a very bright light in the shape of a rounded-off teardrop," hovering over her neighborhood in Sacramento, California (population 407,108).

"As I was lying down in bed, it went from the top of my window to the bottom of my window. It was coming straight down from the sky. I can't tell how far away it was. But it seemed large, about the size of my fist if I was holding it up to the night sky. I saw it for several seconds only."

"I would have to agree that it was over Sacramento-- sort of an egg shape and brightly lit."

Sacramento, California's state capital, is on Interstate Highways I-5 and I-89, approximately 91 miles (145 kilometers) northeast of San Francisco.

On Wednesday, February 16, 2005, at 6:55 p.m., Maggie Lind wrote, "My brother asked me to report this sighting. He doesn't have Internet access. He said it came over a hill out in the desert" in Borrego Springs, Cal. (population 2,535).

The UFO "was a large, tirangular-shaped craft, larger than a (Boeing) 747 airplane. It was low in the sky. It had red pulsating lights on each point (corner) of the triangle. It was silent and slow moving. Color not known as it was dark and it was a silhouette against a gray and darkening sky. Flying lower than a helicopter and slow moving."

"Eighteen minutes after he saw this craft, he reported that a helicopter was flying around in the area where the UFO was seen."

Borrego Springs, Cal. is on Highway 522 about 30 miles (48 kilometers) northeast of San Diego. (Email Form Reports)

DAYLIGHT DISC SIGHTED OVER HONOLULU

On Sunday, February 6, 2005, at 5:30 p.m., Gary W. Grimes reported, "I was lying by the Diamondhead pool at

the Ilikai Hotel," at 1777 Ala Moana Boulevard, in the Waikiki section of Honolulu, the state capital of Hawaii, "and noticed what appeared to be a bright shining object or planet, which I found odd because the sun was shining brightly. I saw it was motionless when I first saw it. After a few minutes, the light began moving very slowly westward. At this time, I became very disconcerted."

"I went to the pool attendant to tell him about the object, which he saw and confirmed my witness."

"I stood side by side with another witness as we watched the bright object make a slow, deliberate arc from west to northeast. A cloud passed by, and afterward I could no longer see it."

"I was amazed. I am a rational skeptic, but no one opined a plausible explanation for this phenomenon. What it wasn't--not a balloon, satellite, planet, star, plane, helicopter, meteor nor hallucination. What it was...a UFO."

"Interesting aside--some people were not as enthralled as I was. A day later, I had dreams of UFOs. My first UFO and I feel blessed in a strange way to witness the unexplainable."

Gary estimated that the daylight disc was "30,000 to 50,000 feet (9,000 to 15,000 meters) up and moving at 100 miles per hour (160 kilometers per hour)."

He added that a friend in Honolulu also "said she saw it from her lanai (porch)."

(Many thanks to Canadian ufologist Brian Vike for this report.)

BIG EXPANSION PLANNED FOR HAARP IN ALASKA

On Monday, February 7, 2005, "Phazar Corp. announced that Antenna Products Corp. in Mineral Wells, Texas (population 16,946), a wholly-owned subsidiary, was recently awarded a \$3,723,531 fixed-price subcontract from BAE Systems ATI for the production of 270 low-band antenna matching-unit assemblies and 346 high-band antenna matching-unit assemblies."

"This equipment will be manufactured at the Antenna Products Corp. plant in Mineral Wells, Tex., and production is scheduled to begin in June 2005 and continue monthly through September 2005."

"The equipment will be shipped to the High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program (HAARP) site near Gokona, Alaska, the site of the recently-completed installation of an array of 132 crossed dipole antennae built and installed by Antenna Products Corp. in 2004."

The proposed construction will triple the size of the present top-secret HAARP array, which is operated by the U.S. Defense Department for purposes that are still highly classified. HAARP critics claim that the installation is being used for a number of covert operations, such as anti-UFO activities, weather modification and mass population mind control. (See Business Wire for February 7, 2005. Many thanks to "Sourdough Pete and Cheechako" for this news story.)

MIMAS: SATURNIAN MOON OR DERELICT SPACE STATION?

"That's no moon. It's a space station. Actually, it's Saturn's satellite, Mimas, which bears an uncanny resemblance to the Death Star, the planet-destroying space station in the (1977) film Star Wars."

"Scientists at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California have released a new image of Mimas, which was snapped by the Cassini spacecraft in orbit around the ringed planet," Saturn.

"Mimas is one of the innermost moons of Saturn. Its most prominent feature is a giant crater some 6 miles (10 kilometers) deep and 80 miles (125 kilometers) across, covering about a third of the moon's diameter, probably caused by an enormous asteroid impact."

"Traces of fracture marks can be seen on the opposite side" of Mimas. "If the asteroid had been bigger or faster, the moon probably would have split in two."

"At the centre of the crater is a central mountain about as high as Mount Everest. It was also formed by the asteroid impact which pulverised and molten material rebounded upwards like a splashing water droplet."

"The moon's surface is icy and heavily cratered. Far from the warmth of the sun, it has a temperature about minus 200 Celsius, and scientists think its low density means it consists mostly of ice."

"Most of the craters on Mimas are named after characters in Camelot, but the biggest was christened Herschel after Sir William Herschel (1738-1822), who discovered Mimas in 1789, the planet Uranus in 1781 and invented the word asteroid."

In Greek mythology, Mimas was a Titan or giant who was slain by the hero Hercules.

"Mimas's similarity to the Death Star was first noticed when the twin Voyager spacecraft flew past Saturn in 1980 and 1981."

"The new picture was taken (Sunday) January 16, 2005 while Cassini was about 132,000 miles (151,200 kilometers) away from Saturn."

In other Saturn news, the Hubble Space Telescope has picked up images of a bright Aurora australis over Saturn's south polar region.

"Saturn's auroras vary wildly and unexpectedly last for days, space scientists report."

"The surprising findings, based on data from NASA's Cassini spacecraft and the Hubble Space Telescope, appear in today's Nature (Thursday, February 17, 2005)."

"On Earth, auroras are known as Northern Lights, triggered by the sun's solar wind striking the Earth's upper atmosphere."

"On Saturn, solar wind also triggers auroras, the scientists say. But unlike Earth's, they shrink as they grow stronger and often form spiral shapes."

"Planetary scientists hope understanding Saturn's auroras will reveal how the planet's hidden inner core is built." (See The Guardian for February 15, 2005, "Saturn's moon is the double of Star Wars space station," and USA Today for February 17, 2005, "Saturn's auroras intrigue scientists," page 9D. Many thanks to Steve Wilson Sr. for these newspaper articles.)

READER FEEDBACK:

DRONES, NOT UFOs, IN IRAN

Concerning recent UFO sightings in Iran, Jose Gonzalez writes, "I've watched CNN, FOX and MSNBC about the UFOs in Iran. Iranian newspapers told CNN that many UFOs are flying over Iranian military and nuclear sites, especially during last December (2004). But, according to the Washington Post for February 13 (2005), the UFOs are actually U.S. drones to spy on nuclear sites in Iran."

Well, that's it for this week. Join us in seven days for more UFO, Fortean and paranormal news from around the planet Earth, brought to you by "the paper that goes home-UFO Roundup." See you next time.

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2005 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their Web sites or in news groups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan.nul> or use the Sighting Report Form at:

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/submit/sightings.shtml>

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster.nul>

UFOINFO: <http://www.ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives for UFO Roundup, AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI Magazine

plus archives of Humanoid Sighting Reports (Albert Rosales), Filer's Files, Oz Files, UFO News UK.

UFO Roundup is only sent to subscribers.
If you wish to unsubscribe or feel you have received
the bulletin in error, please write to:

<john.nul>

With the subject: Unsubscribe UFO Roundup.

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: New Einstein@home Program Ready To Roll - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:47:53 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:05:06 -0500
Subject: Re: New Einstein@home Program Ready To Roll - Groff

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:43:57 EST
>Subject: New Einstein.nul Program Ready To Roll

>Now this is the kind of project that makes science fun.

>Like the SETI.nul project it allows you to use your computer
>to process data. Makes a guy feel like he's up there with the
>big shots in physics.

>Sure, I know there are some who disagree with SETI but what the
>heck, it's still fun and a way for us regular stiffs to get a
crack
>at participating and learning.

Hi Greg,

It must be noted that this project has nothing to do with SETI
other than the fact that it uses the BOINC interface. It's sole
pupose is to search for Pulsars using the LIGO and GEO
gravitational wave detectors.

<http://einstein.phys.uwm.edu/>

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:41:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:06:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - King

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 21:01:39 -1000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:11:23 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

><snip>

>>If there's one aspect of the Magonian mindset that I
>find truly
>>bizarre, it's this illogical obsession with "radical
>>misperception". It's a manifestation of the same kind of
>>reasoning that leads people to believe they've
>discovered cold
>>fusion in a beer bottle.

>I appreciate your expertise in the science of perception but I
>feel I must caution you against making disparaging statements
>against those Listerions who have "discovered cold fusion in a
>beer bottle". Jerry Clark and John Rimmer, despite their huge
>feathered differences, recently attested to their beer bottle
>cold fusion, both English and domestic. In addition Larry Hatch
>seems to have expertise in this area and may attest to his
>experience even if it is only with a burp or two.

Hi Josh,

Actually, unless I misread, the beer-induced fusion to which you refer was rather warm, all things considered.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 14:58:42 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:08:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Sparks

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:56:01 -0500
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:49:20 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>Of course, you're partly right - there is a null hypothesis for
>>>UFO studies, which is that every UFO report can be explained
>>>using only known entities. And that null hypothesis certainly
>>>can be falsified, and frequently is, or we would have no UFO
>>>reports to begin with (if we disregard the CSICOPian position,
>>>which is in fact completely unfalsifiable).

>>But UFO reports are just reports of things that are puzzling to
>>the witness, and 90-95% are described as IFOs by non pelicanist
>>Ufologists.
<snip>

The Hynek definition of a UFO requires that a scientifically and technically competent analysis screen the report first to eliminate IFO's and conventional explanations. Has nothing to do with what the witness thinks is puzzling, puzzlement gets the case reported to someone is all. A witness can think it's a perfectly explainable or identifiable phenomenon - and be wrong. The witness cannot be their own Ph.D. scientist investigator of their own case (unless they happen to be Ph.D. scientists and there are many cases of that).

>In the Battelle Memorial Institute study of 1947-1952 sightings
>- published by the USAF in 1955

>3,201 sightings of 2199 "objects" were analyzed - there was a
>division as follows:

>K = known (IFOs) 70%
>U = Unknown (probable or likely TRUFOs) 20%
>I.I. = Insufficient Information (can't be sure it was an IFO) 10%

<snip>

These statistics are false. Battelle used the fraudulent Blue Book method then being developed of combining speculative IFO identifications (Possible and Probable) into "Knowns." Before that became a standard BB practice, Ruppelt revealed that actual IFO's and conventional explanations (I lump them all together as "IFO" for simplicity) was running at about 11%. The Unknowns were running at about 27%. The rest were Insufficient Data and indeterminate status, in limbo, not identified, about 62%.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 01:18:52 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:11:12 -0500
Subject: Re: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean - Hatch

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 14:57:35 -0400
>Subject: Re: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 11:16:57 -0800
>>Subject: New UFO Map Of The Indian Ocean

>>I put up a new UFO sightings map, this one is for the Indian
>>Ocean. This is probably the second largest expanse of ocean
>>waters without a single sighting (Reunion Island excepted).

>>Events in the surrounding lands, Indian subcontinent, Africa,
>>Australia... make a visual contrast.

>><http://www.larryhatch.net/INDIANOC.html>

>It certainly is notable for its scarcity of activity. Even
>allowing for the AT routes and marine waterways, historically
>you would expect a greater volume of reports.

>Only a few years ago I recall a thread about the almost
>complete lack of reports coming out of India, the second largest
>population base in the world. Look at the reports now. But this
>is a bit different as you have noted due to the lack of even
>small island groups [at least those with even a small
>population] in this vast ocean.

>Your bringing this up might shake out a few for your U base.

In a way I'm not too surprised at the lack of reports. They may
darned well have sightings, its the reports that don't come
through.

Like so much of the 3rd world, its a matter of language and
infrastructure .. and probably no decent place or way to report
sightings. There could be any number of events hidden / lost in
ships logs, in 100 arcane languages, all inaccessible to ufology
at large.

Reunion Island is an exception, reports from there get into the
French UFO journals so I can translate those at least.

Marine traffic isn't all that much in the central Indian Ocean I
take it. Only one 'sea lane' is indicated on my large Replogle
world globe, from the Suez Canal, SE down to Australia. Most
traffic is up north between N.Africa, the Middle East (Suez
again) and SE Asia. There I show a few sightings at least. One
was from an oil tanker.

At the opposite (south) end are the least visited parts of
Antarctica.

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:42:51 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:14:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Connors

>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:43:49 -1000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 16:05:37 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Josh Goldstein <lovolution.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 22:23:02 -1000
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>>Wendy, can you please clear up my confusion by letting me know
>>>what "fezzic" means?

>>>Thanks,

>>Sure. It means a person who acts jicky.

>Ha ha you have stumped me again. Are these words from the
>colloquial language of your region, your personal language, or
>space alien language? It makes me feel zimmy.

Hi Josh,

I thought my reply would give you a good laugh and was meant in that vein. Some of the slang terms I use are from the region of the country I reside, but most are from my own fertile imagination. I've always enjoyed coining new words... keeps me from falling victim to intellectual stagnation and imagination decimation due to aging.

Of course I am a product of the 1940s and picked up the slang of that period and even earlier, but when the 1950s arrived I was living the bohemian ideal and using the language. For example it would not be unusual for me to say something like.....

"Hey, hepcat! Like, let's make with the minnow bucket and squeeze bossy." "You'd be a slick chick if you were a cool cat."

Then came the 1960s and being stationed in NY, I did avail myself of Woodstock. Unlike Clinton, I did inhale a little back then, but didn't go any further. Those were an interesting few years in my human development.

Came the 1970s and I began to teach and fall in love with the generations coming up. Then normal burnout experienced by teachers and on to the 1980s.

From there it has been all down hill. I can't understand a word uttered by anyone under the age of 30. I try to talk about the dreams of my generation (we were supposed to build a lab and then a complete city on the moon for our younger generation of

academics and scientists to work and expand humanities future into the Cosmos, eliminate hunger and poverty in our nation and lead the world into new directions), but only receive a blank stare as most (but certainly not all) young people can't focus mentally for more than a few seconds and could care less about anything beyond their own pathetic and immediate wants. However, my generation is responsible for that, in many respects.

By 1990 I have been unable to comprehend anything of the new revisionist history and political correctness gone totally ballistic and beyond common sense.

But, I still have an imagination and use it. Not an easy feat once the Senior years are reached.

My greatest mistake made in my life? I didn't take time to listen carefully to the older generation I grew up with and having had to spend so much time learning the hard way. At least I'm not alone. :-)

Besides... I know what a whippersnapper and huckleberry is.
<LOL>

Wendy Connors
www.fadeddiscs.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Pelicanist - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:35:38 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:30:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - King

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:49:41 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

<snip>

>How much more does one need to know?

>I think the problem here is not pelicanism, but another common
>one. Even the best people can make serious mistakes when they
>argue outside their own fields of expertise (of which Brad
>Sparks has many BTW).

>I often blunder myself when I try to argue outside of my own
>knowledge bubble, which is why I try to make it a rule not to
>wade into arguments of about which I know little. I have more
>than once kicked myself for not heeding that rule.

Hi David, Brad, List,

It is rare even in this List to read such a cogent,
authoritatively supported, well thought out (and expressed)
analysis.

It is posts like this that make me glad I happened upon the List
in the first place.

Well done, David. And your admonishment against treading into
"foreign waters" is one we would be wise to heed, as best we
can. Although if it leads to this kind of rebuttal...<g>

Another civil, reasoned, and thoroughly enjoyable debate.

Kudos for making my morning.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:22:43 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:32:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:49:41 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 15:14:52 -0600
>>>>Subject: Pelicanist [was: Magonia Supplement No. 54]

>>>>I think of pelicanists not as casual dismissers (as, for
>>>>example, most skeptical scientists and journalists are) but
>>>>as persons who know the subject and are active within the
>>>>UFO community. The original pelicanist was James Easton, who
>>>>proposed, then fiercely defended, the scientifically unsus-
>>>>tainable idea that Kenneth Arnold observed not aircraft of
>>>>some sort but pelicans. Pelicanist interpretations tend to
>>>>be extraordinary claims masquerading as prosaic
>>>>explanations.

<snip>

>>>From that point of view, we have to consider that the Klass
>>>proposal in 1997 that Arnold saw meteors was also a
>>>'pelicanism'.

>>I am convinced that Arnold saw daytime meteor fireballs,
>>does that make me a "pelicanist" too? There is nothing
>>"scientifically unsustainable" about that.

>My definition of pelicanism is not someone proposing a
>hypothesis which may later turn out to be untenable, but
>irrationally clinging to it when it becomes obvious it is
>ridiculous after being analyzed. The whole Easton pelican
>hypothesis for the Arnold sighting was, of course, the classic
>original "pelicanism," not because Easton proposed it, but
>because he refused to abandon it when it should have become
>blindingly obvious to anybody of average intelligence that it
>was impossible. Another recent example of pelicanism on this
>list was the balloon hypothesis for Socorro.

<snip>

Hi Dave - First off we're going to have to agree to disagree
here. I did not intend to present a full case for Arnold seeing
meteor fireballs here and it is unfair to expect me to just jump
into it. We can agree on Easton's absurd pelican theory for many
reasons, not least of which is that it fails even by Easton's
own pelican data (which he did not bother to analyze).

>Concerning the Arnold case, I think we can stipulate from the
>outset that if the objects passed in front of Mt. Rainier then
>the objects could not have been meteors because they would have
>been much too low and flying much too slow. Let us now examine
>what Arnold described.

>>Arnold could not make up his mind about whether he saw tiny
>>objects flashing light in front of the mountain(s) or behind
>>them, and in his first published interview with the morning
>>Chicago Tribune (which beat the afternoon East Oregonian) he
>>said specifically the objects "went behind Mt. Rainier."

>The Chicago Tribune story was the only one that ever claimed
>Arnold said the objects passed behind Rainier. All other
>quotes from Arnold are of the objects clearly passing in front
>of Rainier and of him seeing the outline of the objects against
>the background snow. E.g., Arnold's first radio interview from
>either June 25 or June 26:

The Chicago Tribune was not the only time Arnold said the
objects went behind Mt Rainier - you yourself quote another such
statement below. The June 26, 1947, East Oregonian story you
quote, states that Arnold saw the objects go behind an
"intervening peak." That peak was Mt Rainier itself as Arnold
makes clear in his other longer statements he personally wrote
of his sighting.

I will dig out these other statements later, as I have no time
for this now. As for the visual acuity data you need to get data
on tiny moving objects, not stationary cards that someone can
look at for however long they want 5 minutes even. Furthermore
if you read Arnold's personal accounts where he goes into
greater detail than in newspaper articles, he indicates the
objects were not continuously visible. He could only see them
when they flashed intense light - like a meteor fireball
flashing as pieces break off and flame out - every 9 seconds or
so. With all 9 objects that meant, he said, that about once
every second but at irregular intervals, he could see 1 of the 9
objects. So any one of the objects could be seen only about once
in 9 seconds. He is vague about what else he could see of the
objects. At closest approach he describes "thin black lines."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 12:09:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:34:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Kaeser

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:54:53 EST
>Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>>Source: About.Com

>><http://tinyurl.com/6de4u>

>>Skeptical Inquirer magazine - January/February 1996

>>Special Report

>>A Surgeon's View: Alien Autopsy's Overwhelming Lack of Credibility
>>Joseph A. Bauer, M.D.

>Hats off to Dr. Bauer for exposing that nonsense.

>That film reminded me of some sort of scam to flush out real
>witnesses. (Y'know, staged film, bandwagoners claiming it's
>what they saw back in the '40s and '50s then wait and expose the
>film as a fraud.)

>See? All skeptics aren't bad. Dr. Bauer did what a real
>scientist is supposed to do without the childish character
>assassinations and low-brow wisecracks.

>We need more Dr. Bauers round these parts.

I could have pointed to several surgeons who felt otherwise, but
to what end?

It all depends on what you, the reader, want to believe. If you
accept the expert knows what he's talking about, then you can
accept the theory as fact.

I've seen a lot of annedotal evidence that the AA "film" was a
fake, as well as a lot of annecdotal evidence otherwise.

Show me physical evidence that doesn't rely on someone's say so,
and it might be worth discussing again. Otherwise, it's a
neverending debate that won't resolve anything..... <IMO>

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:52:16 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:37:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Gehrman

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:54:53 EST
>Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>>Source: About.Com

>><http://tinyurl.com/6de4u>

>>Skeptical Inquirer magazine - January/February 1996

>>Special Report

>>A Surgeon's View: Alien Autopsy's Overwhelming Lack of Credibility
>>Joseph A. Bauer, M.D.

>Hats off to Dr. Bauer for exposing that nonsense.

Greg,

It's obvious that neither you nor Dr. Bauer have spent much time viewing the AA. I do agree that the footage shows a dissection and not an autopsy. Bauer must have been viewing the Fox version and not the uncut video or CDs because what he describes is not what actually occurs in the footage. Other pathologists have viewed the footage and come away with an entirely different reaction.

>That film reminded me of some sort of scam to flush out real >witnesses. (Y'know, staged film, bandwagoners claiming it's >what they saw back in the '40s and '50s then wait and expose the >film as a fraud.)

Have you viewed the uncut version.

>See? All skeptics aren't bad. Dr. Bauer did what a real >scientist is supposed to do without the childish character >assassinations and low-brow wisecracks.

He only offered opinions and didn't spend much time viewing the footage otherwise he wouldn't have made the comment about the skullcap removal:

"Why did a professional photographer repeatedly, if not intentionally, go out of focus and usually position himself or herself behind the actors to obscure the view at the most crucial moments - such as when the cranium (head) was opened? Why was the removal of the skullcap not seen, nor the in situ appearance of the brain?"

The opening of the skull is clearly seen in the footage as is the procedure used which is consistent with the way skull caps are removed. The creature's brain can be clearly seen.

>We need more Dr. Bauers round these parts.

He should have done more homework. And you might take another look. Maybe you missed something the first time around.

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:09:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:39:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Ledger

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:54:53 EST
>Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>>Source: About.Com

>><http://tinyurl.com/6de4u>

>>Skeptical Inquirer magazine - January/February 1996

>>Special Report

>>A Surgeon's View: Alien Autopsy's Overwhelming Lack of Credibility
>>Joseph A. Bauer, M.D.

>Hats off to Dr. Bauer for exposing that nonsense.

>That film reminded me of some sort of scam to flush out real
>witnesses. (Y'know, staged film, bandwagoners claiming it's
>what they saw back in the '40s and '50s then wait and expose the
>film as a fraud.)

>See? All skeptics aren't bad. Dr. Bauer did what a real
>scientist is supposed to do without the childish character
>assassinations and low-brow wisecracks.

>We need more Dr. Bauers round these parts.

Hi Greg,

Why only Dr. Bauer? He would have to included in a long list who
trashed Ray Santilli's hoax-including myself from the film
production point of view. But this was long ago on this list and
before you became part of it.

To be honest, however, he did package it nicely from the
medical/surgical POV.

I note Phil Mantle has been looking for detail about the
autopsy. This might come in handy.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 03:06:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:42:29 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 14:05:21 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:29 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 17:15:36 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

><snip>

>>>Not surprising. Of course the source of the unexpected lights
>>>could have been a helicopter that didn't land at Reagan or even
>>>some private plane.

>>This being the case Bruce, where's the scrambling of jets?
>>Would his not have been radar identified as a target at Andrews
>>or even Reagan IA?

>>It should be in the logs for a primary/transponder radar
>>contact whether it arrived or departed. It's still under RRIA's
>>control center.

>>Would Bush have been up and about in Marine One?

>>Any other chopper or aircraft would have had to have clearance
>>to first be in the Control Zone and secondly be in the no-fly
>>zone. A double-whammy.

>>Any indication that RRIA Center was being coy? I'm damn sure
>>they know about the television image of the thing.

>>There are still questions to be answered. I trustingly assumed
>>that this was an airliner. But this changes things.

>Could be a military or police 'copter. If it were it was closer
>to the camera than the cars, at a low altitude (few hundred
>feet) and definitely not over DC proper.

>Might even have been one of those "black helicopters" for all
>we know.

Still they aren't invisible to radar. I suspect that whomever
you talked to at Washington Center answered only the question
that you asked them and did not volunteer any other information.
I've been to DC three different times and watched the police
chopper doing the figure eight over the Capitol Dome and then
the Whitehouse, constantly. ATC would know of its existance and
would be working traffic around it. They would also have know
about anything else flying on the night in question over that
area, police [more likely now, military] chopper and all. So why
didn't they say so? There would be nothing secret about that,

everybody sees them.

The No-Fly zone is much larger now in circumference. Once aircraft departing RRIA flew directly

The only thing I can think of that would be not be freely offered is the habits and schedules of Marine One. That's why I asked the question. Even a military jet, cleared through the NO-Fly zone would have been known by civilian ATC. Even your "Black Helicopter" squawking a secure transponder code. It's a need-to-know piece of information.

It keeps people from getting killed.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:31:36 -1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:46:44 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:04:48 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:10:00 -1000
>>Subject: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>I wish to further pursue this issue of whistleblower testimony
>>and how important it is to relax the strict evidentiary rules
>>that might be applied to whistleblower testimonies alleging
>>reverse engineering of extraterrestrial vehicles, retrieval of
>>crashed extraterrestrial vehicles, and of secret agreements with
>>extraterrestrial biological entities. An example of such a
>>whistleblower is Bob Lazar who allegedly worked at the secure
>>facility of S4 in the vicinity of Area 51, but had great
>>difficulty in supplying documentary evidence supporting his
>>alleged work at S4 on an extraterrestrial vehicle. He even
>>claimed that the subsequent absence of documentary evidence of
>>his two Master's degrees were a result of these being somehow
>>pulled from the public record. This has led to great criticism
>>from UFO researchers arguing that without documentary evidence
>>of his employment and academic degrees, Lazar's testimony is not
>>credible. In fact, Stanton Friedman claimed "Not one shred of
>>evidence has been put forth to support this story" (see
>><http://www.v-j-enterprises.com/sflazar.html>). This is not at
>>all accurate. Some evidence was found to support parts of
>>Lazar's story that he was employed as a nuclear physicist at
>>Los Alamos before being relocated to S4.

>Michael this is flat out wrong. Read my brief piece again. I
>noted Lazar's name in the LANL phone book. It is followed by K/M
>which means he worked for Kirk Meyer NOT for Los Alamos. I
>talked to the Personnel Dept. giving them the name of a
>physicist I knew had worked there and had a high level clearance
>as well as Bob's. They found my guy, not Bob. The listing
>certainly doesn't indicate he was a nuclear physicist. He was a
>technician working at the Meson Accelerator facility.

Aloha Stan,

I do believe Lazar provided evidence to support his claims. I know you dismiss this as insufficient to support his alleged activities at S4, but I think that the LANL phone book listing, the pay slip, Knapp's interviews with other employees supporting Lazar's employment as a scientist all qualify as evidence supporting his claims. Also, there is the matter of the Los Alamos Monitor article (June 27, 1982) where the staff writer Terry England refers to Lazar's employment as a scientist with Los Alamos, and where Lazar is standing next to one of his jet cars. You say that Lazar was employed as a 'technician' rather than a 'scientist'. Putting aside the issue of whether he was a technician or scientist, you at least acknowledge his employment at Los Alamos which appears to have been for some time since he allegedly left S4 in 1989 and had a Los Alamos article verifying his employment there in 1982. His employer at Los Alamos may have been Kirk Meyer as you say, but the fact that he could

prove he worked at Los Alamos is some evidence to support his claim that he was tapped on the shoulder by Teller who was impressed by Lazar's initiative and jet car expertise after reading the Los Alamos Monitor Article. Teller may well have been the key to why Lazar was able to move so quickly from doing research at the Meson Accelerator facility to working at S4.

>I checked at least 5 different offices at MIT: The Registrar, the
>Physics Dept., the guy who keeps commencement lists, the guy who
>keeps track of MS theses, (Bob was a total no show) and perhaps
>of most interest the Legal counsel. He said there is no way for
>the government to wipe out all records. I checked his high
>school and found he was in the bottom third of his high school
>class with only one science course. MIT says no admission with
>that low a class ranking.

You say there is no way for the government to wipe out academic records and refer to the university legal counsel's opinion to validate that. There may be a different interpretation here for what happened. A plausible explanation is that the Legal Counsel was contacted by some national security officials, e.g., Naval Intelligence, who citing the National Security Act declare all university information on Lazar is now classified and nothing is to be released to the general public. Nonsense you may say. Yet I think that such a scenario happens more often than many would think at universities where research on innovative topics is conducted and then disappears once it becomes classified. I just read Nick Cook's Hunt for Zero Point Gravity where he refers to something similar happening in 1950s with gravity nullification research. As for finishing the bottom third of high school with only one science course, who knows what Lazar had in mind at the time. Perhaps he was a late academic bloomer.

>Bob falsely claimed Bill Duxler taught him Physics at Cal Tech.
>Duxler nnever taught at Cal Tech, but did have Bob registered in
>his class at Pierce Jr. College in So. California at the same
>time he was supposedly going to MIT 3000 miles away. If you can
>go to MIT, you don't go to Pierce. Long commute, too.

Perhaps, Lazar confused names, dates and institutions when you questioned him. The point is that he was taught Physics at Pierce Jr College by Bill Duxler. There may be an inconsistency in what Lazar told you for why he confused the institutions but there may be a plausible explanation.

>The tax form showed under \$1000.; a week's pay for a scientist.
>One doesn't get a high level clearance in a week.

What the W2 establishes is that he worked on a contractual basis with an employer that could be traced to Naval Intelligence in Maryland. I'm not sure how Naval Intelligence payed Lazar over the whole period he was allegedly employed at S4. Nevertheless, the W2 slip proves he was employed for at least a short period by Naval Intelligence. That's more evidence.

>>Lazar was able to supply a
>>pay slip substantiating his contractual employment for Naval
>>Intelligence for a short period. In addition investigators
>>associated with George Knapp were able to find a telephone
>>directory for Los Alamos that included Lazar's name, and even
>>employee corroboration that Lazar had worked at Los >Alamos.

>See above re Phone book.

>At Los Alamos is not the same as for Los Alamos. A technician
>is not the same as a scientist.

>>Also, Lazar was able to supply the name of the individual for
>>doing background security checks that was confirmed by George
>>Knapp. For discussion of evidence supporting Lazar see:
>><http://www.karinya.com/travel2.htm>). A furthermore source of
>>corroboration was John Lear who alleged that Lazar was able to
>>take Lear and their two wives to view the testing of a reverse
>>engineered saucer. This incident apparently sparked Lazar's
>>termination as an employee at S4, and supports Lazar's claims
>>that he knew of the testing schedule of the craft that were
>>reverse engineered from the retrieved ETV.

>How in the world can anybody claim that the bright object, which
>might have been one of the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles being
>tested, was reverse engineered from the retrived ETV?

Lazar claimed to know the flight testing schedule for the ETV and took Lear and co., out to the desert to witness it. That shows he at least knew the schedule so that's also evidence supporting his S4 claims.

>>Applying strict evidentiary rules to Lazar's testimony may be >>insufficient to substantiate his allegations due to the absence >>of key documents. Critics such as Stanton Friedman have >>concluded that Lazar is "bunk". However, if one relaxes these >>strict evidentiary rules on account of the special security >>procedures applying to Lazar's alleged employment, we discover >>three things. First, that a program involving extraterrestrial >>related technologies would be so highly classified that >>knowledge of these is to very few individuals with a >>demonstrable 'need to know'.

>Where is there any evidence that Bob had a demonstrated need to >know or a high level security clearance or was a scientist? Guys >who operate Brothels have trouble with security clearances.

Now Lazar knew the name of the background checking official who interviewed him. He also worked at the Meson Particle Lab at Los Alamos for a number of years. He also worked for a short time for Naval Intelligence. I think a quick Security Check was done on him and he passed. As for the brothel, if one's academic records are removed, one's past employer doesn't acknowledge the work done, and you are black balled in your field, you might become financially desperate enough to make some poor choices about who to work for and with.

>I take it Bob lost his diplomas, lost his Master's Thesis, was >unable to get a transcript of his high school record... the >request was prepared by George... but never, somehow, received >by Bob. Gene Huff, Bob's buddy, asked me what it would take to >convince me. I suggested a resume, copies of diplomas, copies of >papers, membership in professional groups, listings in alumni >directories. I sent him copies of my stuff. None were provided >for Bob. Others have checked MIT yearbooks. Nothing.

Ok, I think this is the key here. You seek documentary proof over and above the evidence Lazar supplied in terms of names, W2, list of employers, etc., and what investigators such as George Knapp supplied in terms of corroborating witnesses, etc. Lazar also passed a lie detector test but you won't acknowledge this as significant. You say you won't be convinced until this additional material is supplied to satisfy you that Lazar actually got the degrees he claimed. Well that just means that you are a pretty detailed researcher requiring an exhaustive list of documentary evidence to support a whistleblower's allegations.

That gives you credibility as a UFO researcher, yet in my view is very inappropriate when dealing with whistleblowers such as Lazar who reveal clasffied information on a deep black project. As I mentioned in my earlier post, a waived Special Access Program is not even declared to exist. Members of congressional committees are not told its existence, and if they were to somehow mention it, that would be an offense under the National Security Act. In my view, it would be a very important security procedure to discredit any whistleblower that revealed the existence of a waived SAP. That is very logical security policy and I think it very plausible that a number of national security agencies worked in tandem to undermine Lazar's credibility by removing public records such as his academic degrees, birth certificate, etc.

>>Second, projects involving alleged >>extraterrestrial vehicles are so highly classified, that >>draconian security procedures are involved. Third, it is >>possible that security procedures are in place that involve the >>removal of public records that might support the testimony of >>such witnesses.

>We are talking 5 years minimum at MIT. The legal counsel said it >would be impossible. Why wasn't the record at Pierce JC >deleted???

I can't answer all these questions. Perhaps Pierce JC wasn't wiped since there are some in the black world who want Lazar to be taken seriously while maintaining plausible deniability.

>>What I will do in what follows is show how the kind of program
>>that Lazar allegedly worked in would be at the very least a
>>Waived Unacknowledged Special Access Program where knowledge of
>>this program was strictly limited to a few with a 'need to know'
>>and where Congress exercises no effective oversight of the
>>program. I also will argue that the Security Manager for such
>>classified programs has extraordinary power to determine
>>security procedures without any effective Congressional
>>Oversight. This would make it possible for the Security Manager
>>of the classified program Lazar allegedly worked in to arrange
>>for the removal of public records substantiating Lazar's
>>employment, and the intimidation of witnesses who could
>>corroborate Lazar's testimony.

>How about the records at MIT and CIT? What would be the purpose
>of removing these even if it were possible? Loads of people with
>very high level security clearances still have their degrees
>noted. One can't get GPA's without permission of the subject,
>but attendance and degrees can indeed be verified. Even the
>witness protection programs don't remove records of past
>degrees. Names are changed... perhaps new records inserted.

I think the removal would be contingent on a number of things.
One would be the public profile of the employee. Another would
be whether the employee becomes a whistleblower and thus a
security threat. Lazar claims his records were removed after he
went public.

><snip>

>>(End of Extract)

>>There are a few important points that can be drawn from the
>>above extract. First, knowledge of a waived Special Access
>>Program (SAP) is strictly limited and only the Defense and/or
>>Intelligence Committee chairs in both houses of Congress are
>>apprised of these without being given any detailed information.
>>This means that while Congress is de jure exercising oversight
>>of these programs as prescribed by the US Constitution, it is de
>>facto exercising no oversight at all. Basically, the SAP Program
>>Managers are free to run these and the only effective oversight
>>comes from committees within the military-intelligence
>>establishment. Most revealing is that the program managers of
>>SAPs have the power to decide who has a 'need-to-know" and
>>implement their own "independent security rules". Basically
>>without any real congressional oversight system in place, the
>>program managers of SAP's can implement draconian security
>>procedures. These procedures would be entirely lawful due to the
>>de jure oversight exercised by Congress. So in theory, the
>>security manager of the SAP can arrange for the removal of
>>public records such as University degrees and employment >record.

>I see nothing in what you have written about security procedures
>for special access programs that has anything to do with the
>ability to remove public records of university degrees, theses,
>etc. And it doesn't explain how Bob could be taking a course at
>Pierce while attending MIT.

The point I was making was the program managers have enormous
power to implement whatever security procedures they feel to be
appropriate for a waived SAP. There is no Congressional or
civilian oversight of these SAP's. Basically, it would be quite
possible for a Program Manager to authorize the removal of all
public records of a whistleblower in an effort to discredit the
whistleblower. Since the SAP has congressional approval, such
request would be lawful and a university Registrar or Legal
Counsel would be obliged to comply.

>>This would be entirely legal and any University Registrar or
>>Employer that refused to comply with such a request would be
>>violating a lawful request for the removal of public information
>>that violates national security.

>It is difficult to imagine how public information violates
>national security... by definition. Furthermore it has nothing to
>do with how attendance at a University and its awarding a degree
>somehow can be construed as National Security Information. I
>know there are other listers who have had a security clearance
>besides me. Maybe they can correct me. Bob is not on any

>commencement lists... period. He of course never mentions a BS
>degree (he clearly qualifies for a Degree in B.S) though he
>couldn't have gotten an MSc without one.

The point is that there is a procedure in place that determines what public information violates national security. The Program Manager of a waived SAP would determine this and we in the general public have no idea of what's going on. Even Congress and the General Accounting Office don't know what security procedures are in place and how and when they are enforced. We need to remember that even the existence of these SAP's are a secret and the committee chairs are only told of their existence without any details. All these decisions about what 'public information' violates national security when it comes to a waived SAP are made in an opaque way so we can only deduce what's happening when someone like Lazar comes along.

>>This would be a federal offense
>>and demonstrates the legal mechanism that could be used for
>>the removal of the public records that Lazar alleges were withdrawn
>>in his case. Also, the employment slip that Lazar possessed that
>>associated him with the Naval Intelligence points to the program
>>he worked on being a Special Access Program under the
>>purview of Naval Intelligence.

>Funny that employment on a special Access program is shown on a
>Tax slip! It must have been written in invisible ink. I couldn't
>find it.

The point about the W2 was that it could be traced to Naval Intelligence. That partly supported Lazar's testimony about S4 which is commonly understood to be under the control of Naval Intelligence.

>>In conclusion, the Bob Lazar case is very important since I
>>believe it demonstrates how a whistleblower will have
>>extraordinary difficulty in substantiating his/her allegations
>>due to the removal of public documents that support their
>>credibility. My recommendation is that taking into account the
>>extraordinary security power of the managers of SAPs such as
>>Lazar's the rules of evidence are considerably relaxed so we can
>>properly evaluate the implications of their testimony rather
>>than getting into debates over the conclusiveness of the
>>evidence supporting testimonies such as Lazar's. Despite my
>>respect for Stanton Friedman's intellect and fidelity to detail,
>>I strongly disagree with his evaluation of the Bob Lazar case,
>>and conclude that Lazar is a genuine whistleblower revealing
>>important information concerning a waived Special Access
>>Program at S4.

>Quite extraordinary.. even without considering his lack of
>knowledge of physics (ask Jacques Vallee). and so many
>indications that he has lied about all aspects of his background
>and was not employed by LANL.

Even if he were not employed 'by' LANL I think it clear he was employed 'at' LANL. That partly confirms his testimony.

>Michael, do you have your diplomas?

People can lose academic records. It happens all the time. In my case, I have all my academic transcripts but I no longer have my actual diplomas, they were lost during one of my many moves. I can always request a copy but no longer have a need to hang them on the wall any more. Some anecdotal evidence to support Lazar

>Bob is a liar. He hasn't sued for Libel because the best defense
>against libel is truth. He doesn't know the meaning of the word.
>There are genuine whistleblowers... Lazar is not one of them.
>Neither was Michael Wolf Kruvant. Don't forget all comen are
>good liars. They get a lot of practice and they often take
>people in.

Stan I do disagree with you. I think there are liars in the UFO field but you've picked on the wrong person. The investigations that Knapp and others have conducted on Lazar show much evidence to support his testimony of working at S4. People don't willingly do lie detector tests unless they are confident of the truth of what they say. That suggests to me that the areas of concern you've identified, absence of records, etc., point to a well orchestrated security operation to discredit Lazar. Lazar

himself mentions that this occurred with his records, and I've shown that it is very possible and entirely lawful for the program managers of waived SAPs such as the one Lazar identified, to authorize such draconian security measures.

I think basically our approaches reflect very different professional backgrounds. You worked as a nuclear scientist and believe things are pretty transparent when it comes to investigating scientific phenomenon. It's natural to assume that you will extend your methodology from the physics lab into UFO research. I've worked in international politics and found it very common for governments to lie and cover up their national security policies when it comes to sensitive areas. Intimidation, threats, evidence tampering are very common when it comes to how national security officials treat whistleblowers and witnesses of classified projects. National Security personnel are trained to do this in a very systematic and thorough way that pays lip service to civilian oversight processes.

Basically, those security officials responsible for maintaining security for classified projects involving ETVs/EBEs have no effective civilian oversight and are largely left to themselves in how they implement and enforce security procedures. Undermining the credibility of witnesses/whistleblowers is an important part of how security would be enforced for a waived SAP. For someone like Lazar, this means removing his public records which I contend is far easier than you suggest. The deliberate and meticulous undermining of whistleblower/witness credibility is a factor that can't be ignored by UFO researchers, nor should whistleblowers such as Lazar be ignored because of the absence of sufficient documentation. Without analysing the whistleblower testimony of individuals such as Lazar, we don't move forward in understanding the big picture of what is happening with alleged ETV/EBE research and projects.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 12:59:07 -1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:48:41 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:51:19 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>T.o: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:10:00 -1000
>>Subject: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>I wish to further pursue this issue of whistleblower testimony
>>and how important it is to relax the strict evidentiary rules
>>that might be applied to whistleblower testimonies alleging
>>reverse engineering of extraterrestrial vehicles, retrieval of
>>crashed extraterrestrial vehicles, and of secret agreements with
>>extraterrestrial biological entities. An example of such a
>>whistleblower is Bob Lazar who allegedly worked at the secure
>>facility of S4 in the vicinity of Area 51, but had great
>>difficulty in supplying documentary evidence supporting his
>>alleged work at S4 on an extraterrestrial vehicle. He even
>>claimed that the subsequent absence of documentary evidence of
>>his two Master's degrees were a result of these being somehow
>>pulled from the public record. This has led to great criticism
>>from UFO researchers arguing that without documentary evidence
>>of his employment and academic degrees, Lazar's testimony is not
>>credible. In fact, Stanton Friedman claimed "Not one shred of
>>evidence has been put forth to support this story" (see
>><http://www.v-j-enterprises.com/sflazar.html>). This is not at
>>all accurate. Some evidence was found to support parts of
>>Lazar's story that he was employed as a nuclear physicist at Los
>>Alamos before being relocated to S4. Lazar was able to supply a
>>pay slip substantiating his contractual employment for Naval
>>Intelligence for a short period. In addition investigators
>>associated with George Knapp were able to find a telephone
>>directory for Los Alamos that included Lazar's name, and even
>>employee corroboration that Lazar had worked at Los Alamos.
>>Also, Lazar was able to supply the name of the individual for
>>doing background security checks that was confirmed by George
>>Knapp. For discussion of evidence supporting Lazar see:
>><http://www.karinya.com/travel2.htm>).

>The fact that there is a record merely shows that he worked
>there (and on fast cars). That's a "far cry" from being able to
>demonstrate that he was transferred, at the request of Edward
>Teller, to work at S-4 on a program that only a handpicked few
>would know about.

Aloha Bruce,

I've responded to some of these issues in my post to Stan.
Basically, I don't understand how somebody who is contracted to
work at the Meson Accelerator facility at Los Alamos would have
as their area of speciality 'fast cars'. The 1982 in the Los
Alamos Monitor mentioned his fast car hobby yet referred to him
as a scientist. Lazar in his testimony claims he started
working as technician, then became employed as a physicist, and
was transferred to S4 as a senior physicist. The W2 with Naval
Intelligence signifies something deeper going on and I'd suggest
much more significant that Lazar's expertise with 'fast cars'.

His relationship with Teller sounded plausible enough. As you know, it's these kinds of synchronistic personal experiences that can land one some plum jobs.

>>A furthermore source of
>>corroboration was John Lear who alleged that Lazar was able to
>>take Lear and their two wives to view the testing of a reverse
>>engineered saucer. This incident apparently sparked Lazar's
>>termination as an employee at S4, and supports Lazar's claims
>t>hat he knew of the testing schedule of the craft that were
>>reverse engineered from the retrieved ETV.

>As I recall, this was a night time venture into the desert to
>see moving "lights in the sky" which Lazar claimed were ET
>vehicles, but could not be confirmed.

I agree, this is not confirmation that it was a reverse engineered model of an ETV but it does give Lazar some credibility that he knew the flight schedule for some pretty advanced technologies being tested at S4.

>>Applying strict evidentiary rules to Lazar's testimony may be
>>insufficient to substantiate his allegations due to the absence
>>of key documents. Critics such as Stanton Friedman have
>>concluded that Lazar is "bunk". However, if one relaxes these
>>strict evidentiary rules on account of the special security
>>procedures applying to Lazar's alleged employment, we discover
>>three things. First, that a program involving extraterrestrial
>>related technologies would be so highly classified that
>>knowledge of these is to very few individuals with a
>>demonstrable 'need to know'. Second, projects involving alleged
>>extraterrestrial vehicles are so highly classified, that
>>draconian security procedures are involved. Third, it is
>>possible that security procedures are in place that involve the
>>removal of public records that might support the testimony of
>>such witnesses.

>The story he told of working at S-4 is not the only reason to
>question what he has claimed. The physics that he describes of
>how craft traveled from one point to another and the famous
>element 116 all range from highly questionable to "bunk." For
>this reason some have suggested that Lazar did work there but
>was "set up" to provide disinformation for the masses.

Linda Moulton Howe did a story on some nuclear chemists who developed four atoms of element 115. When she asked them about Lazar's claims of a stable version of 115 that could be held in the hand, they said it was possible but that the present technology does not exist for that (see <http://www.earthfiles.com/news/news.cfm?ID=656&category=Science>). So a stable isotope of 115 is possible so what Lazar's claims that this can be used as a form of anti-matter propulsion is very possible rather than bunk.

>However, as far as I am concerned Lazar's story is just that and
>I wouldn't use it as a basis for the formulation of any
>exopolitical policy without the following introducing the all-
>powerful "if":

>_If_ Lazar's story is true, then we might have some particular
>exopolitical consequences.

I understand that very smart people will reach different conclusions over the credibility of Lazar and his testimony. We have in Lazar's whistleblower testimony, an eyewitness report of what is happening in S4. There has been corroboration of many parts of Lazar's story such as his work at Los Alamos, contractual work for Naval Intelligence, to lead many to conclude, including myself, that he is telling the truth. If eyewitness testimony is enough to get a conviction in a court of law, then I think Lazar has sufficient credibility based on what has checked out to create an exopolitical analysis of Lazar's claims. Rather than a big 'if' being applied to the Lazar's testimony, perhaps more appropriately we should be asking 'what next'? There's enough there to start an exopolitical analysis of what he has said rather than just putting it in a gray box to gather dust.

>As for the rest of Dr. Salla's post, the description of SAP/CAP/
>etc. is all very interesting but one wonders what to do with it.
>My own opinion is that we will never get the straight story from

>the government until we have found it out on our own... at which
>point the government may say, "Oh yeah, we knew that all along!"

How can we find out what's going on with SAP/CAPs if we ignore the very whistleblowers telling us what's happening because we can't confirm their school records or some other arbitrary criterion a parsimonious researcher stipulates as a necessary condition? One might think they are doing 'good science' by raising the evidentiary bar up high that only watertight whistleblower testimonies make it over the hurdle. In the process, you eliminate witnesses like Lazar, and all you have left are those like former FAA Air Chief John Callahan with some records of radar sightings of fast moving UFOs around a Japanese Jumbo jet, and evidence that the government didn't want the FAA seriously investigating this (<http://www.ufoevidence.org/documents/doc1324.htm>). If that's the sort of hard evidence with credible whistleblower testimony that will be universally accepted, then this field of UFO research will grow very very slowly, lose innovative researchers capable of understanding what's going on in the SAPs/CAPs dealing with ETV/EBE research, and become increasingly irrelevant to the general public who seek answers to what is happening.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -

From: Rob Kritkauskay <robkrit.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:18:58 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:52:47 -0500
Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -

>From: Erik Landahl <landahl1.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 21:25:19 -0800
>Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 23:58:27 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>When them thar military folk sez they ain't a-innerested in or
>ain't a-workin' on some high falutin' teknologicky projeckt, you
>kin bet yer F-117 that they be a-workin' their bee-hinds off to
>unnerstans and perfekts it.>

Eric:

There is some truth to that. In fact, this is an area I have done a good amount of reading on, in part due to the fact I have an acquaintance that is actually working on this project.(DARPA) As a result, this may be the lone subject for which I have "inside information". What I do know is this is not a feasibility project, as there is actual work/science/prototyping being done on this now.

In addition, it would seem the budget has been increased substantially... let me share a quote from some recent correspondence between the two of us:

>but you can bet that the new USAF/DARPA budget for
>teleportation research is getting scrutiny from some of my buds
>at Northrup/Grumman, Lockheed/Martin and Boeing too.

You can bet the scrutiny is not over \$25,000 dollars for a feasibility study. It is my understanding that the progress that has been made of late can be attributed to some breakthroughs regarding The Casimir Effect.

I tried to get some more information about this, in fact I wrote:

The progress made concerning the Casimir Effect....does it concern stabilization of cavity space and how complex are these calculations?

What is the correlation in your opinion between resonance and location/topology? What is the mechanism that is being used to induce entrainment? Where does unorientable topology fit in?.... (more specifically, I'm speaking of mobius transformations) The reply I got was quite nebulous and is as follows:

>"I will answer some of your questions re Casimir Effect in due
>course.

>Meanwhile, please refer to: <http://physicsweb.org/articles/world/15/9/6>
>Although Steve Lamoreaux's work is paramount - UC Riverside is doing
>good work as well."

Another interesting note is that I hear they have hired a few stegographers of late. For those well versed in QM, this may be a small indication of the current level of this technology.

Regards,

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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:26:00 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:56:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 17:04:05 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 14:26:31 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 12:13:14 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

><snip>

>>>One thing we do know is that a powerful radar tracking system
>>>was on at White Sands because a V-2 rocket was scheduled for
>>>launch the morning of July 3, 1947. Snipped...

>>>It was aimed to the north because all launches were to the
>>>North. It could have interfered with propulsion or guidance
>>>systems or both and caused a brief but deadly mid air collision.

><snip>

>>First I think we have been brainwashed by old science fiction
>>movies about how indestructable these objects might be. That and
>>the tired old theory that we are being watched closely because
>>we are the most dangerous species in the universe.

>>However, I have no doubt that these vehicles are much more
>>robust in nature than our own, which incidentally are much
>>tougher than they used to be at least in the military
>>application. But I doubt their indestructability. There is so
>>much we don't know about the capability and the construction of
>>these things that it's nearly impossible to state one way or the
>>other just whether they, or one model versus the other, are.

><snip>

>Well I don't buy the idea that a bunch of old WWII radars, SCR-
>584's, CPS-4's and CPS-5's, at White Sands which were in use
>all over the country would have interfered with anything,
>certainly not alien spacecraft, and only "brought them down" in
>NM but nowhere else in the US where the same radars were used.

>Once again this is desperate Special Pleading type argument,
>begging that special exceptions be piled onto exceptions, so
>that this old Frank Scully story of the superpowerful radars
>that brought down the "magnetic" saucers can be recycled once
>again.

The bringing down of UFOs by radar [micro-waves] is not my
theory-nor did I state so above. In fact I would think that if
that was the case the damn things would be falling out of the
sky at a regular rate and creating havoc due to the massive

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Ledger

proliferation of micro waves these day.

Headline: "Mother of Three Downs UFO While Defrosting
Hamburger"

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 16:28:20 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 07:59:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 15:25:09 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:45:42 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:40:55 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>>How would any of us know without appropriate clearances and
>>>need-to-know?

>>For the same reason that any earth-shattering discovery that is
>>shocking to the core of a person's being would become known
>>it would have a visible, noticeable impact on the people
>>involved and on the policies they formulate that can be
>>discerned openly, and outside security-controlled channels.
>>The more shocking the secret discovery the less able to control
>>the visibility and keep the secret.
<snip>

>I think one could make the exact opposite case namely that the
>more shocking the secret discovery, the less likely the kind of
>responsible people who have appropriate clearances would be to
>let out anything. We are not talking about Joe Public.

That is not what I said. I said nothing about anyone intentionally "letting out" the huge fundamentally shocking secret of discovering the earth is visited by extraterrestrials. I said "visible, noticeable impact on the people involved" in policymaking in the government. When Stalin was told that Hitler was invading him, he went into weeks of profound shock and depression. Even in the ruthless secretive conspiratorial Soviet society of the time this policy impact of the shocking Nazi treachery was visible in its effects on Stalin, who was sluggish and unresponsive to battlefield reports and slow to give orders to defend against attack, did not plan or strategize the military response. This was all from a simple planet earth war, whereas confrontation with ET reality and potential military threat beyond anything even dreamed of before, would be even more shocking than a surprise tank invasion, would cause policymakers to question their core religious values and be forced to either cling to them more tightly or abandon them and cause behavioral effects on their circles of friends and family who try to grasp what had happened. This shock-and-awe effect would spill over into public life and would be reported in the press -- "Truman and Forrestal were seen today looking ashen and pale in this morning's meeting in the White House. Reporters asked the White House press secretary if some bad news had been learned, but secretary said he knew of nothing bad or otherwise. Later in the day, the White House announced postponement of

Soviet summit talks, and abruptly dropped plans to implement the new National Security Act legislation, saying that unspecified further modifications had become necessary, and consultations with Congress were in the works to amend the Act. Today, the White House changed its plan for national security but would give no details." Etc. etc. Even though no one was "letting out" any ET secret, the sudden confrontation with ET reality still would have a policy impact in Washington that would be visible.

>>>>With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a >>>>multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy, >>>>the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

>>>>The "Manhattan Project" (that was never its official name) was >>>>not set up by the President and run by a committee of top >>>>interagency directors, generals and scientists. Yes, that refutes >>>>the "Majestic 12" model right there.

>Not at all. Surely FDR authorized Manhattan?

Again I did not say that! FDR did not "set up" the Manhattan project. But Truman purportedly set up MJ-12! Right from the intro to the alleged EBD (Eisenhower Briefing Document) it says:

"... the Majestic-12 (Majic-12) Group ... was established by special classified executive order of President Truman on 24 September, 1947...."

There is nothing similar from FDR "establishing" the Manhattan project. Manhattan was set up by a simple classified Army General Order. Therefore the Manhattan project does not provide an historical precedent supporting the alleged structure and existence of MJ-12, it is not a "close model" but a very distant model or no model at all. Like many military organizations the Manhattan project under the Army had direct interaction with other agencies, many scientists, etc. I do not see how this provides a "close model" for MJ-12, since interactions are routine and prove nothing. Also, why would FDR's way of doing things be a good model for the way Truman did things? Historians note that Truman broke away from FDR's science policy methods and rejected his science advisor Vannevar Bush, as Bush himself said in 1950 to Truman's science policy investigator William T. Golden. Bush was rejected from the very outset as a possible first Presidential Science Advisor, which Truman was considering appointing.

When the CIA and NSA were set up under Truman, they were required to have Directors and Deputy Directors who were either military or civilian but not both at the same time, in order to balance civilian and military interests. Where is MJ-12's military Director and civilian Deputy Director, or civilian Director and military Deputy? Who were the alleged MJ-12 Directors and Deputy Directors?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:15:57 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:01:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Lehmborg

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:04:38 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 17:41:14 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

><snip>

>James, we seem to agree on many things.

>1. I have for decades been stressing that technological
>progress comes from doing things differently in an
>unpredictable way. The future is NOT an extrapolation of the
>past.

This is what puts Feschino's book in a useful category because he did the exact opposite of the preceding. He didn't extrapolate forward. He speculated backward given the facts, as they are, had the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, and had no presuppositions about the 'official' story. The former is speculative, however prescient, fiction. The latter can be history. Unanswered, it is history. Comment?

alienview.nul - :| :-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:53:30 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:02:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>James, we seem to agree on many things.

Really? I am having some problems identifying these things.

>1. I have for decades been stressing that technological
>progress comes from doing things differently in an
>unpredictable way. The future is NOT an extrapolation of the
>past.

Although I agree that you cannot extrapolate the actual innovations, you can extrapolate that there are going to be innovations (an innovation rate). The Chinese had a stagnant and stable culture for thousands of years with little or no technology innovation (sure they invented things, but they were not USED). When a stagnant culture confronts an innovative culture, innovation wins.

When you look at the technology roadmaps for NASA, you see a number of far out innovations that we cannot do yet, but are inspirational goals. Will they all happen? No, money is limited as well as there is a prioritization of needs.

Can an interstellar spaceship be designed and built only based on writing on a piece of paper and a pencil or worse, simply by thinking and using standard tools? Sure. But its going to be hard and very error prone. The pressure to make it easier and more likely to succeed would be in the system. This would make innovations such as slide rules and computers necessary.

I would say that whether you think the innovation rate slows down or accelerates, given the likely age of an alien civilization if it is visiting us, it is much more likely that they have already evolved through our present innovations, implemented many of our dreamed of innovations and have alot of innovations we can't even dream of yet.

Placing limitations on them, putting them in our image, as error prone beings is very hard to accept.

>I am certainly not saying aliens are at our level of
>technology. I very frequently point out that Zeta 1 and Zeta 2
>Reticuli are sunlike stars that are a billion years older than
>the sun and are only 1/8th of a light year apart are only 39
>light years from here and would have had a greater incentive for
>star travel than we do.

>2. Yes, all designers of advanced propulsion systems stress
>reliability and safety. And all such systems have occasional
>accidents. The shuttle is far more advanced than a horse and
>buggy, a ford or chevrolet, a 747; redundancy is built in.. But
>2 have had fatal accidents. We have no idea how many flying
>saucer accidents or crashes there are per thousand miles
>travelled. They may do much better than 747's. It is of
>interest that the earth excursion modules are the ones that seem

>to crash as opposed to the interstellar mother ships.

The odd thing is that you (and others) keep trying to correlate current human capabilities and advanced alien capabilities. If the aliens were at about our current technology level or even slightly behind it, I would agree that you can say the error/crash rates can be similar. However, since we know computers keep advancing and the number of connections keep increasing then it is likely that this has already occurred with advanced alien technology enabling artificial intelligence capabilities that exceed organic thinking. This, combined with computer simulation, will enable a very high number of scenarios to be performed to check spacecraft designs and enhance spacecraft reliability and durability. Combined with automated hardware manufacture and assembly and testing, most uncertainty can be removed. Add the artificial intelligence(s) to the flight control loop then how can it crash???

I am not even going way out in ozone and suggesting that the aliens are integrated into the computers. I am not suggesting utility clouds of nanomachines like Eric Drexler has. Nanomachines open up a whole universe of possibilities which I can't fully comprehend. It seems likely advanced alien civilizations would have at least somewhat mastered such devices.

>3. We must judge by the evidence.. 2 saucers , at least, crashed
>in NM in July 1947. Whether we understand the causes is besides
>the point. Murders have been committed where we have no idea of
>why. But they happened. I can't expect visiting aliens to know
>so much about us and our planet that all contingencies can be
>taken care of. Maybe the pilots need more sleep. Maybe they had
>jet lag from the long trip. Maybe somebody forgot to brief them
>on our lightning storms.Maybe a vital part was overstressed when
>they swerved to avoid a missile...

Placing human limitations on them again. Look at what we have done in the past 100 years and it doesn't seem unlikely that in 100 more years that robots, REAL artificial intelligence will be ubiquitous. Organic pilots will not even be needed (a quaint notion really).

Not know about lightning? Do you think these spacecraft are designed on the fly? They will have likely seen many worlds and have been purposely designed to deal with a wide range of hazards. Likely some craft are specially designed for gas-giants, but worlds like ours have standard phenomena which they really MUST have encountered many times before.

A vital part overstressed???. One that causes a crash? So they had NO redundancy, how backups, separate systems, nanosecond computational abilities to perform automated failure prediction and prevention? Remarkably primitive!

You somehow have proof of alien ET spacecraft crashing. Do you have any DNA sample, spacecraft metal? Its a difficult thing to accept such an extraordinary experience. Why is it that there is no crashed alien evidence? There had to have been many crashes prior to the government secrecy but I have not seen any items from those events either. I will give some credence to sightings of UFOs, not because I have great faith in eyewitnesses, but because scientific studies by those I respect (Dr. Rutledge) confirm that there are indeed such objects. I will even at least keep an open mind about alien abductions and implants because they seem to fit within normal paradigms (if we were visiting other worlds, wouldn't we do the same, more or less). But crashed spaceships seems to be so "low class" technology wise.

I do not know if the crash was a balloon, Atlantean craft, Nazi vehicle with dwarf Aryans at the helm, Vimana(s) from where ever Vimana stay, time travelers from the past or future, interdimensional travelers, US secret program/spacecraft. Each of these have a much higher chance of not being very far ahead of us in terms of reliability and safety as opposed to very advanced aliens.

Mass psychosis, mass hypnosis, hoax obviously are possible and don't impugne the alien safety record.

It really doesn't matter much because we have no hard evidence, so we should just move along.

>4. Don't forget that old reports about this planet may have
>misled the aliens who were taken aback by new and unplanned
>technological progress on our part that never would have
>happened had there not been WW 2. There was a tendency on the
>part of the USA to think that the Russians post WW 2 were just a
>bunch of dumb peasants without ivy league educations. But they
>put up the first satellite, the first animal, the first man, the
>first rocket around the moon. It took a while for us to catch
>up.. Do notice the enormous difference in our technology between
>1937 and 1947.

Do you really think they would bum around without massive sensor sweeps, telescopic inquiries, automated probes before slouching down there in person? Seems odd. Would we do this in our space program? No. Assuming they have done this before, which seems a high probability, then they would know the drill and not be slackers.

>I do not believe we can make judgements about alien perfection
>other than to say they are not perfect.

They don't need to be perfect. In fact they can be as dumb as us. But they really should have better computers than us.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:19:21 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:04:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 08:39:53 -0800
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 12:04:38 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>Gentlemen,

>Pardon me for interjecting, but I couldn't stand it anymore!
>James, not to be rude but I'm wondering if what your seeing on
>your computer screen is coming up in a "foreign language." I
>thought what Stan was saying was flawlessly clear, but allow me
>to translate:

Oh, yes, I understand perfectly what Mr. Friedman is saying. We
have philosophical differences.

>>I do not see any problem with extrapolating technology based on
>>our human experiences. If you claim that UFOs are caused by
>>aliens near our own technology level, then I must counter that
>>this is very unlikely based on probabilities. It seems odd to me
>>that you think aliens (if they are the cause of UFOs) have the
>>same technology level as us. The probabilities imply that is any
>>aliens are visiting, then they would have been spacefaring for
>>thousands of years.

>Therein lies the problem - if aliens are akin to humans then one
>could "logically" extrapolate technology based on "our"
>experiences - since there isn't enough data to substantiate that
>mindset, then making projections from that ideology is not
>feasible!

If the aliens were sitting in their pools or pockets of mud then
I wouldn't try to speculate on their technology. I do not
speculate on their society or religion or culture. But in order
to become a spacefaring civilization, they have got to do
certain things or it will be very unlikely to occur. Unless you
think they use psychic powers to teleport from one place in the
Universe to another, we have to use good ole technology. Exactly
what that technology is is not easy to predict, but it in all
likelihood IS technology. Technology involves innovations. Some
of these are predictable and evolutionary and some are
revolutionary. Given the likely age and advanced nature of a
visiting alien race, they will have passed through all of our
technology innovations (or gleaned them from us and other places
they visited). Also, they will have actually built many things
we have dreamed about and alot we haven't dreamed about. This
and only this is necessary to infer that they are not likely to
build craft that crash, at least with a frequency WE can
observe.

>Stan never indicated that he thought aliens were at the same
>technological level as us. Again not having any data to work
>with about an extraterrestrial civilization there are no
>probabilities.

Are you telling me that it is not obvious that aliens that are substantially behind us would not be visiting us? Are you telling me that aliens that are tremendously ahead of us would be visiting us? No, there is a "sweet" spot of technology advancement that both allows aliens to actually travel to other stars and also even care to drop by and visit us (as opposed to assuming they have seen everything before and see no point on visiting us or can record everything about us remotely via sensors of unknown power).

What am I doing wrong with this harmless inference?

>>In the various technical areas of space travel, I can say, >>because I have witnessed it, that the goal is to make the >>spacecraft/spacesuit/space hardware ever more reliable. I think >>it is valid to assume a high probability exists that ALL alien >>races that do space travel would go through this kind of phase.

>You cannot assume anything - that's the message that you don't >seem to be comprehending. Also, amongst the myriad of things we >don't know about our visitors, the vehicles involved near >Roswell and or others may not have been "space faring" vehicles >at all! Their purpose could just be for "inner-planetary" >(opposed to "interplanetary") travel only.

It matters little whether the craft are interplanetary, interstellar or whatever. They have a mission to perform and advanced alien's with their >100->1000 year advanced technology will not likely design marginal vehicles.

>>Examining our own current goals (technology roadmaps) I see many >>references to highly reliable, safe space hardware. In fact, it >>would be extremely likely that aliens have the reliability "art" >>down to such an automated method based on real-life historical >>data that it is cheap to do.

>There isn't any data to measure to be able to say anything is >likely.

If we can dream it and have sufficient funds/resources/time to invest in innovations, then they (or better things) will more likely occur. I safely assume advanced alien races had the time and resources to do this.

>>The whole point to having spacecraft is to perform a mission. >>What sense is there to make spacecraft that cannot perform the >>mission because they are always crashing?

>Who says aliens make sense?

If they did not make sense then they would be floundering at the bottom of the evolutionary heap.

>>Consider the continuum of possible alien races. Restructuring >>galaxies may not be beyond the abilities of high end races. >>Building new elementary particles from scratch would be easy. >>Nanotechnology would be ancient history. A race a thousand years >>beyond ours should be infallible in our eyes at least.

>"Assuming" aliens are like humans, carbon based, societal, >religious, emotional etc., and advance in the same manner.

They had to have gotten here. They used technology. Or am I to assume the real possibility is that they prayed to their god and poof they are here. Or they cried their way here. Or they formed an alien pyramid and reached here. Technology requires innovation. Innovations got them here, not magic.

>The point James is that in order to form a theorem about >"anything" much less an extraterrestrial race, there has to be >data to draw from; unless you've learned something the rest of >us haven't, (if so please share) any theorem, assumption, idea >is not viable!

I do not know anything about alien races. I just infer based on certain requirements. They need technology to get here. They need innovations in order to have technology. Innovations tend to make things better. Better means more reliable or able to perform a mission. Historical data on alien sorties will shove it in their faces that innovations are required. I tend to think

that they are better than that. Is the "theory of technology advancement" so farfetched? I only think it can be applied since the hypothetical alien race is spacefaring.

Regards,

James

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:33:13 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:05:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 16:35:57 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>You just contradicted yourself and violated Occam's Razor within
>the space of a few paragraphs.

Uh, no.

>First you demand that aliens must
>be extremely advanced (because of alleged probability
>arguments).

My inference only, take it or leave it.

>Then you complain that we wouldn't "see" such
>"advanced" aliens.

I only find it unusual. If they really didn't want to interfere with us, they would be invisible. If they were really really advanced as some alien races MUST be, then they should come here in noncorporeal forms.

There are degrees of advancement (I hope).

>Obviously the fact we "see" them (if they
>really exist and are seen as UFO's, which I'm assuming only for
>sake of argument here), and they don't have adequate stealth, is
>because we only can see those who are near our 21st century
>level of technology in the first place.

Not at all obvious. Maybe they just don't care if they are seen. Maybe they want us to see them for some psychological reason/test.

>And Occam's Razor
>demands that you start with the simplest hypotheses first,
>beginning with ETH for the lowest levels of technology that
>could visit us, not always injecting the highest levels of
>technology ("aliens are like magic") whenever you want to win an
>argument.

Hmmm. Well, don't get cut with that razor.

If you wish to make such improbable assumptions of cave man like aliens who found alien spacecraft lying around and banged it with a rock until it flew them here, only to crash, then go ahead.

Or perhaps, you wish to consider the idea that of all the places that aliens could have visited, our planet at this one time is the place they visited... an crashed at.

Some would say that the probabilities of such events are very remote.

If however, you wish to accept the idea of a huge range of alien societies ranging from our equivalent to 1000000 years advanced

from ours, doesn't it seem that the center of the bell (or even flat) probability distribution curve more likely in the center than at the extreme end as you wish it to be? Given the above range, the likelihood of less than .000001% seems appropriate for alien race near our own level visiting and crashing. The more likely range is >1000 years (my opinion) in advance of our own. Thus technology is likely better than ours such that crashes are unlikely.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Re: Hats Off To George Noory - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 12:03:00 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:08:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Hats Off To George Noory - Boone

There are moments in radio that are history in the making.

Events of such importance they deserve the status of legend.

Such was the case here in Los Angeles when C2C host George Noory was interviewed by lawyer, turned talk show host, Bill Handel.

Here in Los Angeles, the biggest radio station is KFI640 am. The best way to describe KFI's programming line up is what happens when high school detention takes over the school.

The hosts scream at their public, insult them with abandon, rail at public officials, grind into the ground anybody regardless of race, age, ethnicity, religious beliefs.

Brutal would be an understatement and that's why we love KFI.

Bill Handel is a living testament to what it's like being a human. He spouts out his foibles and much like Art Bell he takes the time to admit that he's done some silly things and like Bell it makes him a host you can relate to. Handel is no slouch in the smarts department though. He knows his law. He knows his news. I'm a die hard fan of Handel's and love it when he tears into some slimeball who has tried to rip off the public or pull a fast one. Handel is always teasing C2C. That's because C2C ends at 5am here and Handel's show goes on from 5am to 9am.

One knows what fate to face when Handel gets a handle on ya!

So since KFI decided to allow C2C back to it's old time slot from 10pm to 5am, Bill Handel asked good ol' George Noory onto his show. Ain't been this much edge of the seat excitement in years.

So here comes George and of course Handel makes with the "Martian Anal Probe" jokes etc. and George Noory, George Noory, 3 time Emmy Award winner for news, naval officer, walked through Bill Handel with more cool than Fonzie on an iceberg.

These two men were opposites. Handel that 'Type A' high strung guy and Noory was like a cool breeze that parried Bill's barbs with finesse, elegance and true sportsmanship. He even tossed in a few cracks himself and as diverse as these two hosts are they complimented one another greatly for a great lineup on the radio.

I hope George runs the interview spot on his show. It was a riot.

George fenced Handel's questions and let me tell you, Handel's no joke when it comes to asking the tough questions and he's man enough to admit if he's wrong.

All in all it was a great interview. A real funny moment in radio history!

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Rich Dolan Update - 02-05

From: Richard Dolan <keyhole.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 17:05:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:40:10 -0500
Subject: Rich Dolan Update - 02-05

Greetings.

For those who are interested, I have published a new article to my website. This is entitled "UFO Secrecy and the Death of the American Republic." I had intended to publish all of it at once, but it's become a little longer than I expected, so I will publish the second part later this week, possibly next week.

Link to the website: <http://keyholepublishing.com>

In addition, I published a brief note on the website explaining my relative absence from the writing scene for the past six months. No big deal, nothing serious, but some of you wrote to me wondering what was happening.

I intend to write articles on an occasional basis until Volume Two of my study, UFOs and the National Security State, is completed.

Regarding that, I believe that all will be done in 2006. Doing my best!

Sincerely,

Rich Dolan
<http://keyholepublishing.com>

"The whole visible world is only an imperceptible atom in the ample bosom of nature. No idea approaches it. We may enlarge our conceptions beyond an imaginable space; we only produce atoms in comparison with the reality of things." -- Blaise Pascal

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 23](#)

Secrecy News -- 02/22/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 14:46:10 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:34:50 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 02/22/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 19
February 22, 2005

** VANISHING INFORMATION RESOURCES
** IN CONGRESS
** BOOK: CHATTER
** NEW CRS PRODUCTS

VANISHING INFORMATION RESOURCES

With almost every passing day, public access to yet another government information resource is extinguished. Like an exotic species or a nearly forgotten language that suddenly becomes extinct, its disappearance excites little attention or protest. But the cumulative effect of many such losses is bound to be significant.

The latest official resource to vanish from the public domain is the U.S. Air Force "orbital element" database. These orbital elements, which characterize the orbits of satellites in Earth orbit, have been freely available to the public through NASA for nearly twenty years. Now they won't be.

The change is noted in this February 21 announcement from Analytical Graphics, Inc. (thanks to K):

<http://www.agi.com/resources/tle/>

Related background, updated February 18, is here:

<http://celestrak.com/NORAD/elements/notice.asp>

On a different, purely political level, some congressional committees are making it difficult for the public to gain access to answers to the Questions for the Record (QFRs) which are submitted by government witnesses in response to written questions from committee members following a congressional hearing.

In many cases, QFRs offer substantive new information on sensitive, controversial or complex subjects. They are often the most interesting and least utilized part of a congressional hearing record.

But when Michael Roston of the blog Nuclear Test Watch asked for a copy of the QFRs filed by the newly confirmed Secretary of Energy Samuel Bodman following his confirmation hearing, he was told that a soft copy would not be provided. The QFRs could only be reviewed, but not copied, in a Senate Committee office, he was advised. See his account in the February 21 edition of Nuclear Test Watch:

<http://nucleartestwatch.blogspot.com/>

IN CONGRESS

The Senate last week approved a bill to extend the duration of the Interagency Working Group (IWG) on Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records for an additional two years. The move follows a dispute with the CIA over the scope of declassification and document release required by the 1998 Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act.

"I hope and expect that well within those 2 years, the IWG, working closely with the CIA, will be able to examine the remaining documents and release the important information that still lays within the files of the CIA--unexamined by the public until now," said Sen. Mike DeWine (R-OH).

The bill to extend the IWG was sponsored by Sen. DeWine, along with Sen. John Cornyn (R-TX) and Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA).

See this extended Senate colloquy from February 16 on the achievements of the IWG to date:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/congress/2005/s384.html>

Rep. Edward Markey (D-Mass) last week reintroduced the "Torture Outsourcing Prevention Act" that would formally prohibit the practice of "extraordinary rendition" by which prisoners in U.S. custody are allegedly sent for interrogation to foreign countries that practice torture. See:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_cr/h021805.html

A resolution introduced in the Senate calls upon North Korea to return the U.S.S. Pueblo, the American intelligence vessel seized in January 1968 and now on display in Pyongyang. See:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_cr/s021405.html

BOOK: CHATTER

What is a citizen permitted to know about the global network of electronic surveillance? What more can he or she hope to discover?

These sorts of questions form the narrative backbone of a rather entertaining new book called "Chatter: Dispatches from the Secret World of Global Eavesdropping" by Patrick Radden Keefe (Random House, February 2005).

Nicely and intelligently written, Chatter looks into the far-flung system of intelligence collection facilities, the bureaucrats who operate them, the citizens who obsess over them (Secrecy News is featured in a flattering light), and the secrecy system that shields them. See:

<http://www.randomhouse.com/catalog/display.pperl?1400060346>

NEW CRS PRODUCTS

New and newly updated reports from the Congressional Research Service obtained by Secrecy News include the following.

"The Global Peace Operations Initiative: Background and Issues for Congress," February 16, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL32773.pdf>

"Islamic Religious Schools, Madrasas: Background," updated February 10, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RS21654.pdf>

"The Islamic Traditions of Wahhabism and Salafiyya," updated February 10, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RS21695.pdf>

"Terrorism in Southeast Asia," updated February 7, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL31672.pdf>

"Homeland Security: Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and Border Surveillance," updated February 7, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/homesec/RS21698.pdf>

"National Security Education Program: Background and Issues," updated January 21, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL31643.pdf>

"Nuclear Arms Control: The Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty," updated January 21, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/nuke/RL31448.pdf>

"U.S. Nuclear Weapons: Changes in Policy and Force Structure," updated January 13, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/nuke/RL31623.pdf>

And not so new but still noteworthy is "Post-War Iraq: A Table and Chronology of Foreign Contributions," updated November 5, 2004:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/mideast/RL32105.pdf>

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to secrecy_news-request.nul with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 22](#)

The 2004 Canadian UFO Survey

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 08:57:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 08:57:15 -0500
Subject: The 2004 Canadian UFO Survey

Source: The Canadian UFO Survey

<http://www.geocities.com/area51/rampart/2653/2004survey.html>

02-21-05

The 2004 Canadian UFO Survey: Summary of Results

- There were 882 UFO sightings reported in Canada in 2004 C or more than two each day.
- There were about 31 per cent more UFO reports in 2004 than 2003. The number of UFO reports filed per year in Canada has been increasing steadily since 1998.
- Records show that more than 5,000 UFO sightings have been officially reported in Canada since 1989.
- Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Quebec all had all-time record high numbers of UFOs reported in 2004.
- In 2004, about 15 per cent of all UFO reports were unexplained. This percentage of unknowns falls to about seven per cent when only high-quality cases are considered.
- Most UFO sightings have more than one witness.
- The typical UFO sighting lasted almost 20 minutes in 2004.

The most important findings of this study include the fact that the number of UFO sightings in Canada has increased over the past sixteen years, and 2004 saw an all-time record high number of sightings reported. People continue to report observing unusual objects in the sky, and some of these objects do not have obvious explanations. Many witnesses are pilots, police and other individuals with reasonably good observing capabilities and good judgement. Although most reported UFOs are simply lights in the night sky, a significant number are objects with definite shapes observed within the witnesses' frame of reference.

Popular opinion to the contrary, there is yet to be any incontrovertible evidence that some UFO cases involve extraterrestrial contact. The continued reporting of UFOs by the public and the yearly increase in numbers of UFO reports suggests a need for further examination of the phenomenon by social, medical and/or physical scientists.

Details at:

<http://www.geocities.com/area51/rampart/2653/2004survey.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

E.T. Have A Tim Bit

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 07:27:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 07:27:32 -0500
Subject: E.T. Have A Tim Bit

Source: The Toronto Star - Ontario, Canada

Wednesday, February 23rd, 2005

p. A22

Editorials & Opinions

E.T., have a Tim Bit*

With Canadians reporting a record number of UFO sightings last year =97 30 per cent more than in 2003 =97 it's natural to wonder why.

Are extraterrestrials visiting with increased frequency? And, if so, what on Earth is attracting them here?

Let's look at the data: 882 Unidentified Flying Objects were reported in this country last year, according to Ufology Research of Manitoba, a group tracking UFOs since 1989.

Most were nocturnal lights of various sorts. A classic 'flying saucer' shape is only reported in about 5 per cent of cases. Canadians also described three 'close encounters of the fourth kind;' meaning an alleged alien abduction, or direct contact.

Most UFOs turn out to be satellites, meteors, airplanes, or have some other conventional cause.

But (cue theme music for The Twilight Zone) about 15 per cent of last year's sightings remain unexplained.

Skeptics may bristle, but there is no denying that Canada has much to tempt visitors from another planet. There are prescription drugs at low, low prices; Tim Bits; a wide selection of monogrammed golf balls; and a federal equalization system worthy of envy from here to Alpha Centauri.

With so much to offer, we can only marvel that there are not more UFOs coming in for a landing.

*Tiny donut/doughnut

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:26:18 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 07:31:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sandow

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 16:28:20 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>This shock-and- awe effect
>would spill over into public life and would be reported in the
>press - "Truman and Forrestal were seen today looking ashen and
>pale in this morning's meeting in the White House. Reporters
>asked the White House press secretary if some bad news had been
>learned, but secretary said he knew of nothing bad or otherwise.
>Later in the day, the White House announced postponement of
>Soviet summit talks, and abruptly dropped plans to implement the
>new National Security Act legislation, saying that unspecified
>further modifications had become necessary, and consultations
>with Congress were in the works to amend the Act. Today, the
>White House changed its plan for national security but would
>give no details." Etc. etc. Even though no one was "letting out"
>any ET secret, the sudden confrontation with ET reality still
>would have a policy impact in Washington that would be visible.

Does anyone remember a study by Michael Swords that touched on this? There was - if I remember the details correctly - a lot of interest in UFOs at high levels in the military, at the time of the Roswell event. And for a time shortly after the event, some of those involved in military UFO concerns began complaining of a "silence topside" - meaning that higherups were all at once not responding. Or so Swords wrote. The implication, of course, was that the high-ranking "topside" officers suddenly found out the truth, and for a while weren't sure how to respond to UFO-related communications from those who reported to them.

Does anyone else remember this study? And does Swords' contention hold up in the light of further research? I'd especially love to hear what Wendy thinks.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

UFO Sleuth With An Eye To The Sky

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:01:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:01:29 -0500
Subject: UFO Sleuth With An Eye To The Sky

Source: The Mercury - Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/62avz>

02-24-05

UFO sleuth with an eye to the sky
By Claire Konkes

Reports of an unidentified flying object in the Midlands on Regatta Day are still coming in to a Hobart UFO investigator.

Since the first sighting was reported in The Mercury last week, six people have come forward to say they saw a large bright light, says Keith Roberts, who has collected data at the Tasmanian UFO Investigation Centre since 1969.

Mr Roberts said the first report shortly after midnight on Regatta Day came from three women who said they saw a large craft flying beside them in a paddock.

Since then, six people have told him of a bright light around Mangalore late in the evening on Regatta Day.

"It's not the same event obviously, but they are all within 24 hours," he said.

The Mangalore sighting is the first multiple-reported sighting in nearly 10 years.

Surprisingly, Mr Roberts does not believe in aliens.

"I don't know why the thing is there _ that's why it's called unidentified," he said.

Instead of being an aspiring alien hunter, the amateur astronomer said he enjoyed keeping records of the sightings and investigating the mystery behind them.

He said 80 per cent of the phone calls he gets at his South Hobart home are easily explained over the phone.

Many people are told their UFO is a bright star, satellite or meteorites, he said.

Balloons and flares, and the occasional storm or aurora are also easily explained.

Calls to police, the airport and the Bureau of Meteorology explain a further 15 per cent _ leaving about 5 per cent that remain a mystery.

In recent years, Mr Roberts said, he could expect about 50 telephone calls from people annually, but he has already had 20 this year.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea

From: William Matchen <heyzeus321.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 06:58:51 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:04:46 -0500
Subject: Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea

Source: BBC News

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/4285119.stm>

02-21-05

Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea

A huge, frozen sea lies just below the surface of Mars, a team of European scientists has announced.

Their assessment is based on pictures of the planet's near-equatorial Elysium region that show plated and rutted features across an area 800 by 900km.

The team think a catastrophic event flooded the landscape five million years ago and then froze out.

They tell a forthcoming edition of Nature magazine that sediments covered the ice, locking it in place.

Large reserves of water-ice are known to be held at the poles on Mars but if this discovery is confirmed by follow-up observations, it would be a first for a region at such a low latitude.

Dust covering

"It's been predicted for a long time that you should find water close to the surface of Mars near the equator," Jan-Peter Muller, from University College London, UK, said.

Dust covering

"It's been predicted for a long time that you should find water close to the surface of Mars near the equator," Jan-Peter Muller, from University College London, UK, said.

"This is an area where there are a lot of river features but no-one has ever seen a sea before, and certainly no-one has ever seen pack ice before," he told the BBC News website.

The interpretation is based on images taken by the High Resolution Stereo Camera on Europe's Mars Express spacecraft. These show extensive fields of large, platy features - reminiscent of the fractured ice floes found in polar regions on Earth.

Finding exposed ice at the equator would be unlikely. Very low pressures on the planet would lead to sublimation - the ice would erode over time straight to water vapour.

But the research group, led by John Murray, from the Open University, UK, tells Nature that a crust of dust and volcanic ash, perhaps just a few centimetres thick, has prevented this happening.

"The story runs that water flowed in some kind of massive

catastrophic event; pack ice formed on top of that water and broke up, and then the whole thing froze rigid," explains Professor Muller.

"Large amounts of dust then fell over that area. The dust fell through the water and on top of the pack ice, which explains why the pack ice is a different hue to the area around it."

Feeder channels

The water that formed the sea in the southern Elysium, five degree north of the equator, appears to have originated beneath the surface of Mars, erupting from a series of fractures known as the Cerberus Fossae.

Many of the features seen by Mars Express have also been pictured by the Mars Orbiter Camera on the US Mars Global Surveyor probe.

Further data is now required to support the initial observations but already other scientists think the interpretation is reasonable.

"I think it's fairly plausible," commented Michael Carr, an expert on Martian water at the US Geological Survey in Menlo Park, California, who was not part of the team.

He told New Scientist magazine that a past water source north of the Elysium plates had previously been suspected.

"We know where the water came from... You can trace the valleys carved by water down to this area."

Mars Express has now been in orbit around the Red Planet for a year.

It has already confirmed US observations that substantial water-ice lies at the poles, on its own and mixed with carbon dioxide ice and dirt.

Lander target

The probe will soon deploy its Marsis (Mars Advance Radar for Subsurface and Ionospheric Sounding) instrument, which has been designed to find the planet's subterranean permafrost.

This underground ice is thought to be the major reservoir for water on Mars today.

However, the way the instrument is set up means it may not be able to see the Elysium sea because it is simply too near the surface. Only if the ice mass extends down many tens of metres will it be able to detect the sea-bottom boundary.

The presence of so much recent (in the geological timeframe) liquid water will excite the speculation that life could have thrived in this area.

"The fact that there have been warm and wet places beneath the surface of Mars since before life began on Earth, and that some are probably still there, means that there is a possibility that primitive micro-organisms survive on Mars today," Professor Murray said.

"This mission has changed many of my long-held opinions about Mars - we now have to go there and check it out."

Professor Muller added: "What we'd like is for the European Space Agency (Esa), with UK support, to send its next lander there."

Details of the frozen sea were given at the Mars Express science conference, taking place at Esa's European Space Research and Technology Centre (Estec), in Noordwijk, the Netherlands.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Filer's Files #9 - 2005

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 10:01:10 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:15:30 -0500
Subject: Filer's Files #9 - 2005

Filer's Files #9 - 2005,
Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director MUFON Eastern
Vice President of Skywatch International
February 23, 2005, Web: www.georgefiler.com

Webmaster: C E Warren www.cewarren.com

Record Sightings in Canada & Mexico

Science will benefit by collecting the daily evidence of UFO sightings recorded by cameras around the world, to discard the fact of hundreds of sightings each week because they are extraordinary is not scientific. George Filer

The purpose of these files is to report weekly the UFO eyewitness and photo/video evidence that occurs on a daily basis around the world and in space. Many people claim it is impossible for UFOs to visit Earth, I ask you only to keep an open mind and watch the evidence we accumulate each week. These Files make the assumption that extraterrestrial intelligent life not only exists, but my hypothesis is that of the over one hundred UFOs reported each week many represent a factual UFO sighting.

China Clipper Followed By UFO in 1938.

UFOs were seen over California, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Sightings were also reported in Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, and Puerto Rico, the United Kingdom.

Creature in Idaho Raises Prospects for Life on Mars, and Peter Jennings Explores ABCs of UFOs on Thursday February 24 at 8 PM Eastern.

The China Clipper (Boeing 314) and an UFO. Jeff Challender has found possibly the earliest color photo of a UFO. Recently, while watching a historical documentary on Speedvision about the development of the great flying boats of the past, Jeff noticed an anomalous object following one of the early model Boeing 314s as it flew over the ocean. This was extremely rare COLOR footage of the plane, and it would necessarily have been filmed in 1938 or 1939, after the 314s maiden flight in June 1938, but before the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939. We can narrow this time frame down, because after the beginning of war, these "China Clippers" as they were called, were repainted with a giant American flag on the nose. This was to denote them as Neutrals in the European war zone, and hopefully prevent them from coming under attack. ("<http://www.speedtv.com/home.php>"). Jeff writes: The time frame for this film clip makes it absolutely the EARLIEST UFO video I've ever come across! This incident even predates the famous Foo Fighters reported by all sides in the Second World War! (Article [HERE](#) on Foo Fighters & a flight of Boeing B-17s.

<http://www.projectprove.com/Articles%20Storage/FOO/FOO.PHP>

It was very lucky I was watching carefully. The clip used in the documentary only lasts THREE SECONDS! The anomalous object was very bright, and appears to be trailing the big plane, skimming above the clouds as it flew along. More on this available here;

<http://www.projectprove.com/Articles%20Storage/B-314/B-314.htm>

California - Sphere Emits Rainbow of Colors
FORT SMITH - The witness reports he saw a strange thing in the early morning sky on February 5, 2005, at 5:10 AM. It looked like a comet moving southeast over Fort Chaffee headed southeast. At first I thought it was a flare or the moon shining through a hole in the clouds. It had a light on the head of it and a tail that looked just like a comet. It finally just faded away and disappeared. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

LAGUNA NIGUEL - There is a star like object in the sky towards southeast, almost over head February 1, 2005, at 9:10PM. It moves slightly to left and right about every 20 or 30 seconds. No other stars move around, only this one. It looks like a normal star, but moves around. No other star around it does that. Thanks to Peter Davenport
SAN JOSE - I was leaving work and I heard a roar of an airplane on February 4, 2005, at 9:45PM. The Company I work for is located near San Jose Minnetta International Airport. I looked up and noticed a sphere shaped object glistening in the sunlight. It was probably at 2,000 - 3,000 feet hovering motionless. It began emitting a rainbow of colors, very intense and bright and it definitely had a pattern to it. I waved my arms, convinced that whatever was occupying this unknown object had intelligent life forms aboard it. It then began to move westward and then took off at amazing speed. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director
SONORA -Between storm systems over California on February 22, 2005, the clouds cleared out for a beautiful and bright evening. At 9:09 PM, after hours of watching the sky, I was about to call it a night and go inside. I looked up to see an object to my northeast, heading south.

No FAA mandated red or green lights were to be seen. This object appeared brightly lit and moved slowly, without any sound whatsoever. To see the video clips of the triangles, please visit "<http://www.sonorasightings.com/91249.html>".
District of Columbia - Enhancement of Photo
Gordon DeSpain writes, "I pulled the Webcam picture into my computer, opened it in Paintshop Pro, and, cropped it and converted it to a BMP File, to prevent destruction of data during enhancement. Then, I resized it to 300% (3X), applied a Median Filter (raised the strength to 6), and, applied an edge enhancing "Dilute." This resulted in an amazingly clear picture of something that appears to be rectangular, or, possibly a slightly blunt, wedge shape, with kickup on the rear, and, something attached that looks like a raised, oversize gutter (like one along the edge of a roof). And, it seems to be trailing some type of wake, or, possibly a shadow caused by a light source outside the pictures boundary. Whatever it may be, I defy anyone to call it a balloon, or, a temperature inversion.

Again, whatever it is, it's a hard, physical object, unlike anything we may have in the air today. Since I can't possibly identify it as natural, a misidentified celestial object, or, misidentified aircraft, I'd have to call this a real, "Category 10" UFO...unlike any other real UFO I've seen. Gordon DeSpain
<http://millenniumcowboy.homestead.com>

Photo thanks to mediavillage.com, Skywatch International and National Park Service Webcam.
Creature in Idaho Raises Prospects for Life on Mars By Robert Roy Britt Senior Science Writer Space.Com reports, "They eat hydrogen, breathe carbon dioxide, and belch methane. And they form the root of an ecosystem unlike any previously known on Earth. Meet the methanogen, a tiny organism living in complete darkness 660 feet (200 meters) underneath the surface of Idaho. Researchers report in the Jan. 17 issue of the Journal Nature the discovery of a community of various organisms dominated and supported by these methanogens, creatures they say could represent just the sort of life to look for when turning over rocks on Mars. The work, along with another report this week of life found in extreme conditions in Antarctica, adds to mounting evidence for life's tenacity and creativity, fueling increased speculation about the prospects for life on other worlds. Extreme diet - Unlike other organisms

at the bottom of the food chain, methanogens need little of the traditional sustenance that biologists associate with life. They get by without oxygen and no help from sunlight, said the U.S. Geological Survey's Francis H. Chappelle, who led the study along with Derek Lovley of the University of Massachusetts. Methanogens simply feed off hydrogen in the rocks around an underground hot spring. No one knew if life could live in such conditions. So the Idaho site was chosen for its lack of organic matter, stuff that is originally produced by sunlight-powered organisms and is known to support other subsurface ecosystems. "This kind of microbial community has never been found on Earth," Chappelle told SPACE.com, adding that it "may be representative of the kinds of life that initially evolved on the early Earth, and which may presently occur on Mars or Europa." Snip Thanks to www.space.com Editor's Note: Dr. Gilbert Levin's Labeled Release Life Detectors signaled positive for life repeatedly in 1976, from the Mars Viking Landers 1 & 2, but for some reason NASA scientists decided to ignore the truth. Many scientists are now contacting me claiming Levin was right. "There is life on Mars!

Illinois - Low flying UFO with Lights Flashing

HOMER GLEN -There was a low flying craft this evening flying through our subdivision on January 31, 2005, at 6:20 PM. It appeared to make no sound and it flew very slowly. There were lights on this UFO. It was flying from south to north and it continued to fly at a low height until it was out of sight. It did not look like any normal aircraft. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Iowa - Fireball Craft Observed for 10 Minutes

CEDAR FALLS - The witness reports, "The craft I saw was a fireball type and I saw it for about ten minutes northwest of Cedar Falls and then it shot due west at about 200 mph at about 8500 feet in altitude on February 2, 2005, at 1:23 PM." It also left a trail or contrail. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Louisiana - Circle

NEW IBERIA - The observers on February 4, 2005, at 9:45PM, saw a big, round, colorful UFO that just stopped in one spot a few feet in the air, and then it took off, and it was no where in sight. They state, "It was about 40-50 feet wide, with white, green, and red big bright lights all around it." It was about 10-15 feet from the ground and hovering in one place. Finally, it started to move forward and we got scared, so we took off and turned right back around to see if it was still there, which didn't take us more than 30 seconds to get back to where it was, and it was no where in sight! We looked all around, and we looked in the sky and it was really no where around." The next day, we looked in the same spot where we saw it at and we found what looked like eyeballs and reddish finger looking things. We have pictures of the things we have found. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Massachusetts - MUFON Investigation Margaret Smith reports, Whatever it was that appeared in the cold skies over Billerica on Dec. 12, at least one observer was concerned enough to seek answers.

That's according to Mark Petty, an investigator with the Massachusetts Mutual UFO Network, which said he is heading up a team to look into the reported sighting.

The volunteer-run network is part of a nationwide mutual UFO network, whose chapter members track reports of all manner of peculiar lights and objects seen hovering or cruising through the heavens. Petty did say that someone reported a similar sighting that same night, several miles away, on a southern stretch of Interstate 495 in the Worcester County vicinity.

He hopes others who may have witnessed something unusual will come forward in an effort to help the investigation and will e-mail him at MassMUFON.nul or visit the Web site, www.massmufon.com .

Billerica police said they did not receive any reports of an

unusual sighting in the sky Dec. 12, but said from time to time, they, like all police departments, do get calls from concerned residents of a strange light or sound. Usually, it's easy to figure out what the person is seeing.

UFO network chapters are volunteer-driven, and members come from many walks of life, from astronomers to factory workers, Petty said. The network trains and certifies volunteers who wish to investigate UFO reports, teaching them skills that include interviewing witnesses and looking at data on celestial activity. The Massachusetts network has more than 120 members.

In a written statement, Greg Berghorn, the state director of the Massachusetts network, said he sent a team of four investigators, led by Petty, to conduct interviews and survey the area of the reported sighting.

<http://www2.townonline.com/woburn/localRegional/view.bg?articleid-181155>

Minnesota - Oval Performs Aerial Feats

HASTINGS - I am a Field Investigator Trainee with MUFON reporting here a sighting my sister had on the evening of January 28, 2005 at 9:45 PM,. My sister was driving south on Highway 61 in Hastings, en route to Winona when she spotted a bright, oval shaped white light southeast of her position. There were scattered clouds and the moon was fully visible. This object appeared at the 3-4 o'clock position relative to the moon and my sister assumed that it was the light of an oncoming plane that she was seeing until it began to perform some very remarkable movements. From its stationary position it rapidly descended vertically to near the horizon level and hovered. It seemed either to be wobbling or to be flashing lights. The object then reversed direction to head directly upwards 1/3 the distance it had initially descended then stopped again. After a second or two the object shot off with incredible speed to the northeast before disappearing. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Montana - Falling Star Explodes Into Green Sparks

GREAT FALLS - On January 25, 2005 at 6:25 p.m. I was driving north on Interstate 15 approximately 14 miles north of Great Falls when I saw a "falling star" ahead of me through the windshield. The object fell approximately at a 35-40 degree angle for about 2 seconds then exploded/fragmented and the sparks or fragments were of a green color. It reminded me of exploding fireworks. The location in the night sky was to the N.E. of the place where the sunset. As I drove north it was in the top left part of my windshield. I am guessing that what I saw was a fragmenting meteorite that hit the earth's atmosphere. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Nebraska - Oval Shaped Object Picks Up a Cow.

Wood River - While getting ready to leave my parent's house, around midnight, five of my friends and I were sitting on the porch of an old Victorian house on January 31, 2005, on 11th Street and the object was hovering above a corn field several miles to the west. The object stayed in the sky moving from side to side for about ten minutes then after watching it appeared to be gone. In this ten minute time period the oval shaped object let out a few bursts of light like it was glowing and shone a blinding bright light down to the ground and started lifting up objects. We aren't sure what the object was but it most likely, with the size and shape of an Angus cow. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

New York - Boomerang Moving Steady and Quietly

COMMACK - The observer went outside to his backyard to watch the night sky on January 31, 2005, at 7:30 PM, and spied a dark boomerang shaped object pass overhead well below airline traffic. These were approximately six round shaped objects of the same size on the bottom side (possibly could have been lights) unlit. They could have been slightly illuminated. It moved at a steady, quiet speed traveling from east to west. As I watched, it passed over my house and it seemed to disappear in the night sky. There were no visible lights to follow its

movement. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

BEACON - On February 2, 2005, at 7 PM, the observer reports, "As I stepped outside to the front of my house, I saw what I thought was the radio tower on Beacon Mountain, but it started to move slightly." I thought it might be a helicopter as a plane was heading toward this object. It flew quite a distance above the plane as the plane headed toward its direction. It then stayed above hovering. I tried to look through binoculars on a steady point and this object just kept on moving around and I am unable to get a clear look, this is going on as I type this note. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

North Carolina - Frequent Sightings

HIGH POINT -Alan Caviness writes, "For years, residents in an undisclosed area just west of High Point, North Carolina have experienced strange occurrences of the seemingly "paranormal" variety." The experiences vary widely and involve many different kinds of paranormal topics normally studied by investigators. After 3 years of field studies and monitoring, I have determined and confirmed many times over that the overall phenomenon is real and does indeed encompass many aspects of the paranormal world. The colleagues I work with also agree without reservation. Here is a typical photo:

Oklahoma - LightTULSA - About 7:15 PM, a very large bright blue green light moved slowly northwest across the sky on February 2, 2005, The very large object then retraced its flight to the northeast very fast and disappeared. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Texas - Triangular Lights Video Taped

KAUFMAN COUNTY - Mr. Lawalk writes, Thought I'd send you some grabs off a taping I did at about 7PM, on February 9, 2005. I noticed these two red lights going east at not too fast a clip. Looked like two horizontal lights side by side at first with no noticeable flashing lights and no sound. As I zoomed in on it, it shows to have three lights in a triangle shape. I got about thirty seconds or more of it before it went behind my house. The lights were moving east at a couple hundred miles per hour in a horizontal straight path. Watch toward about the middle of the clip, (about 14 seconds in to it), and it passes a star so you can see it's moving.

Thanks to Brian Vike.

<http://www.hbccufo.org/videos/TriangleShape02092005.wmv>

Utah - A Small Light

RIVERDALE - The observer was outside getting ready to take a drive up to the mountains, when he happened to look up, just in time to watch a light briefly streak across the sky on February 4, 2005, at 7:54 PM... At first I thought that it may have been a meteor, but then I realized that it didn't have a trail behind it. Usually, this is the case. The light was moving WNW to SSE at about 40 degrees above the horizon. Could have been a meteor, but there was no trail! Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Virginia - Saw Circular Figure with Moving Lights

CENTREVILLE -When I saw this aircraft it looks like a circle and had lights that kept moving around in a counterclockwise direction on February 4, 2005, at 4 AM. The lights were blue and green. It was amazing. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Washington - Nighttime UFO sighting in east

PUYALLUP, Pierce County - On January 31, 2005, at 10:45 PM, three observers were on our roof having a cigarette when they saw fireworks in the sky to the southeast. My roommate told me some objects were flying just underneath the plane he was pointing at. The object was orange in color and was moving very slowly toward the north. It had no blinking lights but just a steady orange glow and seemed to be fairly high up and far away. We saw a light fall directly down from the object. It was smaller than the large light but the same color and was falling straight down for about seven or eight seconds and then would

disappear. My first thought was that it could be an airplane breaking up, but the larger light continued to move slowly then eventually looked like it stopped from our viewpoint. As it was stopped, we saw the same balls of light fall from it four more times, each one disappearing after about five to ten seconds. The larger object then began to move higher and dropped a light that fell straight downward until it disappeared. We watched as the large orange light continued east and got smaller until it vanished about 50 degrees up in the horizon. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Argentina - UFO Imprints

MAR DEL PLATA - Carlos A. Lurched, a distinguished Argentinean UFO researcher and long-time collaborator of INEXPLICATA, has sent data from Carlos Ferguson, Coordinator of the RAO - Argentinean Ufology Network who reports, "Imprints were found after a UFO appeared in the early hours of February 8, 2005, causing at least a pair of prints at Sierra de los Padres. Furthermore, we have already received word on ten new prints in the Route 88 area. Mr. Romelio Tapia saw a luminous white sphere (the most reported in these cases). When the UFO took off, marks were left behind that usually have a similar diameter. Similar cases have already taken place in Mar del Plata and elsewhere: For example: 2) 14 June 1968: El Boqueron - Burn Mark. 3) July/ August 1968: Parque Camet - Re-greening mark. 4) 2 March 1973: Golf Club MDP - 30 charring marks and residue in the form of grayish dust. 5) 6 January 1985: Mundialista Area - circle measuring 4.20 meters with grayish dust. 6) 26 February 1987: SMATA campground - Circular and semi-circular dehydration marks. 7) 3 March 1987: As above. 8) October 1988: Santa Clara del Mar - One 5 meter diameter burn mark. 9) March 1989: En Playa Dorada - One 14 meter diam. dehydration mark. 10) October 1989: Santa Clara del Mar - One 4.70 meter diam. dehydration mark. 11) February 1990: Caisamar - 1 print measuring 5 m. /diam. with greyish dust. 12) February 1990: Sierra de los Padres - 2 circles, one measuring 4m and another 2 m, containing a sort of grayish dust and fungi. 13) February 1990: Port - 2 circles (One measuring 5 meters/diameter and smaller one) of grayish dust 14) 8 February de 2005: Sierra de los Padres. 15) 8 February 2005: Parque Palermo. Generally speaking, some scorching, dehydration and a fine grayish dust have been found in these prints. The residues are usually found among some very small fungi. Some are already saying that if fungi are found in the Sierra de los Padres case, the case would be invalidated. Nothing could be further from the truth. These microscopic fungi are generated by something that activates them externally, adding to this the temperature present in the area (high humidity). But this would not invalidate at all the report on the presence of a UFO, which - as we know - possesses electromagnetic energy that could have well been the source of these prints. SNIP. Thanks for Translation (c) 2005. Scott Corrales, IHU of UFO activity in this region. Inexplicata The Journal of Hispanic Ufology

February 14, 2005 Canada - Object Moves Quickly

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, BURNABY B. C. - The wind was blowing pretty good so I set my camera to time exposure and aimed it over towards Simon Fraser University on February 14, 2005, at 6 PM. After the sun had gone down I set it to night shot and slowly panned eastward across the mountain tops. The sky was quite clear and just over Heritage Mountain I noticed what appeared to be two bright stars sitting side by side just over the ridge of the mountain. I don't usually see many stars in that location so I stopped and started to zoom in on them. I planned to just leave the camera aimed at that spot and see if anything turned up. But I had just started to zoom when the star on the left or west side, took off at a high speed in an easterly direction. It moved so fast it was just a streak of light on my viewfinder. Because my camera was still on time exposure I didn't managed to catch it. But later when I played the tape back I found an usual white oval shaped object with a white V shaped tail, the white oval object itself was not unusual but I've never seen one with a tail. My camera was running at one second exposure every thirty seconds and the object was only showing for the one second. Thanks to Brian Vike Canada - Record Number of UFO Sightings WINNIPEG - The London Free Press reports: "There were no little green men to be seen but there were plenty of strange occurrences in the night sky last year. A national survey by Ufology Research of Manitoba

shows a record

882 UFO sightings were recorded in Canada in 2004

An average of more than two a day and up 31 per cent from the previous year. Included in the reports of unidentified flying objects were disc-shaped crafts, spectacular fireballs and a large black triangular object moving through the sky. Chris Rutkowski, research co-ordinator for the UFO tracking group, said the results show that people still have a fascination with what's going on above. "People are curious about the universe," Rutkowski said yesterday. "People continue to report observing unusual objects in the sky and some of these objects do not have simple or obvious explanations." Rutkowski said he's not exactly sure what caused the increase, although sightings have been growing steadily. For a while that could be attributed to popular TV shows such as the X-Files or significant events such as the millennium, he said, but now it might simply be due to more UFO reporting sites on the Internet. Ontario led with 254 sightings, British Columbia was second with 247 and Manitoba was third with 112. Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Quebec all had a record number of sightings. Figures show that more than 5,000 UFO sightings have been officially reported in Canada since 1989. Witnesses include pilots, police and individuals with good observation capabilities, Rutkowski said. About 15 per cent of all UFO reports remain a mystery. Even when only the most high-quality cases are considered, seven per cent still weren't explained. Copyright =A9 The London Free Press.

Thanks to Skywatch-International Web Site

Chile - UFO Fleet Photos

HORNOPIREN - Inexplicata - The Journal of Hispanic Ufology reports eyewitnesses photographed a fleet of UFOs flying over Cerro Hornopir=E9n for over 60 seconds at 3 PM on February 21, 2005..Walter Jara and his cousin Luis Aguilar saw a UFO for over a minute that flew over the summit before his startled eyes, and a few seconds later, he gathered his wits and managed to take a digital photo of the object. Jara said that at the moment of the photograph he was not aware of the numerous flying objects that flew over the perimeter vertically. But after keeping the UFO in sight for 60 seconds, his perception and that of his cousin were changed. The flying saucers were not visible in plain sight. However, when he zoomed the camera lens, he was able to see them clearly. It was a moment of wonder and amazement, said Jara. "The day was clear and cloudless. The object oscillated vertically in the sky. I don't think it was a bird because they move differently." He added that the UFO was grey in color and oval-shaped.

Thanks to Scott Corrales, IHU Translation (c) 2005.

Cyprus - Light Moving In Different Directions

LIMASSOL -We have been watching near the star Orion we think when we saw a bright light appear for only one second at a time on January 26, 2005 at 11 PM, then it appeared again, I have timed it and it appears every three minutes. I know that the stars move from left to right but this light is moving from right to left and moving up at an angle it then moved at a different angle three minutes later to what it was moving in. We don't know what it is, I have tried to film it but my camcorder isn't good enough to pick it up. Can someone help and maybe look at it as well. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director www.nuforc.org

Mexico - UFOs Over Volcano

MOUNT POPO - Jerry Pippin reports, "UFO activity in and around the vicinity of Mt. Popocatepetl, North America's most active volcano which is located just outside of M=E9xico City continues." On February 4th and 5th 2005, we recorded two such events. We were astonished, to say the least, after re-viewing our recording from the 4th, when the technician who was at the controls turned the camera's attention toward a glowing object that was fixed in the daytime sky and began to zoom in on what can only be described, at this time, as an Unidentified Flying Object. On February 14, another UFO was recorded. Jerry Pippin

has a great website with numerous photos.

Many thanks to Jerry Pippin 'Spyman'

<http://www.jerrypippin.com/MtPopopUFOs.htm>

MEXICO CITY - An important sighting was recorded by professional cameramen from Televisa in Mexico City on January 9, 2005, as a UFO flew over the Plaza Mexico bullring between 5:45 and 6:00 pm. On that same day, Mexican researcher Pedro Avila Rubio obtained impressive video evidence of apparently the very same unidentified flying object at an altitude of 4000 meters over the municipality of Tlalnepantla in the state of Mexico at 3:45 p.m. Thanks to Pedro Avila Rubio. Puerto Rico - Sighting on Mountain

SIERRA BERMEJA - Professor Reinaldo Rios reports that on February 18, 2005, at about the 6:30 p.m he was on Highway 303 between Lajas and Red Cabo Rojo when he noticed the presence of a luminous object suddenly moving west. The object moved quickly and was about 7 to 8 meters of a shining clear color that sounded like a washing machine. The sighting was at dusk. He could clearly see it was a well-known object. He shot some photographs. Thanks to Prof. Reinaldo Rios and Skywatch-International Web Site "<http://www.skywatch-international.org> Jennings Explores ABCs of UFOs

The Washington Post reports, Peter Jennings, anchor of ABC's "World News Tonight." Jennings, whose new two-hour special tackles the subject of UFOs, admits he and his production team began the project with doubts and a dose of curiosity.

"We have a lot of skeptics - I am very skeptical - but we seriously investigated something a lot of people are serious about," he said. "And when we come to the end, this is wonderfully interesting.

"More than 80 million Americans believe intelligent beings from somewhere else have come here," he said. "Forty million believe they have seen UFOs, so this is of deep interest to people."

Produced for ABC News by Jennings's production company, which also has delved into the JFK assassination conspiracy theories, the program examines the UFO phenomenon from an early milestone: a 1947 sighting by a man named Kenneth Arnold.

Segments include visits to the Center for UFO Studies outside Chicago, where files bulge with reports of sightings, and to a radio talk show on "UFology." That show's host, Art Bell, cites among his 18 million weekly listeners "the most informed UFOlogists, the best scientists and some of the craziest people you'll ever meet." snip

"There was one scientist assigned to it for its entire existence," Jennings said of J. Allen Hynek. "He started off dismissive and became a believer. Then he spent the rest of his life trying to get people to believe him."

Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - Seeing Is Believing Thursday Feb. 24 at 8 p.m. on ABC Thanks to:
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A26961-2005Feb15.html>

Subscribe to Filer's Files to Receive UFO CD So you won't miss a single breaking news story or the increased evidence for UFO and life in the universe.

George A. Filer has been bringing you the latest in UFO news since 1995, on radio, television and the internet. Your dollars do make a difference! We appreciate our loyal subscribers and will continue to grow with your help. Annual Membership is only \$25 for 52 weekly intelligence reports. Don't miss the latest images of UFOs from Earth and Mars.

Subscribe today and receive a free UFO Photo CD. Send check or money order to: George Filer, 222 Jackson Road, Medford, NJ 08055. You can also Click: <https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr> for [majorstar](#).nml You may use Paypal,

Visa, American Express, or Master Charge.

"Life on Mars" UFOs over Mars Your chance to get your (fingers) on the throttle of significant and up to-date UFO info as well as the real deal on the Mars expedition. Get your official and private DVD copy now for \$25. Send your contact info to: jlpromo2001.nul or mail your check to Fast Street Productions, 37 Surrey Lane, Willingboro, NJ 08046 or pay: "https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr for majorstar.nul

REAL ESTATE!

Get your free report and learn how you can obtain the best real estate agent to help you relocate, buy or sell a home. To get a free copy of this report e-mail me at : Majorstar.nul

MUFON UFO JOURNAL - For more detailed monthly investigative reports subscribe to the MUFON JOURNAL. A MUFON membership includes the Journal and costs only \$45.00 per year. To join MUFON or to report a UFO go to "http://www.mufon.com/". To ask questions contact MUFONHQ.nul or HQ.nul

Filer's Files is copyrighted 2004 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post the COMPLETE files on their Web Sites if they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue. These reports and comments are not necessarily the OFFICIAL MUFON viewpoint. Send your letters to Majorstar.nul Sending mail automatically grants permission for us to publish and use your name. Please state if you wish to keep your name or e-mail confidential. CAUTION, MOST OF THESE ARE INITIAL REPORTS AND REQUIRE FURTHER INVESTIGATION.

God Bless Our Troops

George A. Filer www.nationalufocenter.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Scheldroup

From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:38:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:26:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Scheldroup

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>4. Don't forget that old reports about this planet may have
>misled the aliens who were taken aback by new and unplanned
>technological progress on our part that never would have
>happened had there not been WW 2. There was a tendency on the
>part of the USA to think that the Russians post WW 2 were just a
>bunch of dumb peasants without ivy league educations. But they
>put up the first satellite, the first animal, the first man, the
>first rocket around the moon. It took a while for us to catch
>up.. Do notice the enormous difference in our technology between
>1937 and 1947.

Stan,

'They' were not so equipped as you might be lead on to believe,
however none of those things that you mentioned would be
possible had they not captured German scientists and technicians
following WW 2, whom perfected the technology.

Research can show that, as Red Army marched into Berlin,
largely, it was the first time they had seen or been made aware
of possibilities for, indoor plumbing and toilets.

<http://www.aeroscientists.org/rockets2.html>

Flush,

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

SETI Billboards 'UFOs - Seeing is Believing'

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 08:12:20 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:32:45 -0500
Subject: SETI Billboards 'UFOs - Seeing is Believing'

Source: SETI Institute

<http://tinyurl.com/3zm31>

Calendar

Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - Seeing is Believing

Thursday, February 24, 2005
8:00 p.m.

This two-hour primetime special reports on the entire scope of the UFO experience =97 from the first famous sighting by Kenneth Arnold in 1947 to the present day. The program draws on interviews with police officers, pilots, military personnel, scientists and ordinary citizens who give extraordinary accounts of encounters with the unexplained. Also included are the voices of professional skeptics about UFOs, including SETI Institute scientists Frank Drake, Seth Shostak, and Jill Tarter, who are leading the search for life forms beyond Earth elsewhere in the universe.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Michael Hesemann?

From: Philip Mantle <philip.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 18:47:04 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:42:54 -0500
Subject: Michael Hesemann?

I'd just like to ask the List members if anyone has seen or knows the whereabouts of Michael Hesemann? If you do could you ask him to contact me please.

Many thanks,

Philip Mantle.
www.beyondroswell.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 14:57:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:45:14 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC -

>From: William Matchen <heyzeus321.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 14:46:28 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 15:17:27 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 16:46:23 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Caught On Webcam Over Washington DC

>I sent an e-mail the the Metropolitan Washington Airports
>Authority and asked if any flights arrived or departed from
>ronald reagan national airport on Feb 10, 2005 at 3:15 am.

>Here's the response I got:

>-----

>Subject:
>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 13:53:04 -0500
>From: "Phillips, Neal" <Neal.Phillips.nul>
>To: heyzeus321.nul
>CC: "Hamilton, Tara" <Tara.Hamilton.nul>

>Thank you for your inquiry concerning flights on February 10,
>2005. According to the operations log for the 10th of February
>there were no arrivals, or departures, around 3:15 A.M. There
>were two arrivals after midnight (12:15 A.M. and 1:11 A.M.) then
>none until after 6:00 A.M.

Thanks William,

Wish I lived closer. Be interesting to look at the tapes.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:09:03 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:50:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:53:30 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>snip>

>Placing limitations on them, putting them in our image, as error
>prone beings is very hard to accept.

I am not putting them in our image. We have no idea how error prone they are unless you have insider info. Whether crashes are rare or frequent we don't know. Why do you act as though you do? We don't know how many mother ships there are and how many earth excursion modules each carries or how many sorties of how many miles they do each day.

>>I am certainly not saying aliens are at our level of
>>technology. I very frequently point out that Zeta 1 and Zeta 2
>>Reticuli are sunlike stars that are a billion years older than
>>the sun and are only 1/8th of a light year apart are only 39
>>light years from here and would have had a greater incentive for
>>star travel than we do.

>>2. Yes, all designers of advanced propulsion systems stress
>>reliability and safety. And all such systems have occasional
>>accidents. The shuttle is far more advanced than a horse and
>>buggy, a ford or chevrolet, a 747; redundancy is built in.. But
>>2 have had fatal accidents. We have no idea how many flying
>>saucer accidents or crashes there are per thousand miles
>>travelled. They may do much better than 747's. It is of
>>interest that the earth excursion modules are the ones that seem
>>to crash as opposed to the interstellar mother ships.

>The odd thing is that you (and others) keep trying to correlate
>current human capabilities and advanced alien capabilities. If
>the aliens were at about our current technology level or even
>slightly behind it, I would agree that you can say the
>error/crash rates can be similar. However, since we know
>computers keep advancing and the number of connections keep
>increasing then it is likely that this has already occurred with
>advanced alien technology enabling artificial intelligence
>capabilities that exceed organic thinking. This, combined with
>computer simulation, will enable a very high number of scenarios
>to be performed to check spacecraft designs and enhance
>spacecraft reliability and durability. Combined with automated
>hardware manufacture and assembly and testing, most uncertainty
>can be removed. Add the artificial intelligence(s) to the flight
>control loop then how can it crash???

You say "most" uncertainty. That is not all. Something unexpected happens. The Titanic was unsinkable.. but it sank. James can't you understand how ignorant we are?

>I am not even going way out in ozone and suggesting that the
>aliens are integrated into the computers. I am not suggesting
>utility clouds of nanomachines like Eric Drexler has.
>Nanomachines open up a whole universe of possibilities which I
>can't fully comprehend. It seems likely advanced alien
>civilizations would have at least somewhat mastered such
>devices.

>>3. We must judge by the evidence.. 2 saucers , at least, crashed
>>in NM in July 1947. Whether we understand the causes is besides
>>the point. Murders have been committed where we have no idea of
>>why. But they happened. I can't expect visiting aliens to know
>>so much about us and our planet that all contingencies can be
>>taken care of. Maybe the pilots need more sleep. Maybe they had
>>jet lag from the long trip. Maybe somebody forgot to brief them
>>on our lightning storms.Maybe a vital part was overstressed when
>>they swerved to avoid a missile...

>Placing human limitations on them again. Look at what we have
>done in the past 100 years and it doesn't seem unlikely that in
>100 more years that robots, REAL artificial intelligence will be
>ubiquitous. Organic pilots will not even be needed (a quaint
>notion really).

These are theoretical hypothetical notions backed by your
imagination and nothing else.

>Not know about lightning? Do you think these spacecraft are
>designed on the fly? They will have likely seen many worlds and
>have been purposely designed to deal with a wide range of
>hazards. Likely some craft are specially designed for gas-
>giants, but worlds like ours have standard phenomena which they
>really MUST have encountered many times before.

Maybe it has been a long time since they encountered beings as
primitive as we are. James, we don't know.

>A vital part overstressed??? One that causes a crash? So they
>had no redundancy, how backups, separate systems, nanosecond
>computational abilities to perform automated failure prediction
>and prevention? Remarkably primitive!

>You somehow have proof of alien ET spacecraft crashing. Do you
>have any DNA sample, spacecraft metal? Its a difficult thing to
>accept such an extraordinary experience. Why is it that there is
>no crashed alien evidence? There had to have been many crashes
>prior to the government secrecy but I have not seen any items
>from those events either.

What is your basis for saying "had to have been"? Are you
omnipotent?

There is a great deal of evidence. Eyewitness testimony to
wreckage of very strange characteristics is evidence. Do you see
me saying proof?

>I will give some credence to sightings
>of UFOs, not because I have great faith in eyewitnesses, but
>because scientific studies by those I respect (Dr. Rutledge)
>confirm that there are indeed such objects. I will even at least
>keep an open mind about alien abductions and implants
>because they seem to fit within normal paradigms (if we were
>visiting other worlds, wouldn't we do the same, more or less).

>But crashed spaceships seems to be so "low class" technology wise.

>I do not know if the crash was a balloon, Atlantean craft, Nazi
>vehicle with dwarf Aryans at the helm, Vimana(s) from where ever
>Vimana stay, time travelers from the past or future,
>interdimensional travelers, US secret program/spacecraft. Each
>of these have a much higher chance of not being very far ahead
>of us in terms of reliability and safety as oppsed to very
>advanced aliens.

>Mass psychosis, mass hypnosis, hoax obviously are possible and
>don't impugne the alien safety record.

>It really doesn't matter much because we have no hard evidence,
>so we should just move along.

>>4. Don't forget that old reports about this planet may have

>> misled the aliens who were taken aback by new and unplanned
>> technological progress on our part that never would have
>> happened had there not been WW 2. There was a tendency on the
>> part of the USA to think that the Russians post WW 2 were just a
>> bunch of dumb peasants without ivy league educations. But they
>> put up the first satellite, the first animal, the first man, the
>> first rocket around the moon. It took a while for us to catch
>> up.. Do notice the enormous difference in our technology between
>> 1937 and 1947.

> Do you really think they would bum around without massive sensor
> sweeps, telescopic inquiries, automated probes before slouching
> down there in person? Seems odd. Would we do this in our space
> program? No. Assuming they have done this before, which seems a
> high probability, then they would know the drill and not be
> slackers.

>> I do not believe we can make judgements about alien perfection
>> other than to say they are not perfect.

> They don't need to be perfect. In fact they can be as dumb as
> us. But they really should have better computers than us.

They may well have better computers. And 747s have much better
computers than Cessnas. They still have crashed. You are
suffering from a bad case of 'will not to believe'. Better see
somebody about that.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:16:52 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:51:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:33:13 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 16:35:57 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>If however, you wish to accept the idea of a huge range of alien
>societies ranging from our equivalent to 1000000 years advanced
>from ours, doesn't it seem that the center of the bell (or even
>flat) probability distribution curve more likely in the center
>than at the extreme end as you wish it to be? Given the above
>range, the likelihood of less than .000001% seems appropriate
>for alien race near our own level visiting and crashing. The
>more likely range is >1000 years (my opinion) in advance of
>our own. Thus technology is likely better than
>ours such that crashes are unlikely.

You keep acting as though you had data on visit rates, crash rates, mileage, etc. James. we know nothing about these things. Unlikely doesn't mean zero. There are many unlikely events that happen all the time. What fraction of sperm fertilize an ova? One in 10,000 males has hemophilia. But there are some families that have 3 hemophiliacs.. It is very unlikely that a pitcher will pitch a perfect game.. but it happens. I remember when it was claimed that nobody would ever run a 4minute mile. It happens all the time... now, not then.

Three words you should learn: 'we don't know'.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:50:31 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:55:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 16:28:20 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 15:25:09 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:45:42 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 08:40:55 -0400
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

><snip>

>Later in the day, the White House announced postponement of
>Soviet summit talks, and abruptly dropped plans to implement the
>new National Security Act legislation, saying that unspecified
>further modifications had become necessary, and consultations
>with Congress were in the works to amend the Act. Today, the
>White House changed its plan for national security but would
>give no details." Etc. etc. Even though no one was "letting out"
>any ET secret, the sudden confrontation with ET reality still
>would have a policy impact in Washington that would be visible.

You have created an interesting scenario for a book. You are not
a psychiatrist and the MJ-12 guys were certainly not like
Stalin. You and James Smith need to understand 'We don't know'.
Remember that they had lived through bombings killing 100,000
people in one night. Were they all mentally deranged because of
it?

Tibbetts didn't wind up deranged by Hiroshima.

>>>>>With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a
>>>>>multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy,
>>>>>the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

>>>>>The "Manhattan Project" (that was never its official name) was
>>>>>not set up by the President and run by a committee of top
>>>>>interagency directors, generals and scientists. Yes, that refutes
>>>>>the "Majestic 12" model right there.

>>Not at all. Surely FDR authorized Manhattan?

>Again I did not say that! FDR did not "set up" the Manhattan
>project. But Truman purportedly set up MJ-12! Right from the
>intro to the alleged EBD (Eisenhower Briefing Document) it says:

>"... the Majestic-12 (Majic-12) Group ... was established by
>special classified executive order of President Truman on
>24 September, 1947...."

Read the spacial classified EO to Forrestal. "you are hereby authorized to proceed... upon your undertaking". It does not say "I hereby establish". Or "I am setting up"...

>There is nothing similar from FDR "establishing" the Manhattan project. Manhattan was set up by a simple classified Army General Order.

What could be simpler than Truman's 3 sentence memo?

>Therefore the Manhattan project does not provide
>an historical precedent supporting the alleged structure and
>existence of MJ-12, it is not a "close model" but a very distant
>model or no model at all. Like many military organizations the
>Manhattan project under the Army had direct interaction with
>other agencies, many scientists, etc. I do not see how this
>provides a "close model" for MJ-12, since interactions are
>routine and prove nothing. Also, why would FDR's way of doing
>things be a good model for the way Truman did things?
>Historians note that Truman broke away from FDR's science
>policy methods and rejected his science advisor Vannevar Bush,
>as Bush himself said in 1950 to Truman's science policy
>investigator William T. Golden. Bush was rejected from the very
>outset as a possible first Presidential Science Advisor, which
>Truman was considering appointing.

Note also that Bush was the 2nd oldest of the group and had been under enormous stress for many years.

I asked Geroge Elsey (who served under Truman during his entire tenure at the White House) if he had any reason to believe that, if there had been something as important as the crash of a flying saucer, that Truman would not have appointed any of these people to a group to deal with it. He said NO.

>When the CIA and NSA were set up under Truman, they were
>required to have Directors and Deputy Directors who were either
>military or civilian but not both at the same time, in order to
>balance civilian and military interests. Where is MJ-12's
>military Director and civilian Deputy Director, or civilian
>Director and military Deputy? Who were the alleged MJ-12
>Directors and Deputy Directors?

Notice the mix of civilian and military on MJ_12, please.

Those words again come to mind again" I don't know" and have no way of knowing. Considering the backgrounds of the people there was certainly plenty of clout and experience in the management of difficult chores. The original membership included the first 3 DCIs, two NACA directors, the first Executive Director of the NSC, the head of OSRD, the Commanders of the Air Materiel Command and the Armed Forces Special Weapons Center, ass't. secretary of the Army, former Secretary of the Navy..Guys who were eventually the 2nd and 3rd Chiefs of Staff of the USAF, etc..

These were not just ordinary dinks.It was a very well qualified group of all stars seasoned by their activities during the war.

Are you going to tell us what is wrong with the documents? Or do we have to wait for the book? Your theories and speculations are not a basis for rejection... so far as I can see.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 14:41:59 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:22:24 -0500
Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation - King

>From: Rob Kritkauskay <robkrit.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:18:58 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>>From: Erik Landahl <landahl1.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 21:25:19 -0800
>>Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 23:58:27 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

<snip>

Hi Fellas,

I'm wondering if the quote above actually pertained to steganography?

While I'm not sure what it could have to do with teleportation, I am unable to find any reference to stegography or stegographers except where it is a misspelling of steganography or steganographers.

Steganography of course is the science or art of embedding information into larger dissimilar things...like hiding terrorist info in mundane vacation photos, a tactic purportedly used by Al Qaeda, etc.

Also, by the "mobius transformation" term I assume you meant moebius?

This is all very interesting, but I wonder if the barrier between the quantum and the macro applies equally to quantum teleportation versus physical "beam me up" style teleportation.

As we have learned, what is physically possible at the quantum level is often at odds with, if not ultimately impossible at, the macro level.

Fascinating reading nonetheless.

Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

A Definite Maybe

From: Terry Grof <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:14:35 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:26:57 -0500
Subject: A Definite Maybe

Source: The Star-Ledger, Newark, New Jersey

<http://tinyurl.com/3gchb>

There was a fair bit of skepticism, even sneering, when ABC News announced that anchor Peter Jennings' newest primetime documentary would tackle the UFO phenomenon. Would Jennings enrage UFO believers by portraying them as kooks? Would other people get mad at Jennings for dignifying a subject that many scientists consider to be mystic nonsense wrapped in modern folktales?

The special airs tomorrow 8-10 p.m. on Channel 7, under the title "Peter Jennings Reporting: UFO's - Seeing is Believing." It's the first primetime documentary by a network news anchor on this topic, which has obsessed Americans for almost six decades without ever quite becoming respectable

But there's nothing especially provocative about "Seeing is Believing," which presents its information in a slightly cornball way (complete with ethereal backlight on some interviewees, speculative animation of UFOs and creepy "X-Files"-style thriller music), but ultimately settles into the standard, middle-of-the-road network news mode: on the one hand this, on the other hand that.

With its emphasis on rudimentary UFO history - including 1950s newsreel snippets, old government documents and a summary of the U.S. Air Force's now-defunct Project Blue Book and the Search for Extra Terrestrial Life - the special feels so much like a primer that it could have been titled, "UFO 101." The Sci-Fi Channel airs programs just like it all the time.

Interviewees include UFO witnesses from the 1960s through the present, semi-famous obsessives and pundits (including conspiratorial radio DJ Art Bell, who says, "It would be so strange if we were all alone"), and former government officials and scientists (including PBS star Neil Degrasse Tyson, who says scientists consider eyewitness testimony "the lowest form of evidence you could possibly put forth").

The most intriguing part of the special is its middle section, which tracks UFO sightings to the start of the Cold War era (which began after World War II and stretched into the early '90s) and suggests the sightings were unconscious expressions of America's fear of being invaded and dominated by an all-powerful alien force (at that time, the Soviet Union was our national bogeyman).

Is it possible that UFO hysteria is a manifestation of a superpower's fear of being exposed as powerless, then annihilated by forces ranging from communists to right-wing militias and foreign terrorists?

Maybe, and maybe not - and either way, Jennings' special isn't interested in going there. The subject matter is otherworldly, but in style and subject matter, this special stays earthbound.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:29:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:22:43 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:49:41 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist
>>>I am convinced that Arnold saw daytime meteor fireballs,
>>>does that make me a "pelicanist" too? There is nothing
>>>"scientifically unsustainable" about that.

>Hi Dave - First off we're going to have to agree to disagree
>here. I did not intend to present a full case for Arnold seeing
>meteor fireballs here and it is unfair to expect me to just jump
>into it. <snip>

>>Concerning the Arnold case, I think we can stipulate from the
>>outset that if the objects passed in front of Mt. Rainier then
>>the objects could not have been meteors because they would have
>>been much too low and flying much too slow. Let us now examine
>>what Arnold described.

>>>Arnold could not make up his mind about whether he saw tiny
>>>objects flashing light in front of the mountain(s) or behind
>>>them, and in his first published interview with the morning
>>>Chicago Tribune (which beat the afternoon East Oregonian) he
>>>said specifically the objects "went behind Mt. Rainier."

>>The Chicago Tribune story was the only one that ever claimed
>>Arnold said the objects passed behind Rainier. All other
>>quotes from Arnold are of the objects clearly passing in front
>>of Rainier and of him seeing the outline of the objects against
>>the background snow. E.g., Arnold's first radio interview from
>>either June 25 or June 26:

>The Chicago Tribune was not the only time Arnold said the
>objects went behind Mt Rainier - you yourself quote another such
>statement below. The June 26, 1947, East Oregonian story you
>quote, states that Arnold saw the objects go behind an
>"intervening peak." That peak was Mt Rainier itself as Arnold
>makes clear in his other longer statements he personally wrote
>of his sighting.

Brad, that's an absurd interpretation. A dictionary definition
of "intervene" is "to lie between." What peak lay behind Rainier
so that Rainier could intervene? Rainier is absolutely massive,
and if Arnold meant that the objects passed behind Rainier, he
would have simply said they passed behind Rainier. He wouldn't
have referred to Rainier as an "intervening peak." Sheesh!

Not that it matters, but you are also trying to make a case for
"intervening peak" by taking it completely out of context. Let's

look at the complete quote where Arnold was saying he was able to determine distance using an "intervening peak" that blocked his view and also compare it to another quote where he again says that he could figure the distance because the objects flew behind a subpeak of Mt. Rainier:"

Pendleton East Oregonian (June 26):

"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."

INS, Portland Oregonian/Austin Statesman, July 11:

"I reckoned the saucers were 23 miles away," he said, "_because they flew behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier_. I can show on the map exactly where the peak is and where I was."

Saying he could determine distance because "an intervening peak once blocked his view" and "because they flew behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier" both mean the same thing.

Essentially the same "intervening peak" quote also appeared in the AP version of the story I found in the Portland Oregon Journal from June 26. In addition to this, the story also had the following quote, making it unambiguously clear what side of Rainier Arnold was saying the objects were on:

"He also said _they flew on the west sides of Rainier and [Mt.] Adams_, adding this would make it more difficult for them to be seen from the ground."

How could they fly behind Rainier (i.e. the east side) and simultaneously fly on the west side, which was Arnold's side? Again Arnold was very clearly saying they flew in front of Rainier, as he did over and over and over again.

>I will dig out these other statements later, as I have no time
>for this now. As for the visual acuity data you need to get data
>on tiny moving objects, not stationary cards that someone can
>look at for however long they want 5 minutes even.

As I already indicated, steady eye tracking of objects, or smooth pursuit eye movements, has been studied to death in the past. Experiments show that we are extremely good at it and can accurately track objects moving at up to 30 deg/sec. Arnold only had to track his objects at around 1 deg/sec, which would have been very, very easy.

I provided a very simple test anyone could do to verify this for themselves. Get some small print which you can read with slight effort at arms' length (to simulate Arnold just being able to make out the shapes). Then slowly move the print at about 1/2 inch/sec to simulate the angular speed reported by Arnold. You will find that you can still read the print when it is moving, no problem. You will also find you can move it much faster than that and still be able to read it.

Could Arnold have described some details in slowly moving objects? Sure he could.

>Furthermore
>if you read Arnold's personal accounts where he goes into
>greater detail than in newspaper articles, he indicates the
>objects were not continuously visible. He could only see them
>when they flashed intense light - like a meteor fireball
>flashing as pieces break off and flame out - every 9 seconds or
>so. With all 9 objects that meant, he said, that about once
>every second but at irregular intervals, he could see 1 of the 9
>objects. So any one of the objects could be seen only about once
>in 9 seconds. He is vague about what else he could see of the
>objects. At closest approach he describes "thin black lines."

Actually, all of these are arguments against meteors. Where did Arnold report pieces breaking off? Where did he report anything like a meteor trail? Both should have been present if these were meteors. The absence of any trail is especially damning.

Arnold's sighting lasted at least 2 minutes if not 3 minutes,

and I don't know of any documented meteor fireball sightings anywhere near that duration.

These would have had to have been very large meteors to have had any hope of lasting as long as Arnold reported. They would have been continuously glowing as they skimmed the atmosphere, not blinking on and off like Christmas lights. Nor would they ever look black when he viewed them against the white backdrop of snow and ice. (How could they even do that if they passed behind Rainier? Did Arnold have X-ray vision?). Let's get real here.

He was not "vague" about what he could see of the objects and went into some detail. He said he could see their shape outlined against the snowy background. They were thin, flat, and rounded in front, but were chopped and came to a point in the rear. He described them as "saucer-like" or shaped something like a pie-pan or a half moon. He even sketched the shape in his written report to air intelligence on July 12. Later he added a second, larger object, more like a flying wing, crescent-shaped, and also coming to a point in the back.

Your meteors would have had to have been hundreds of miles away in eastern Washington or over Idaho. They would have been visible from the ground for hundreds of miles in any direction, as are other large, long-duration meteor fireballs. There should have been numerous sighting reports from people in eastern Washington, Idaho, Oregon, etc. Where are these reports? They don't exist, virtually impossible to explain if these objects really had been unprecedented, giant, very long duration meteor fireballs.

Sorry Brad, meteors just don't wash on numerous grounds.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:44:42 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:53:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:56:01 -0500
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 18:16:13 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:49:20 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>Of course, you're partly right - there is a null hypothesis for
>>>UFO studies, which is that every UFO report can be explained
>>>using only known entities. And that null hypothesis certainly
>>>can be falsified, and frequently is, or we would have no UFO
>>>reports to begin with (if we disregard the CSICOPian position,
>>>which is in fact completely unfalsifiable).

>>But UFO reports are just reports of things that are puzzling to
>>the witness, and 90-95% are described as IFOs by non pelicanist
>>Ufologists.

>To restrict the definition to "just reports of things that are
>puzzling to the witness" is to miss the key issue, where the
>"rubber meets the road" in UFO investigation. The key issue is
>this: does the sighting _puzzling to the analyst_, or can some
>acceptable explanation be found during the investigation of the
>claims made by the witness. I like to use a special term to
>indicate sightings which have been investigated and no
>reasonable identification has been proposed by the analyst(s).
>An investigated sighting for which "experts" (analysts with at
>least some training in identifying phenomena from sighting
>descriptions) are unable to find a reasonable explanation is a
>TRUFO sightings (TRue UFO).

>Every sighting starts as a UFO - puzzling to the witness (the
>Condon definition, for example). (If a hoax, then the witness
>pretends to be puzzled.) Only a "select few" sightings make it
>through investigation and analysis to become TRUFO sightings
>which remain unexplained.

>It is in the collection of TRUFO sightings (5%? of UFO
>sightings) that one may find evidence of ET visitation or
>perhaps a new natural - read that, "unintelligent" - phenomenon.

<snip>

An example of UFO vs TRUFO is contained in the nearly-year-old
Mexican DOD sighting.

<snip>

>>Some British Ufologists feel that the number of (non
>>obvious) IFO cases is as low as 2%.

>I suppose this implies that "non-obvious IFO cases" constitute
>the percentage that others might classify as TRUFOS. That is 100
>UFOS = 98% IFOs and 2% "non-obvious IFOs".

Sorry that was a typo The 2% are what you would call TRUFOS

>In the Battelle Memorial Institute study of 1947-1952 sightings
>- published by the USAF in 1955

>3,201 sightings of 2199 "objects" were analyzed - there was a
>division as follows:

>K = known (IFOs) 70%

>U = Unknown (probable or likely TRUFOS) 20%

>I.I. = Insufficient Information (can't be sure it was an IFO) 10%

These figures don't seem to replicated today. Was this the result of poor investigation, much less sophistication as to the extremity of misperception/misidentification/misremembering than there is now or that there was something in the early 1950s which was boosting up the then TRUFO figure but which isn't here now, or were the number of unknowns being manipulated upwards? or a mixture of all the above

>Of course, TRUFO sightings will also be argued... with new
>explanations being proposed as old ones fall by the wayside. A
>sighting classified as TRUFO (after investigation) remains a
>TRUFO sighting unless some previously unproposed explanation is
>found to be reasonable. On the other hand it remains a TRUFO
>sighting if, eventually, there are no more conventional
>explanations and if it appears that no conventional explanation
>could ever be found for the sighting. Of course, this last
>criterion is quite stringent in that it "predicts" the future:
>no conventional explanation will ever be found. Very few
>sightings have this level of evidence. One that I would suggest
>is New Zealand, Dec. 1978.

But I have seen others have a very low opinion of this case, while no doubt you have a low opinion of others that other people hold to be permanent TRUFOS

>>Though CSICOP-ers know

>>that the null hypothesis is true and Ufologists know that it
>>is false, in reality very little of the detailed critical
>>investigation that would be needed to resolve the issue has gone
>>on. Most UFO investigation is really just the assemblage of
>>evidence to bank up the investigators preconceptions and both
>>sides spin like Mandelson and Campbell

>The above statement underestimates the level of investigation
>that has happened in some cases. I will agree that most UFO
>sightings don't receive sufficient investigation... there just
>isn't the man/womanpower available to tackle everything. But
>some sightings have been investigated thoroughly... often
>requiring years of (sporadic if not continuous) activity. And
>the results of the investigations are argued both ways until
>either there is a final agreement or there is an agreement to
>disagree.

>In the famous Arnold case, some may recall the heated dispute in
>the UpDates (and other) email lists about 6 years ago when the
>pelican hypothesis was put forth.

>This was about the 8th explanation presented over the then-52
>year period since the Arnold sighting.

Speculation on these cases can go on for ever but after a time any real reinvestigation is ruled out by passage of time, witnesses die or disappear from view, memories become transformed, sites change, documents get lost and so on.

I suspect that the TRUFOS are not representative of a unique phenomenon but like IFOs are a heterogeneous collection of many different things, though not perhaps the same things which generate the vast bulk of IFOs.

Peter Rogerson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:58:50 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:02:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rogerson

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:54:58 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:47 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:55:11 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

><snip>

>>>>Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
>>>>qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only they
>>>>know what the silly term means.

><snip>

>>Its meaning then and now refers to one who runs with an
>>insupportable theory [usually a pet theory], no matter how
>>ludicrous, and against all reason to debunk a UFO sighting. Oft
>>times the Pelicanist's theory is more off-the-wall than that of
>>the UFO report itself making it easier-for the reader-to
>>subscribe to the UFO theory than the proposed debunking of it,
>>which is self defeating for the Pelicanist when you think about
>>it.

>The definition of pelicanism, which I elucidated in a recent
>post, is quite simple, and as Don shows above, its meaning is
>hardly obscure or arcane.

>I coined the neologism "pelicanist" in the awareness that
>"skeptic" and "debunker" finally don't mean all that much. Every
>thoughtful ufologist, including one inclined to suspicion or
>conviction that puzzling sighting reports may be attributable to
>an unknown, presumably nonearthly intelligence (ET or
>otherwise), is skeptical of many things claimed about UFOs; if
>active in research and investigation, he or she has surely done
>a fair amount of debunking him- or herself. There is, after all,
>much to be skeptical about, and much that is eminently
>debunkable.

>"Pelicanism," on the other hand, addresses a psychosocial
>phenomenon heretofore not reducible to a single phrase. It
>defines the practice of ascribing any explanation, however
>scientifically unsustainable, illogical, or fantastic, to a UFO
>event or experience, in a desperate effort to deny that anything
>seriously anomalous may be going on. That is why I have
>suggested that pelicanists are advancing extraordinary claims

>masquerading as prosaic explanations.

>Ideally, if what were at issue disinterested truth-seeking, even
>those who identify themselves as skeptics (or "sceptics") would
>disdain this practice just as sober proponents blast careless,
>loose-thinking UFO advocates in their midst.

>Unfortunately, as we have seen, what passes for "skepticism" as
>an active (as opposed to the outsiders' casual) position in the
>UFO controversy is often in practice an ideological stance, to
>be defended, as ideological turf always is, at all costs. Thus,
>the complaints we hear are addressed not to the practice of
>pelicanism, but to the phrase itself - as well, inevitably, to
>the one who initially drew attention to the emperor's feathery
>dress.

>Finally, of course, the phrase was meant to be amusing, taking
>off from a fairly recent, rather egregious case of the sort of
>excess described above. Those who whine that it's "no longer
>funny" were - here's a shock - not amused in the first place.

This definition is riddled with subjective judgements. A simpler
more objective one is; a Pelicanist is someone who prefers
explanations which do not involve non human intelligences to
ones that do. The reverse of a Pelicanist is a Mysterian, one
who prefers explanations involving non human intelligences to
ones that do not.

Peter Rogerson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 22:14:17 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:15:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 14:58:42 EST
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:56:01 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>The Hynek definition of a UFO requires that a scientifically and
>technically competent analysis screen the report first to
>eliminate IFO's and conventional explanations. Has nothing to do
>with what the witness thinks is puzzling, puzzlement gets the
>case reported to someone is all. A witness can think it's a
>perfectly explainable or identifiable phenomenon - and be wrong.
>The witness cannot be their own Ph.D. scientist investigator of
>their own case (unless they happen to be Ph.D. scientists and
>there are many cases of that).

>>In the Battelle Memorial Institute study of 1947-1952 sightings
>>- published by the USAF in 1955

>>3,201 sightings of 2199 "objects" were analyzed - there was a
>>division as follows:

>>K = known (IFOs) 70%
>>U = Unknown (probable or likely TRUFOs) 20%
>>I.I. = Insufficient Information (can't be sure it was an IFO) 10%

><snip>

>These statistics are false. Battelle used the fraudulent Blue
>Book method then being developed of combining speculative IFO
>identifications (Possible and Probable) into "Knowns." Before
>that became a standard BB practice, Ruppelt revealed that actual
>IFO's and conventional explanations (I lump them all together as
>"IFO" for simplicity) was running at about 11%. The Unknowns
>were running at about 27%. The rest were Insufficient Data and
>indeterminate status, in limbo, not identified, about 62%.

What proportion of that 62% looked exotic, and what proportion
were things which looked like a duck, waddled like a duck and
quacked like a duck but couldn't be tied down to an actual
identifiable duck, and what proportion were things which could
have absolutely anything. All these statistics seem to be saying
is that the bulk is badly investigated dross. See my reply to
Bruce Maccabee for my further comments on these early figures.

Can I advance the heretical point that there are probably high
school kids who make ufo investigators than quite a few Phd's
(Pierre Guerin for example)

Peter Rogerson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 16:38:19 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:29:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:53:30 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

Hi James,

Just poking my nose in to note that the idea that a construct...
any construct...is failure prone.

Beings are prone to failure, machines are prone to failure, etc.

Putting two things (or more) together to do something is not
only rarely perfect, it is impossible to be perfect. Physics,
philosophy, science, personal observation, whatever you call it,
perfection is a concept, not a reality. The only scenario where
you can infer or assert a construct that is incapable of error
is to infer that it is divine. And divinity itself is a concept,
unobservable and un-quantifiable. To apply such infallibility to
an unknown hypothetical scenario is counterintuitive to every
measure we have available, and makes your argument more of a
religious one than a technological one.

Consider an alien craft piloted by an alien. Unless the alien is
immortal, he could contract disease or simply age to a point
where his faculties are reduced in effectiveness. If this alien
were piloting his craft and suffered an attack of age-related
incapacity, he might pilot his craft right into the ground. Or
say he slipped in his craft and injured himself. Regardless of
the wonderful advanced nature of his craft, this is indeed
plausible, unless you assert aliens are immortal, incapable of
error, or disease, or building something perfect. Each of the
foregoing are far less than plausible, given everything we have
learned about the physical world and universe in which we
operate.

Extrapolating that we will advance as time marches on is
reasonable. Extrapolating that we will advance to the point of
infallibility is absurd, if history is any gauge at all. In the
final analysis we all know that perfection is the province of
the divine...unattainable by imperfect beings such as we
mortals. We don't even know for sure if
the divine exists. We can only hope and pray so.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Subscription Fee To UpDates?

From: **John Scheldroup** <jschel.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 18:26:01 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:31:40 -0500
Subject: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

Dear List,

Has there ever been talk about an annual subscription fee to subscribe at ufoupdates?. I for one, would like to pay a fee so that I can post to the list in the future.

I would imagine that running a site like this takes time and it's annoying to edit all those typos like my own. So my question to the list is just how do you feel about some fee to EBK group for the work performed to keep this site going ?

I'm not one to bark but I'm thinking somewhere in the range of 50-100 \$US per year what do you think? Perhaps someones elses figure are less that live outside the Canada-US border.

Anyway, as owner operator of a small software business that develops to peddle business graphics into major application software, we have now expanded this to include military avionics software, and a very interesting challenging field to be involved.

I own a own house, beat up pick-up truck a black 99 mercedes S500 and a 50 lb bag of peat moss for when I plant my garden this spring.

I hope to spend as little as time as possible at ufo updates, but I would like to pay for the services that I enjoy to use the most these days.

Sincerely,

John Scheldroup

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 16:29:43 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:34:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' - Tonnies

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:52:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 09:54:53 EST
>>Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>>>Source: About.Com

>>><http://tinyurl.com/6de4u>

>>>Skeptical Inquirer magazine - January/February
>1996

>>>Special Report

>>>A Surgeon's View: Alien Autopsy's Overwhelming
>Lack of Credibility
>>>Joseph A. Bauer, M.D.

>>Hats off to Dr. Bauer for exposing that nonsense.

>It's obvious that neither you nor Dr. Bauer have spent much time
>viewing the AA. I do agree that the footage shows a dissection
>and not an autopsy. Bauer must have been viewing the Fox version
>and not the uncut video or CDs because what he describes is not
>what actually occurs in the footage. Other pathologists have
>viewed the footage and come away with an entirely different
>reaction.

I concur with Ed. I think it's also worth mentioning that Dr.
Bauer chooses to accept the "autopsy" as extraterrestrial in
nature (if real) when in fact the nature of the being on the
table is unknown.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot.nul)

Website: <http://www.mactonnies.com>

Daily blog: <http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

"After the Martian Apocalypse" available from Amazon!

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/074348293X>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 00:29:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:37:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 14:58:42 EST
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:56:01 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>>In the Battelle Memorial Institute study of 1947-1952 sightings
>>- published by the USAF in 1955>

>>3,201 sightings of 2199 "objects" were analyzed - there was a
>>division as follows:

>>K = known (IFOs) 70%
>>U = Unknown (probable or likely TRUFOS) 20%
>>I.I. = Insufficient Information (can't be sure it was an IFO) 10%

<snip>

>These statistics are false. Battelle used the fraudulent Blue
>Book method then being developed of combining speculative IFO
>identifications (Possible and Probable) into "Knowns." Before
>that became a standard BB practice, Ruppelt revealed that actual
>IFO's and conventional explanations (I lump them all together as
>"IFO" for simplicity) was running at about 11%. The Unknowns
>were running at about 27%. The rest were Insufficient Data and
>indeterminate status, in limbo, not identified, about 62%.

Brad is correct.

On a January 23, 1953, about two weeks after the Robertson
Panel, Project Blue Book briefed the Air Defense Command (ADC)
on the status of UFO investigations. The Project Blue Book
personnel admitted in private what they would never say
publicly. Based on a statistical breakdown of about 1,000
sightings received through military channels in 1952 the Blue
Book staff concluded that (get this!) only 11% of the reports
could be positively identified. These reports fell into the
categories astronomical, balloons, aircraft, other and hoaxes.
Most of the remaining sightings were labelled probably
identified (17%), possibly identified (29%) and unknown (20%).
There was also a separate category for sightings which were
indeterminate. That is, they couldnt make a definite decision as
to whether or not these sightings were identifiable because of
insufficient information (23%).

By the time the Special Report had been finished half a year or
more later, all the "possibles" and "probables" had been lumped
in with the "positivelys" to get the "K" collection of sightings
Although, to be fair, one should note that the Battelle study
did categorize the identifications as certain or doubtful. The
collection of doubtful sightings made up nearly 1/3 of the
total.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 00:29:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:41:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:22:43 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:49:41 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 17 Feb 2005 18:50:57 -0500
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From that point of view, we have to consider that the Klass
>>>>proposal in 1997 that Arnold saw meteors was also a
>>>>'pelicanism'.

>>>>I am convinced that Arnold saw daytime meteor fireballs,
>>>>does that make me a "pelicanist" too? There is nothing
>>>>"scientifically unsustainable" about that.

>>My definition of pelicanism is not someone proposing a
>>hypothesis which may later turn out to be untenable, but
>>irrationally clinging to it when it becomes obvious it is
>>ridiculous after being analyzed. The whole Easton pelican
>>hypothesis for the Arnold sighting was, of course, the classic
>>original "pelicanism," not because Easton proposed it, but
>>because he refused to abandon it when it should have become
>>blindingly obvious to anybody of average intelligence that it
>>was impossible. Another recent example of pelicanism on this
>>list was the balloon hypothesis for Socorro.

<snip>

>Hi Dave - First off we're going to have to agree to disagree
>here. I did not intend to present a full case for Arnold seeing
>meteor fireballs here and it is unfair to expect me to just jump
>into it. We can agree on Easton's absurd pelican theory for many
>reasons, not least of which is that it fails even by Easton's
>own pelican data (which he did not bother to analyze).

>>Concerning the Arnold case, I think we can stipulate from the
>>outset that if the objects passed in front of Mt. Rainier then
>>the objects could not have been meteors because they would have
>>been much too low and flying much too slow. Let us now examine
>>what Arnold described.

>>>Arnold could not make up his mind about whether he saw tiny
>>>objects flashing light in front of the mountain(s) or behind
>>>them, and in his first published interview with the morning
>>>Chicago Tribune (which beat the afternoon East Oregonian) he
>>>said specifically the objects "went behind Mt. Rainier.">

>>The Chicago Tribune story was the only one that ever claimed
>>Arnold said the objects passed behind Rainier. All other
>>quotes from Arnold are of the objects clearly passing in front
>>of Rainier and of him seeing the outline of the objects against
>>the background snow. E.g., Arnold's first radio interview from
>>either June 25 or June 26:

>The Chicago Tribune was not the only time Arnold said the
>objects went behind Mt Rainier - you yourself quote another such
>statement below. The June 26, 1947, East Oregonian story you
>quote, states that Arnold saw the objects go behind an
>"intervening peak." That peak was Mt Rainier itself as Arnold
>makes clear in his other longer statements he personally wrote
>of his sighting.

>I will dig out these other statements later, as I have no time
>for this now. As for the visual acuity data you need to get data
>on tiny moving objects, not stationary cards that someone can
>look at for however long they want 5 minutes even. Furthermore
>if you read Arnold's personal accounts where he goes into
>greater detail than in newspaper articles, he indicates the
>objects were not continuously visible. He could only see them
>when they flashed intense light - like a meteor fireball
>flashing as pieces break off and flame out - every 9 seconds or
>so. With all 9 objects that meant, he said, that about once
>every second but at irregular intervals, he could see 1 of the 9
>objects. So any one of the objects could be seen only about once
>in 9 seconds. He is vague about what else he could see of the
>objects. At closest approach he describes "thin black lines."

Regarding the meteor hypothesis, David Rudiak has provided a
detailed discussion of the likely visual capabilities of Arnold
with respect to seeing the objects against snow (as well as the
sky) and against the (western) side (flank) of Mt. Rainier.

Arnold wrote in his letter to the AF:

"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."

and in his June 25 radio interview

"They didn't fly in a conventional formation that's taught in
our army, they seemed to kind of weave in and out right above
the mountaintops, and I would say that they even went down into
the canyons in several instances, oh, probably a hundred feet,
but 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."

So it certainly appears reasonable to believe that Arnold saw
them between himself and Mt. Rainier (and mountains south of
Rainier). Rudiak has shown that Arnolds claim of being able to
see basic details of shape is consistent with his presumed
visual acuity based on the "calibration" he did at the time,
claiming to see the spacing between the engines on a DC-4 at 15
mi (exact distance not known). Rudiak has also pointed out that
"smooth tracking" should have allowed Arnold to see details
despite the speed of the objects.

Dr. Rudiak has approached the meteor hypothesis from the point
of view of Arnold's own visual capabilities...does Arnold's
report make sense and could he have seen what he reported if
they were NOT meteors.

My approach is to try to determine what requirements Arnold's
report places on the meteors and whether or not these
requirements make any sense given the known physics of fireball
meteors.

Brad assumes that Arnold was mistaken about seeing the objects
against Mt. Rainier and seeing some details of shape. Brad
suggests that they were really meteors far beyond Mt. Rainier.
How far beyond?

And if they were far beyond, what sort of track must they have

made relative to the earth to be seen for the duration reported by Arnold? And would they have been bright enough to cause Arnold to compare them with a mirror-like solar reflection.?

So, with no guidance from Brad as to the exact specifications of his meteor hypothesis I will make the following simplifying assumptions tht are consistent with Arnold's report:

1) Arnold saw these from some initial direction north of Mt. Rainier (he said the vicinity of Mt. Baker, almost due north of Arnold) to the final direction south of Mt. Rainier (toward Mt. Adams, nearly due south of Arnold), so he might have seen these over an angle range as great as nearly 180 deg. However, on the chance that he didn't see these until they were about halfway between Baker and Rainier, in angular measure, I will assume for the purposes of the following calculation he saw them over an angle of about 140 deg (50 deg north of Rainier to 90 deg south of Rainier)

2) They were at their closest when nearly due east of Arnold

3) At their closest they were exactly on Arnold's horizon. (Since they went, in this hypothesis, behind Rainier they had to be very close to horizontal from Arnold's point of view.) (For simplicity atmospheric refraction is ignored; it tends to bend light around the earth.) Since he was at 9200 ft, this specifies a line projected from his altitude and running due east. This line makes a right angle to vertical, where vertical at Arnold's position is the line from his plane to the center of the earth.

4) Arnold saw these objects for 2.5- 3 minutes as he reported.

Taking (#4) first, 2.5-3 minutes is an unbelievably long time for a single meteor. I have discussed meteor durations in <http://brumac.8k.com/RemarkableMeteors/RemarkableMeteors.html> and concluded that it would be impossible to see a single meteor for 2 1/2 minutes (some have been seen for an estimated 1 min; the famous 1972 fireball movie lasts only 26 seconds). Thus the meteor hypothesis seems NOT to be that 9 large meteors started to glow and did so continually as they passed, one after another, in front of Arnold. Rather it is that a large group of small meteors entered the atmosphere at varying times. Each glowed and then burned out. 2 or 3 at any one time would "light up" as the group traveled southward. In other words, I assume that the objects are meteors in a group that that extends over a considerable distance in space. Individual meteors start to glow and then burn out quickly, lasting only several seconds with different ones starting to glow at different locations along the general track of the group so that several may appear at any one time as a small group (2, 3) of glowing objects traveling along. Then, as these burn out, others start to glow farther along the path.

Thus no single meteor travels the whole path.

(This is somewhat like the 1913 "meteor procession" studied by Chant which has been interpreted by "some" as a collection of UFOs traveling from Canada to Bahamas,,,, roughly speaking.) This synthesizes Arnold's report of repeated flashes but not seeing any one object appearing bright continuously. (It does not of course, account for "dark lines" against the snow.)

The consequences of assumptions 2 and 3 are as follows.

The closest distance is a problem in geometry. Bright fireball meteors (chunks of rock "smashing" their way through the atmosphere at speeds above 7 miles per second - which is approximate escape speed) might reach an altitude as low as 40 mi above the earth.

Use the round earth (avg.3959 mi radius) and add 1.8 mi to get Arnolds height above the center of the earth, 3960.8 mi. Add 40 mi to get the meteor height above the center, 3999 mi. Since there is a right angle at Arnold's location (his sighting line is assume to be horizontal, defined as perpendicular to a radius of the earth) and the earth radii to Arnold and to the meteors join at the center of the earth, we have a right triangle with the two long sides being 3960.8 and 3999 (the hypotenuse). The short side is the distance from Arnold to the meteors at 40 mi height: square root of $(3999^2 - 3960.8^2) = 550$ mi (thank you,

Pythagorus).

Right off the bat one wonders about the impact of this distance on meteor brightness. After all, one can look at the sun at sunset, which is evidence of atmospheric extinction decreasing the brightness by a great amount (nearly 1/200 as compared to the brightness of the sun overhead). At Arnold's altitude, because of the less air mass between him and the hypothetical meteors, the reduction would be less, perhaps by a factor of 1/10. (hmmmm)

Assume the meteors started to glow brightly at 50 miles up and burn out at 40 miles. (Other altitudes from 35-60 miles could be tried in this hypothesis.) Furthermore, assume for simplicity that the flight track of the meteors was perpendicular to the line of sight at closest approach. This means a flight track nearly due north-south (since Arnold was looking nearly due east at closest approach). Meteors travel along an arc centered on the earth and they become bright as they penetrate the atmosphere, starting to glow at perhaps at 60 mi altitude. At 50 mile altitude they would have been farther away than at 40 miles. Projecting the horizontal line to 50 miles gives a distance of about $\text{SQRT}(4009^2 - 3960.8^2) = 620$ mi.

The angle between the direction to the 40 mile up point (almost due east) and the 50 miles up point can be found as follows. When they were at 50 mi the meteors were 620 mi from Arnold and when they were at 40 miles they were 550 mi from Arnold. Since the meteor path was perpendicular to Arnold's horizontal line of sight when they were due east the distance from the 50 miles point to the 40 mile point is about $\text{SQRT}(620^2 - 550^2) = 290$ mi. The horizontal angle between the direction to the 40 mi altitude and the direction to the 50 mi altitude is $\arctan(290/550) = 28$ deg, considerably below the 50 deg angle assumed in #1 above. (Definitely not in the general direction of Mt. Baker.) Traveling at 7 miles per second (or more) they should take about $290/7 = 41$ sec seconds to travel this distance (more likely faster speed so less time). But this means that each meteor would be seen for about 40 seconds (or less). It would not appear as a flash. To get a "flash" would require that the meteors light up at, say, 41 mi and then burn out at 40 mi altitude. In that case the distance to the 41 mi point would be 558 mi and the distance between the 41 and 40 mile altitude points would be about 94 mi and it would take about 1.3 sec (or less) for a meteor to travel this distance) (tilt)

The meteors would continue on this track southward. By hypothesis (#1) above they traveled nearly 90 degrees after passing Rainier. Since they were still flashing at that time we have to assume previously unburned meteors were reaching the 50 mi glowing altitude and dropping down to 40 mi every few seconds. But now we run into a another problem. 28 degrees is the angle from due east (rotating to the north) at which the meteor elevation is 50 mi. Similarly, rotation to the south of Rainier by 28 degrees, not 90 degrees, would be the direction at which the meteors would be at the 50 mi altitude and starting to glow. As the line of sight rotates beyond 28 degrees and toward 90 degrees south of Rainier the altitude at which meteors start to glow drops below his horizon cutoff (his horizon cutoff angle is about at 0 degrees relative to horizontal because he was looking toward chain of mountains with alttudes approximating his altitude). In other words, it appears in this hypothesis that they would disappear below his horizon much before they were in the direction of Mt. Adams. (oops)

This sort of analysis could be continued with various hypotheses about the meteors in an attempt to fit the theory to Arnold's sighting (while ignoring some details of his sighting, of course). However, before spending any more time on this I await further specification of the meteor hypothesis. (Oh, in case you didn't notice, the above version of the hypothesis has failed.)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 00:30:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:43:16 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 12:59:07 -1000
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:51:19 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

snip

>As for the rest of Dr. Salla's post, the description of SAP/CAP/
>etc. is all very interesting but one wonders what to do with it.
>My own opinion is that we will never get the straight story from
>the government until we have found it out on our own... at which
>point the government may say, "Oh yeah, we knew that all along!"

>How can we find out what's going on with SAP/CAPs if we ignore
>the very whistleblowers telling us what's happening because we
>can't confirm their school records or some other arbitrary
>criterion a parsimonious researcher stipulates as a necessary
>condition? One might think they are doing 'good science' by
>raising the evidentiary bar up high that only watertight
>whistleblower testimonies make it over the hurdle. In the
>process, you eliminate witnesses like Lazar, and all you have
>left are those like former FAA Air Chief John Callahan with some
>records of radar sightings of fast moving UFOs around a Japanese
>Jumbo jet, and evidence that the government didn't want the FAA
>seriously investigating this
>(<http://www.ufoevidence.org/documents/doc1324.htm>). If that's
>the sort of hard evidence with credible whistleblower testimony
>that will be universally accepted, then this field of UFO
>research will grow very very slowly, lose innovative researchers
>capable of understanding what's going on in the SAPs/CAPs
>dealing with ETV/EBE research, and become increasingly irrelevant
>to the general public who seek answers to what is happening.

Don't disparage Mr. Callahan. At least you can believe him
because what he says is backed up by documentary evidence and
witnesses. The most complete report on the Japan Airlines
sighting, even more complete than the FAA's own report, is at:

<http://brumac.8k.com/JAL1628/JAL1628.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

New York Times On Tonight's Jennings's Documentary

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 01:01:38 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:45:59 -0500
Subject: New York Times On Tonight's Jennings's Documentary

The New York Times

February 24, 2005

Tv Review - 'Peter Jennings Reporting'
An ABC Documentary Lands in U.F.O. Territory
By Alessandra Stanley

During a sweeps month, U.F.O. is not solely an abbreviation for unidentified flying object. When a veteran network anchor devotes two hours to the subject in a special prime-time report, U.F.O. can also be code for uncontrollable fear of obscurity.

Tom Brokaw's retirement as the NBC anchor did not drive viewers to ABC en masse; actually, the ratings of his replacement, Brian Williams, are higher than Peter Jennings's. Even Dan Rather's fall from grace and imminent retirement have not significantly benefited ABC's "World News Tonight." And that may help explain the mystery of why Mr. Jennings, ABC's lofty and fastidious anchorman, chose to lend his gravitas to a lengthy examination of extraterrestrial life forms.

Space aliens are not particularly timely. Newspapers are not brimming with fresh reports of mass sightings of bright lights hovering over the Mojave Desert. Steven Spielberg does not have a sci-fi sequel, "Close Encounters of the Fourth Kind," in the works. And no one would argue that this is a slow news period.

But the race for ratings is particularly intense in February. Mr. Jennings points out in his introduction that as many as 80 million Americans believe in U.F.O.'s and that 40 million say they have seen one or know someone who has. If even a fraction of those people turn to ABC tonight, "U.F.O.'s: Seeing Is Believing" could do for Mr. Jennings what more somber special reports like last June's "Guant=Elnamo Bay" could not.

Not that this special report is a day at the beach. Mr. Jennings applies the same solemn, impassive tone he used to examine Christianity in his special report "Jesus and Paul: The Word and the Witness" last April. He does not try to prove or debunk the existence of U.F.O.'s. Instead, he handles Ufology, as he refers to it, like a religion whose followers are numerous and steadfast enough to merit respectful treatment.

And that is not inappropriate. Ufology has many of the rites and rhythms of more traditional faiths, and the skeptic-turned-convert is a crucial element in any belief system. The millions of followers of Padre Pio, a 20th-century friar who was said to have had stigmata and supernatural powers and was canonized in 2002, bolster their case by pointing out that Father Maccari, a Vatican investigator sent to prove the friar a fraud, later recanted and prayed to Padre Pio on his deathbed (at least according to a Capuchin publication, "The Voice of Padre Pio").

The documentary showcases a U.F.O. version of Father Maccari: J. Allen Hynes, an astrophysicist and a consultant for an Air Force project created in 1952 to assess U.F.O. reports. Early on, he dismissed witnesses as crackpots. He later repented and went on

to found the Center for U.F.O. Studies in Illinois. He was one of the first scientists to give the study an aura of respectability. (Dr. Hynek came up with the phrase "close encounters of the third kind," which Mr. Spielberg used for his film title.)

The history of U.F.O. sightings is interspersed with contemporary accounts by witnesses: housewives, pilots and truck drivers who do not look or sound like crackpots and who matter-of-factly describe what they saw that turned them into believers. ("It arched over the top of our car. ...") The most recent well-known incident was reported over Phoenix in 1997, when hundreds of people said they saw strange lights overhead that did not resemble an airplane or a helicopter. One man videotaped some of what he saw: a row of lights in the sky that he said were atop some kind of spaceship. The tape is not very distinct, however. Mostly, ABC uses animation to recreate what the witnesses say they saw.

The U.F.O. is a topic usually relegated to the tabloids, but Mr. Jennings gives the phenomenon his full consideration. "Seeing Is Believing" is not likely to create a new army of converts, but it may draw viewers who are already convinced and hungry for network affirmation: believing is seeing.

'Peter Jennings Reporting'

'U.F.O.'s: Seeing Is Believing'

ABC, tonight at 8, Eastern and Pacific times; 7, Central time.

Mark Obenhaus and Tom Yellin, executive producers. Produced by PJ Productions and Springs Media for ABC News.

Copyright 2005 The New York Times Company

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

New UFO Sighting Over Mexico City

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 07:03:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:55:46 -0500
Subject: New UFO Sighting Over Mexico City

INEXPLICATA-The Journal of Hispanic Ufology

February 24, 2005

New UFO Sighting Over Mexico City

Ana Luisa Cid reports a personal sighting on 17 February 2005

On February 17, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. I witnessed the transit of this flying object toward Mexico City's eastern regions.

I was writing an article on my computer when something shiny made me turn to the left and look through the window. It was an elongated structure of considerable size, visible to the unaided eye, which traveled horizontally at great speed.

When I reached for my camcorder to shoot video, the brilliant structure made a sudden reverse motion and hid behind the rooftop. I remained patient and waited for it to emerge, obtaining the following images.

I would have wanted to follow its trajectory, but my young daughter was asleep, so I advised my colleagues so they could continue tracking this bizarre flying object.

Translation (C) 2005 S. Corrales, IHU. Special thanks to Ana Luisa Cid.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Argentine Mountaineer Photographs UFO

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 07:30:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:59:35 -0500
Subject: Argentine Mountaineer Photographs UFO

INEXPLICATA
The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
February 25, 2005

NOTE: The photo in question has NOT been forwarded to IHU's attention. An effort to secure it will be made.

SOURCE: El Tribuno (Salta, Argentina) DATE: 02.24.05

Mountain Climber Photographs Large UFO

At Cachi, over Monte Nevado

The "thing" is of tremendous size, amber-colored and saucer-shaped

An unidentified flying object (UFO) of prodigious size, amber in color and with the characteristic shape of the so-called "flying saucers" was photographed with a high-definition camera by a Buenos Aires mountaineer during the ascent of Nevado de Cachi, one of the greatest challenges for South American climbers.

The photograph, of extraordinary clarity, was taken while the sportsmen were at Las Pailas, an inhabited location halfway up to the summit at an elevation of 3,500 meters above sea level which contains the ruins of an ancient Chalchaqu=ED settlement.

The protagonist of the event was Guillermo Martin, an instructor with the Buenos Aires-based "Entrenamientos de Monta=Fla" club.

The photos were taken in November 2004, but were made known last week. Mart=EDn had not had enough time to examine them due to work reasons. "I didn't realize I'd taken the photo until I saw it as a print. We researched with specialists and there are no errors or damage to the negative. Nor does it appear that the object is the result of an undesired chemical reaction of some sort.

What the camera did record, for some reason, perhaps due to the "thing's" speed, could not be seen by the human eye, according to the sportsman, who forwarded the startling images to Antonio Zuleta, a Cachi UFO researcher, who is also a renowned mountaineer and host of a radio show on FM San Jos=E9. He has also managed to record these objects on videotape.

Cachi, located 150 kilometers south of the provincial capital and some 2,200 meters high, has become a worldwide center of interest for lovers of this mysterious and intriguing subject.

Martin has returned to this locale once more since last week and is attempting a new ascent of El Nevado, 6,380 meters above sea level, this time heading a team of 8 mountaineers. "The day I took the photo--around noon- the skies were clear, cloudless, the sun was shining, there was no wind, and the temperature was quite pleasant," Mart=EDn told Zuleta, who in turn forwarded a transcript of the sportsman's statements to El Tribuno.

The Las Pailas UFO Case is analogous to the one experienced by a married couple from Chaco -- engineers Cesar Cotichelli and Graciela Cedro, who were returning from San Antonio de los Cobres in July 2004 heading toward the provincial capital. They stopped between the towns of Ingeneiro Maury and Chorrillos and took some photos which, upon developing, showed a UFO similar to the one in the shot taken by the Buenos Aires mountain climber.

"We had the negatives analyzed in detail," said Cotichelli, "and it was clear that there were no faults nor problems of a chemical nature. Furthermore, the objects on our negatives reflected the sun's rays, proof that the object was of a solid nature."

The images in question were taken on International Hwy. 51 "Mario Banchik", 80 km. from the provincial seat, at the midpoint between Ingeniero Maury and Chorrillos in the municipality of Campo Quijano.

This area is similar--as far as landscape and geological characteristics are concerned--to Cachi and is known as a "producer" of reports involving UFOs.

The UFOs appearing in the photographs of the Cotichelli-Cedro couple appeared in the 07.25.04 issue (p.49) of this newspaper. They were identical to the one photographed by the mountain climber in Cachi, being amber in color.

Translation (c) 2005, Scott Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology. Special thanks to Mercedes Casas.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:00:58 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 11:01:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Friedman

>From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:38:23 -0600
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>4. Don't forget that old reports about this planet may have
>>misled the aliens who were taken aback by new and unplanned
>>technological progress on our part that never would have
>>happened had there not been WW 2. There was a tendency on the
>>part of the USA to think that the Russians post WW 2 were just a
>>bunch of dumb peasants without ivy league educations. But they
>>put up the first satellite, the first animal, the first man, the
>>first rocket around the moon. It took a while for us to catch
>>up.. Do notice the enormous difference in our technology between
>>1937 and 1947.

>'They' were not so equipped as you might be lead on to believe,
>however none of those things that you mentioned would be
>possible had they not captured German scientists and technicians
>following WW 2, whom perfected the technology.

>Research can show that, as Red Army marched into Berlin,
>largely, it was the first time they had seen or been made aware
>of possibilities for, indoor plumbing and toilets.

><http://www.aeroscientists.org/rockets2.html>

Right you are John. Toilet paper was indeed in short supply. But
the Russians also had the biggest cyclotron in Europe before the
war and lost 20 Million people during the war and had hundreds
of cities destroyed. We had none.

The American atomic bomb and post war rocketry would not have
happened without all the imported scientists who left Europe
because of the Nazis.

Breaking the German and Japanese codes was of great importance
as well.

My point really was that the planet was a very different place
in 1947 from what it had been in 1940. More change in 7 years
than had ever occurred before. (Those Reticulan briefers weren't
with it.) A visitor might be very surprised. and not fully
prepared for the differences..

Stan

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

ABC Jennings Special

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:26:03 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:03:54 -0500
Subject: ABC Jennings Special

The first segment was weighted positive by the number of witnesses. Unfortunately they combined the "8 o'clock hour" events over Phoenix (triangle) with th 10 PM videos that probably show flares, as described on my web site.

The astronomer guy clearly didn't know anything about the 8:30 PM triangle or else simply ignored all that testimony in favor of commenting only upon the : "lights in the sky" that were videod at 10 PM.

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

ABC Jennings Special - Pt II

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 22:13:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:06:49 -0500
Subject: ABC Jennings Special - Pt II

Kudos to Michio for pulling our theoretical irons out of the fire. Oddly enough, he was saying what is in the recently published "Inflation" paper mentioned previously on this List: we ought to examine UFO sightings on the off chance that one or more might actually be evidence of a far advanced civilization. As Kaku said: "Let the investigation begin."

Too bad Jenning disparaged Roswell (all a bunch of people trying to make a buck) and tried to make abductions look like nonsense (all mental, dreams). No reference to abductions while the witness was doing something other than sleeping.

Kudos to all the witnesses and investigators. This show will probably cause a number of people to come forward with their own reports.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Jennings Is Toast

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 21:23:57 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:08:21 -0500
Subject: Jennings Is Toast

Jennings...

Be not fooled...

Complete if subtle hack-job, employed all the old prejudices, made out like ufologists operate on conflicted faith and are mentally ill, misinformed, or misinforming... Skeptibunkies, on the other hand are hard nosed realists with the conviction of real science behind them. Chumped Stanton Friedman and dismissed him and Kevin Randle as opportunists!

The ufological fencesitter was in no way encouraged to ask difficult questions of Government, Institution, or Agency. ET is a long-shot, credible evidence does not exist, and they can't get here anyway, largely because we can't get there... oh, and all is right with the world... our arrogant hubris is intact.

I was completely disgusted. No points for Jennings, at all...

More later...

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Jennings Blinded By Skepticism Ignorant Or What?

From: William Hand <ufotruth.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 23:17:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:15:01 -0500
Subject: Jennings Blinded By Skepticism Ignorant Or What?

The Peter Jennings UFO special on ABC was overall very under researched, very narrow-minded, quite short in length, and barely touched the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the most stunning evidence that extraterrestrials are visiting our planet.

Countless extraordinary cases were not even mentioned by this program. Instances where nuclear missiles were remotely turned off by UFOs, in which UFOs were captured by the space shuttle, instances where energy pulses were seen shooting at these UFOs in orbit, even other cases in which craft were captured on radar while being chased by jets, the numerous Mexico City sightings of the 1990's to present day, the UFOs encountered by the Belgium Air Force that were seen by so many, the Kecksburg case, the Rendalsham Forest incident, many high level government/military witnesses to the coverup, and so many other important aspects to the UFO phenomenon were not even considered!

For goodness sakes, the entire MJ-12 issue was not even discussed!

Additionally, skeptics were given lots of time to talk but Ufologists that could have easily refuted their claims (like the Phoenix lights were just flares) were not even interviewed. Also, they did not even interview city council woman Francis Barwood who went on a single person crusade to get to the truth about the Phoenix lights only to have the Governor of Arizona announce an emergency press conference to bring out two of his goons dressed in kooky alien costumes to try and belittle all the eye witnesses who saw a huge solid object. His quote was, "You guy's need to stop taking this stuff so seriously."

However, what really upset me the most was his complete bashing and debunking of the Roswell UFO crash. Instead of doing any real research into Roswell he basically refused to question anything the Airforce said, labeled all Roswell researchers as "gold diggers", claimed that no one can be certain if Jesse Marcel was even telling the truth, and that all new witnesses were frauds that were just jumping on the bandwagon!

Here are a few of Peter Jennings quotes from the show or at least as close as I can remember them:

"The myth of Roswell."

"There is not a shred of credible evidence that an alien ship crashed."

"There are no credible witnesses of bodies."

"There was lots of money to be made, but your book had to have even more grandious claims than the previous one."

"Many more witnesses came out of the woodwork to jump on the bandwagon."

"They (speaking of anyone who believes Roswell was the crash of an alien space craft) cling to a myth that in Roswell the answer to alien life was answered, but it was not!"

Peter Jennings complete and utter contempt for even the possibility of an alien space craft crashing at Roswell clearly shows during the segment. Additionally, he disrespects witnesses by basically ignoring all of them and not mentioning one name other than Jesse Marcel (and briefly his son) which he gives no signifiace and in a way even belittles.

The truth of the matter is that there are many credible witnesses of the Roswell incident, they came from all walks of life (from rancher Mac Brazel all the way to general Author Exon), all have unique perspectives to the event, and show something extraordinary happened that could NOT have been any type of weather balloon, mogul balloon, or even a string of weather balloons.

Want to read about these witnesses? Then read the statements of many, many witnesses to the Roswell Incident at the following internet address:

<http://www.roswellproof.com>

Does he need some more evidence that Roswell happened?

Well too bad he did not take the time to zoom in on the telegraph that was in General Ramey's hand while he posed for photos in front of the switched weather balloon junk! If Peter Jennings had bothered to zoom into that letter (he showed the general non-zoomed photo during the special) he could have almost clearly read the following:

"AND THE VICTIMS OF THE WRECK IN THE DISC WE WILL SHIP"

among other readable portions of the telegraph!

Wanna read it for yourself? Go to the great website of David Rudiak at:

<http://www.roswellproof.com> and take a look!

An incident involving nothing more than a mere weather balloons (that would have been easily identifiable by Jesse Marcel and everyone else on base without question) would not have victims, that apparently were harmed by a wreck, and would be shipped in a disc!

Peter Jennings ignored and basically refused to even mention the testimony of numerous witnesses to the Roswell Incident. But one that he did not mention, in particular, really ticks me off!

The name is Col. Philip J. Corso co-author of, "The Day After Roswell."

Col. Corso was as solid and credible of a witness as you could find. He was a decorated military officer and had a military career that many would dream of having. His testimony is basically two fold:

1) In 1947 while on watch at a military base he came across a couple large crates that were under high security. After another soldier had reported taking a peak he opened them and saw two very bizzare bodies of what he would later realize were EBEs or extraterrestrial biological entities from the Roswell Craft.

2) In the 1960's he was assigned to the Foreign technology division of the pentagon. The general that was his supervisor gave him access to a filing cabinet that contained photos, documents, sketches, debris samples, and all kinds of info on the crash of an ET space craft outside of Roswell NM.

Col. Philip J. Corso before his death signed sworn affidavits to the above, wrote his book about his experiences (that Senator Strom Thurmond wrote the forward to knowing full well what the content was about, but then when his staff realized what he did they ordered it be yanked), gave many interviews about the above events, and went on the radio to tell the world of what he saw, read, and knew.

No one in the military, not one living soul, has officially declared him to have lied, misled anyone, or even to have hallucinated the whole story.

Peter Jennings completely and totally ignored Col. Corso's testimony!

Obviously, if Peter Jennings had done any real research into Roswell they would have discovered his book, his testimony, and his sworn affidavits. But obviously they brushed his testimony under the rug just like they did every single other witness to Roswell (except Marcel and his son).

I highly urge everyone to read the book, *The Day After Roswell*, and read yourself about the man that Peter Jennings did not want the world to hear about!

Another part of this UFO special that I found repugnant was his obvious lack of research into new physics research that could allow for FTL travel, allow for gravity manipulation, alter the properties of inertia itself, and extract unlimited energy from the vacuum to allow for ET's to travel basically anywhere they want (without having to harness the power of entire stars).

Want to read more about the above? Then why don't you read up on websites such as....

Tom Bearden's website at <http://www.cheniere.org>

or

American Antigravity at <http://www.americanantigravity.com>

Yes, they talked about wormholes... big deal! People are working on devices that tap energy from the vacuum, manipulate gravity itself for propulsion, and even generate beams of gravity to retract or push away objects. Want to learn more and read the scientific abstracts about these experiments? Go to the above sites!

To sum it up, this UFO special was nothing special at all. Peter Jennings showed his true colors to the world by following the Air Force's line and refusing to even look at the Roswell witnesses (the many credible witnesses and of course Col. Corso), repeatedly calling those who seriously study UFOs "true believers", refused to look at the telegraph in Ramey's hand, ignored so many of the amazing incidents that have occurred in the UFO phenomenon, and only reported a small handful of not even the best cases indicating ET's are visiting our planet.

He took a cursory glance at UFOs, towed the mainstream party line on the entire subject, refused to admit any type of coverup, refused to take a solid position himself other than just saying he remains skeptical, and ignored one very important principle.

If you have a thousand or a million black crows and then find one white crow you have just PROVEN that not all crows are black.

I have a VERY important question for Peter Jennings:

How many different people, military officers, radar systems, pilots, space shuttle cameras, satellites, and even whole cities will have to report seeing or one step further even taking images of white crows until you are willing to believe that not all crows are black and take a firm position on this issue?!

Perhaps Peter Jennings is a true skeptic at heart, perhaps he is just ignorant of the vast majority of UFO data, or maybe this show was all he was allowed by the powers that be to raise public awareness of these issues.

It is even possible that Peter Jennings knows more and accepts more than he presented on the program.

But overall, the show was not much of special, and in my opinion did little to advanced the cause of exposing the truth about ETs visiting our planet.

I ask once more... When will you admit to a white crow, Mr. Jennings?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

ABC - A First Reaction From Outside Ufology

From: Loren Coleman <lcoleman.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 23:21:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:16:53 -0500
Subject: ABC - A First Reaction From Outside Ufology

I'm not a Ufologist, per se, but merely a Fortean researcher and writer. So I watched the program, anyway, out of curiosity and to see how ABC News dealt with this subject. My first reactions: Very well-done. High production values, not sensationalized, and quite intelligent.

Peter Jennings' UFO special created a decent overview of the ufological phenomena, I thought, for the general public. First a few quick grabber moments with recent cases of triangles over Phoenix and southern Illinois, with Coast to Coast AM's Art Bell (but why no credit to George Noory?). Then some good historical material, with great down-to-earth commentary by Jerome Clark and others. Pilots' sightings, J. Allen Hynek, and more pro-UFO material filled the first hour.

When hour two opened, I thought the good cop-bad cop split was going to occur. And indeed, for a time, it was nothing but skepticism, from SETI people and astronomers. Then the "myth" of Roswell was retold, with lots of funny visuals and a bit of media bias in the voice-overs. Stan Friedman and Karl Pflock were given good moments to detail their thoughts. This was followed by a segment delivered, with a careful introduction from Jenning, on abductees and Bud Hopkins, who was portrayed as the "first one out of the gate" on this subject. Unmentioned, let's hope Betty and Barney Hill and John Fuller, please, are resting in peace. Whitley Strieber's book cover was shown as one of those tomes coming after Hopkins. I'm outside the feuds of the field, but I could feel the sparks flying already. And then the whole thing ended with some thoughtful insights on space travel from physicist Michio Kaku.

All in all, an excellent addition to the documentary attempts to address the question of UFOs.

Sincerely,

Loren Coleman
<http://www.lorencoleman.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:19:36 -0500
Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

List,

Last night on C2C AM, Richard C. Hoagland spouted how he got "inside information" that the ABC UFO special going to be "groundbreaking TV". I immediately deprogrammed the special from my Tivo. I knew that it was going to be crap. I'm glad I saved the hard drive space.

I watched the Jennings special, and besides seeing the face behind Jerry Clark's prose, saw nothing of any revelatory, scientific, or even much entertainment value.

Stan Friedman was offered up as a UFO "nut", with zero mention of MJ-12 or any "Cosmic Watergate" except as hyperbolic talk show fodder. Although many of the supposed MJ-12 "players" were noted. If my recent characterization of the Friedman perception was that of a "mad scientist" was misplaced, one can scarcely argue it now. Network prime time no less.

Roswell? The holy grail of Ufology? Nope, just a money machine for charlatans per Mr. Jennings.

Budd Hopkins was painted as little more than a Svengali.

Either I missed Dick Hall, or they left him on the cutting room floor along with John Mack.

Seth Shostak was presented as one of the few really smart ET guys on the planet, even though all the millions spent on SETI have resulted in nada, zip, bupkis, just like the search for hard evidence of UFO crashes.

Peter Davenport appeared as the "lone gunman" of UFOs, holed up in his bunker, answering call after call... "Whew, that was a good one".

I think I saw Art Bell on his porch with Ramona. Saw a black triangle or somesuch. Compelling... not.

John Mack, whose interview was cut, was sorely missed here as plenty of abduction stuff was offered up, only to be coolly dismissed by pretty Dr. Clancy, with little or no rebuttal or debate presented.

Anyone who honestly felt that this was going to be anything other than a play for sweeps ratings was sorely disappointed. To those who were duped into providing grist for this "pap mill" have my sympathies.

It was a pure puff piece, except that now network television can state with a straight face... "been there, done that, nothing to see here... move along". Case closed.

I'm surprised they didn't interview Rich Reynolds. He'd have been perfect.

The animations were cool at times. Not the first time that the special effects have been better than the plot or script.

In the end, I was more entertained by Project Runway. And I was more informed by the Daily Show... the fake news.

A dark day for Ufology, and is that the distant sound of a bell tolling?

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea - Groff

From: **Terry Groff** <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 08:07:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:21:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea - Groff

>From: William Matchen <heyzeus321.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 06:58:51 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea

>Source: BBC News

><http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/4285119.stm>

>02-21-05

>Mars Pictures Reveal Frozen Sea

>A huge, frozen sea lies just below the surface of Mars, a team
>of European scientists has announced.

I have a PDF of this report but I've been asked not to publish
it until after it comes out in Nature magazine.

Here are the credits for the paper though.

EVIDENCE FROM HRSC MARS EXPRESS FOR A FROZEN SEA CLOSE TO MARS'
EQUATOR.

John B. Murray, Jan-Peter Muller, Gerhard Neukum, Stephanie C.
Werner, Ernst Hauber, Wojciech J. Markiewicz, James W. Head III,
Bernard H. Foing, David Page, Karl L. Mitchell, Ganna
Portyankina & the HRSC Co-Investigator Team. Dept. of Earth
Sciences, The Open University, Milton Keynes MK7 6AA, U.K.
j.b.murray.nul Dept. of Geomatic Engineering, University
College London, Gower St., London WC1E 6BT, U.K. Geosciences
Institute, Freie Universit=E4t Berlin, Malteserstr. 74-100,
Building D, 12249 Berlin, Germany. DLR-Institut f=FCr
Planetenforschung, Rutherfordstrasse 2, D-12489 Berlin-
Adlershof, Germany. Max Planck Institute for Aeronomy, Max-
Planck-Str. 2, 37191 Katlenburg-Lindau, Germany. Dept. of
Geological Sciences, Brown University, Box 1846, Providence,
Rhode Island 02912, U.S.A. Chief Scientist, ESA Research &
Scientific Support Dept., ESTEC/SCI-SR postbus 299, 2200 AG
Noordwijk, The Netherlands. Dept. of Mineralogy, The Natural
History Museum, London SW7 5PB, U.K. Environmental Science
Dept., Lancaster University, Bailrigg, Lancaster LA1 4YQ, U.K.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 10:05:40 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:23:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Clark

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:58:50 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:54:58 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:47 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:55:11 -0600
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>"Pelicanism," on the other hand, addresses a psychosocial
>>phenomenon heretofore not reducible to a single phrase. It
>>defines the practice of ascribing any explanation, however
>>scientifically unsustainable, illogical, or fantastic, to a UFO
>>event or experience, in a desperate effort to deny that anything
>>seriously anomalous may be going on. That is why I have
>>suggested that pelicanists are advancing extraordinary claims
>>masquerading as prosaic explanations.

>>Ideally, if what were at issue disinterested truth-seeking, even
>>those who identify themselves as skeptics (or "sceptics") would
>>disdain this practice just as sober proponents blast careless,
>>loose-thinking UFO advocates in their midst.

>>Unfortunately, as we have seen, what passes for "skepticism" as
>>an active (as opposed to the outsiders' casual) position in the
>>UFO controversy is often in practice an ideological stance, to
>>be defended, as ideological turf always is, at all costs. Thus,
>>the complaints we hear are addressed not to the practice of
>>pelicanism, but to the phrase itself - as well, inevitably, to
>>the one who initially drew attention to the emperor's feathery
>>dress.

>>This definition is riddled with subjective judgements.

Physical laws are not "subjective judgments," Peter. As Bruce Maccabee likes to say, explanations that purport to be prosaic ones have to obey conventional physical laws. Pelicanists recognize no such distinction, as witness the reason the neologism came into being in the first place: James Easton's physically impossible "theory," vigorously defended by skeptics ("sceptics"), about the Arnold sighting. As I recall, it was not pelicanists who took Easton's pseudoscience apart; it was

scientifically trained UFO proponents.

Pelicanists, apparently, believe that anything a skeptic ("sceptic") says is somehow true, even if it is not, in fact, a lowly fact. Pelicanists hold their beliefs to speak to larger truths than petty empiricism can get them to. Which takes their approach outside the realm of science into - as I have already had occasion to observe - the ideological, at the least.

>A simpler

>more objective one is; a Pelicanist is someone who prefers
>explanations which do not involve non human intelligences to
>ones that do. The reverse of a Pelicanist is a Mysterian, one
>who prefers explanations involving non human intelligences to
>ones that do not.

As with the sort of discussion we're familiar with from Magonian rhetoric, there is nothing "objective" about your proposed definition. It simply underscores the ideological obsession that I have already criticized, reaffirming the basic faith that any explanation, however crazy or pseudoscientific or in other ways unsupportable, has to be true because nothing seriously anomalous is, or can be, going on with UFOs. (There is also the quasi-religious credo that mankind is lord of the earth and therefore the prospect of other intelligences in our space - or maybe anywhere - is by definition unworthy of consideration.)

As I've said before, pelicanists advance extraordinary claims masquerading as conventional explanations. I realize, as you've as much as acknowledged above, that this is fine with you. It is not okay with the truth-seeking process, though, and it dishonors non-pelicanist skeptics.

And if you want to call your more open-minded colleagues Mysterians,* hell, that's fine by me. I have no trouble recognizing that this world and this universe are brimming with mysteries of which, from all indications, the UFO phenomenon is one. I do wonder, however, about persons so psychically threatened by possible unknowns that they actually think that someone who is not so threatened will be insulted if called an acknowledger of mystery (or, expressed another way, of the limitations of current knowledge). I'm sure there is an interesting psychosocial explanation for that sort of curious behavior, though I'm just as confident that we won't see it explored in the pages of Magonia.

One fundamental difference between a pelicanist and a mysterian is that the mysterian is not wed to the idea that every alleged UFO event or experience is enigmatic at its roots; thus he or she is not locked into one and only one solution and can follow the evidence where it leads (whether into prosaic accounting or acknowledgement of anomalousness). The pelicanist is wed to only one possible conclusion, the ostensibly conventional, and if facts and science don't make that case, so much for facts and science.

One wonders if, since to pelicanists all that is at issue is first principle (that UFOs by definition cannot be seriously anomalous or related to an unknown intelligence or intelligences), why bother to investigate sightings at all? If one has the answer before the inquiry, of what use is evidence-gathering - or, one might put it, scientific procedure itself? To the pelicanist, the armchair is almost literally the throne of wisdom.

Jerry Clark

*For those unfamiliar with late 1950s Japanese science-fiction films, an invasion-from-space movie called The Mysterians then played on screens around the world. The young Jerry Clark watched it with pleasure and big bag of popcorn. In the mid-1960s a garage band called ? and the Mysterians had a brief run on the pop-music charts with, if memory serves, a song titled "96 Tears." If memory serves, the singer was not weeping for the foolishness of pelicanists.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 12:48:43 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:24:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Friedman

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:44:42 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:56:01 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>I suspect that the TRUFOS are not representative of a unique
>phenomenon but like IFOS are a hetrogenious collection of many
>different things, though not perhaps the same things which
>generate the vast bulk of IFOs.

It is of interest that the Chi Square analysis in BB SR 14 showed that the probability that the UNKNOWNS were just KNOWNS, according to a chi-square analysis based on six different observable characteristics, was less than 1%. Furthermore the better the quality the more likely to be an UNKNOWN, and the less likely to be listed as insufficient Information. The duration of observation for the UNKNOWNS was also on the average longer than for the KNOWNS. In short the UNKNOWNS seem to be different in many ways from the KNOWNS which certainly goes against the notion that if only more data had been available they would have been identified, too. Nice to have that INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION category, much as debunkers wish to ignore it.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 11:19:34 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:26:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:58:50 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:54:58 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:47 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 14:55:11 -0600
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 20:51:45 +0000
>>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>><snip>

>>>>>Surely only Jerry, Dick Hall, and, above all, Mr Lehmborg, are
>>>>>qualified to say who is and who isn't a Pelicanist, as only
>>>>>they know what the silly term means.

>><snip>

>>>Its meaning then and now refers to one who runs with an
>>>insupportable theory [usually a pet theory], no matter how
>>>ludicrous, and against all reason to debunk a UFO sighting.

>>The definition of pelicanism, which I elucidated in a recent
>>post, is quite simple, and as Don shows above, its meaning is
>>hardly obscure or arcane.

<snip>

>This definition is riddled with subjective judgements. A simpler
>more objective one is; a Pelicanist is someone who prefers
>explanations which do not involve non human intelligences to
>ones that do. The reverse of a Pelicanist is a Mysterian, one
>who prefers explanations involving non human intelligences to
>ones that do not.

Mmmmmno. Besides, yours tries to use the either/or fallacy as a
mechanism when "black" and "white" only exist as ideals,
forgetting that it lets pelicanists off way too easy.

Moreover, it's the subjective that ultimately validates the
objective anyway, in this case perhaps, making sense out of what
'it' is or what 'it' turns out to be. Yours won't do what an
expression like this is supposed to do, regardless, and that is
to put a name to an axe-grinding hurdle.

alienview.nul - : | :-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:23:12 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:27:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:44:42 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>I suspect that the TRUFOS are not representative of a unique
>phenomenon but like IFOS are a heterogeneous collection of many
>different things, though not perhaps the same things which
>generate the vast bulk of IFOs.

Peter

I agree with this. It's extremely unlikely that our investigative and deductive filters are so refined as to have sieved a perfectly pure sample of one class of phenomena. Since we have no idea what we are looking for this could only have happened by chance. It's inevitable that the residue is a complicated mixture of objective and subjective processes about which we are fairly ignorant.

But this is not a satisfactory conclusion. It merely restates the question of interest to us (or the spectrum of questions) in a richer and more concentrated form. This is as far as investigation has brought us! Maybe not far, from an absolutist point of view, but science in reality is like all experience an endlessly reiterative activity. ("We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to return back where we started and know the place for the first time." T.S.Eliot - a transatlantic emollient for the culturally polarised UFO community!)

You wish to go further, and I think you are proposing that none of those "many different things" is a truly remarkable thing. But to do this is actually to propose that this is an homogeneous sample, in terms of an underlying uniform unremarkability. This may not seem quite as unlikely as that the whole residue of TRUFOS is uniformly amazing, but it is somewhat unlikely. It masquerades as a "simple" option in the spirit of Occam's Razor by importing an unknown amount of explanatory complexity to impose an artificial uniformity on nature.

In my opinion the messier but more realistic assumption is that the unknown causes of the sample will exhibit some heterogeneity, and that there will be a spectrum of remarkability.

Regards

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 12:32:25 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:28:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:16:52 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:33:13 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>You keep acting as though you had data on visit rates, crash
>rates, mileage, etc. James. we know nothing about these things.
>Unlikely doesn't mean zero. There are many unlikely events that
>happen all the time.

Well, we can estimate visit rates based on UFO sighting reports
and applying correction factors. As for crash rates, we have
reported ones and we can apply correction factors. I will agree
that unlikely doesn't mean zero. I am just saying, hopelessly,
that advanced technology forces very low failure rates.

Also, leaving crashed stuff lying around violates the UFO
behavior of non-dramatic revelation.

>Three words you should learn: 'we don't know'.

I don't know. Knowing implying have definite information .
However, I have a mind and I can exercise logic.

What is the harm in saying that there are likely tendencies in
societies that can achieve interstellar travel? They don't
likely use magic or paranormal powers to get here.

The tendency for technology to advance, innovations to occur and
highly reliable/safe systems seems very likely. Most methods for
accessing other planets has to be via advanced technology. As
such societies age, even more innovations are developed. As
advanced and more powerful technology is developed, it is
required that reliable and safe systems be implemented in order
to protect their society. If they develop antimatter, then it is
likely that they would develop reliable and safe systems to
utilize/store it. To not do so would result in catastrophic
events that could harm small areas to entire planets. Same
applies to nanotechnology, computer systems, genetic engineering
and a wide range of energy/power systems as well as ballistic
systems such as UFOs.

If this method can apply to predicting the number of
civilizations exist in the galaxy, why can't it apply to their
technology?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Deardorff

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:34:49 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:30:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Deardorff

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:22:43 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>The Chicago Tribune was not the only time Arnold said the
>>objects went behind Mt Rainier - you yourself quote another such
>>statement below. The June 26, 1947, East Oregonian story you
>>quote, states that Arnold saw the objects go behind an
>>"intervening peak." That peak was Mt Rainier itself as Arnold
>>makes clear in his other longer statements he personally wrote
>>of his sighting.

>Brad, that's an absurd interpretation. A dictionary definition
>of "intervene" is "to lie between." What peak lay behind Rainier
>so that Rainier could intervene? Rainier is absolutely massive,
>and if Arnold meant that the objects passed behind Rainier, he
>would have simply said they passed behind Rainier. He wouldn't
>have referred to Rainier as an "intervening peak." Sheesh!

>Not that it matters, but you are also trying to make a case for
>"intervening peak" by taking it completely out of context. Let's
>look at the complete quote where Arnold was saying he was able
>to determine distance using an "intervening peak" that blocked
>his view and also compare it to another quote where he again
>says that he could figure the distance because the objects
>flew behind a subpeak of Mt. Rainier:"

>Pendleton East Oregonian (June 26):

>"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."

>INS, Portland Oregonian/Austin Statesman, July 11:

>"I reckoned the saucers were 23 miles away," he said, "because
>they flew behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier_. I can show
>on the map exactly where the peak is and where I was."

>Saying he could determine distance because "an intervening peak
>once blocked his view" and "because they flew behind one of the
>peaks of Mt. Rainier" both mean the same thing.

>Essentially the same "intervening peak" quote also appeared in
>the AP version of the story I found in the Portland Oregon
>Journal from June 26. In addition to this, the story also had
>the following quote, making it unambiguously clear what side of
>Rainier Arnold was saying the objects were on:

>"He also said they flew on the west sides of Rainier and [Mt.]
>Adams_, adding this would make it more difficult for them to be

>seen from the ground."

>How could they fly behind Rainier (i.e. the east side) and
>simultaneously fly on the west side, which was Arnold's side?
>Again Arnold was very clearly saying they flew in front of
>Rainier, as he did over and over and over again.

It's too bad that no interviewer asked Arnold to pin down just what sub-peak of Mt. Rainier he was referring to. The mountain has a very broad summit, without anything that one would call a sub-peak near its 14,400 ft top. Its many glaciers that turn into river valleys on all sides all drain rather uniformly downwards for miles.

It might be that he was referring to some intervening peak along his line of sight N.W. to Mt. Rainier. But I don't know of any peaks around there in the Cascade foothills to the S.W. of Mt. Rainier that are taller than around 6500 ft, while his flight altitude was around 9200 ft. Yet if the saucers flew low enough and close enough behind such a peak they could briefly have been out of sight. But such a peak shouldn't be called a sub-peak of Mt. Rainier. Yet if Arnold was later able to identify the sub-peak as having been 25 miles away from his plane at some point, it should be a peak well marked on a topo map.

Prospector Fred Johnson was in the Mt. Adams area then, probably at around 6000 ft-- he was probably above timberline but not trying to scale Mt. Adams. He estimated the saucers were only some 1000 ft above him when they flew south past him, or perhaps at around 7000 ft. This argues against their having been briefly eclipsed by any small irregularity of Mt. Rainier's broad peak, since I don't think Arnold ever said that they changed their altitude grossly, as from near 14,000 ft to 7000 ft, as they traveled southwards.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:37:21 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:31:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Shough

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:58:50 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:54:58 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>. . . a Pelicanist is someone who prefers
>explanations which do not involve non human intelligences to
>ones that do. The reverse of a Pelicanist is a Mysterian, one
>who prefers explanations involving non human intelligences to
>ones that do not.

And somewhere in between are the sensible human intelligences
that don't rule out whole areas of reasonable scientific
speculation a priori.

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 13:15:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:33:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:26:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>Does anyone remember a study by Michael Swords that touched on
>this? There was - if I remember the details correctly - a lot
>interest in UFOs at high levels in the military, at the time of
>the Roswell event. And for a time shortly after the event, some
>of those involved in military UFO concerns began complaining of
>a "silence topside" - meaning that higherups were all at once
>not responding. Or so Swords wrote. The implication, of course,
>was that the high-ranking "topside" officers suddenly found out
>the truth, and for a while weren't sure how to respond to UFO-
>related communications from those who reported to them.

>Does anyone else remember this study? And does Swords'
>contention hold up in the light of further research? I'd

This comes from an air force document found in the FBI file.
Written in July 1947 it provide an initial summary of the UFO
situation as it appered to mid level officers I think at the
Pentagon. Anyway, it points out that lack of requests for
information on the subject from "topside", as compared to
previous situations (such as Japanese balloon bonbs) suggests
that saucers might be a project that the President, etc. knows
about already..

(See The UFO-FBI Connection, page 15)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 12:21:15 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:35:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Clark

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:26:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 16:28:20 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

Hi, Greg,

>Does anyone remember a study by Michael Swords that touched on this? There was - if I remember the details correctly - a lot of interest in UFOs at high levels in the military, at the time of the Roswell event. And for a time shortly after the event, some of those involved in military UFO concerns began complaining of a "silence topside" - meaning that higherups were all at once not responding. Or so Swords wrote. The implication, of course, was that the high-ranking "topside" officers suddenly found out the truth, and for a while weren't sure how to respond to UFO-related communications from those who reported to them.

The paper you refer to was this one:

"The Summer of 1947: UFOs and the U.S. Government at the Beginning." In George M. Eberhart, ed. The Roswell Report: A Historical Perspective, 9-38. Chicago: J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies, 1991.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Secrecy News -- 02/24/05

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 13:44:02 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:51:23 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 02/24/05

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2005, Issue No. 20
February 24, 2005

** COURT VIEWS SECRECY AND PRESS CONFIDENTIALITY
** AGENCY PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICES SWELL
** SELECTED BUSH, CLINTON PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS OPEN
** ARMY LAW ENFORCEMENT INVESTIGATION MANUAL
** THIS AND THAT FROM CRS
** TIME OUT

COURT VIEWS SECRECY AND PRESS CONFIDENTIALITY

"Secrecy may well be seen as the enemy of freedom when it conceals facts important to public understanding," wrote Judge Robert W. Sweet of the Southern District of New York in a decision today.

Moreover, he opined, "Secrecy in government appears to be on the increase."

The decision came down in the case of New York Times v. Gonzales and addressed the question of whether the Times was obliged to surrender certain confidential telephone records sought by the government as part of a leak probe. The judge concluded that the Times could continue to withhold the records.

See a copy of the 121 page ruling here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/nyt022405.pdf>

AGENCY PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICES SWELL

The number of public affairs officers in federal agencies has increased markedly in the past four years, Newsday reported today.

Newsday analyzed government personnel records and found that "The staffs that handle public relations for government agencies grew even faster than the federal work force."

But does that mean that public access to government information has grown correspondingly?

To the contrary. "At the same time the White House tightened its control over messages to the news media and restricted access to public information."

See "Cadre Grows to Rein in Message" by Tom Brune, Newsday, February 24:

<http://tinyurl.com/5kjj4>

SELECTED BUSH, CLINTON PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS OPEN

The National Archives and Records Administration has announced the opening of selected documentary records from the papers of former presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton.

"Approximately 9,700 pages of George H.W. Bush Presidential records that were previously withheld under the Presidential Records Act restrictions for appointments to federal office and/or confidential advice are now open for research," NARA said in a February 18 news release.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2005/02/nara021805.html>

Meanwhile, "The William J. Clinton Presidential Library ... Is making over 100,000 pages of Clinton presidential records available for research. They represent the first public release of Clinton presidential records since the end of the Clinton Administration," according to another NARA news release.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2005/02/nara022205.html>

Public access to records of former presidents remains a subject of some controversy due to a November 2001 executive order by President George W. Bush which made it easier to curtail such access.

ARMY LAW ENFORCEMENT INVESTIGATION MANUAL

What is the proper method to obtain fingerprints from a corpse?

A newly issued U.S. Army field manual on law enforcement investigations explains that (page 20-9) and much more. The manual, intended for military police and other military investigators, reviews the basics of investigative procedure, from the crime scene to the interrogation of witnesses.

See "Law Enforcement Investigations," Field Manual 3-19.13, Department of the Army, January 2005 (in an extremely large 22 MB PDF file, 507 pages):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-19-13.pdf>

THIS AND THAT FROM CRS

Recent publications from the Congressional Research Service obtained by Secrecy News include the following:

"Nuclear Threat Reduction Measures for India and Pakistan," updated February 17, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL31589.pdf>

"Millennium Challenge Account: Implementation of a New U.S. Foreign Aid Initiative," updated January 21, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32427.pdf>

"A Free Trade Area of the Americas: Major Policy Issues and Status of Negotiations," updated January 3, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS20864.pdf>

"Taiwan: Recent Developments and US Policy Choices," updated January 10, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/IB98034.pdf>

TIME OUT

Secrecy News will be away next week. Publication will resume the week of March 7.

Secrecy News is written by Steven Aftergood and published by the Federation of American Scientists.

To SUBSCRIBE to Secrecy News, send email to secrecy_news-request.nul with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to saftergood.nul

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Secrecy News has an RSS feed at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.rss>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood.nul
voice: (202) 454-4691

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 14:33:04 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:53:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Maccabee

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:44:42 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 18:56:01 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

<snip>

>>Every sighting starts as a UFO - puzzling to the witness (the
>>Condon definition, for example). (If a hoax, then the witness
>>pretends to be puzzled.) Only a "select few" sightings make it
>>through investigation and analysis to become TRUFO sightings
>>which remain unexplained.

>>It is in the collection of TRUFO sightings (5%? of UFO
>.>sightings) that one may find evidence of ET visitation or >
>>perhaps a new natural - read that, "unintelligent" - phenomenon.

>An example of UFO vs TRUFO is contained in the nearly-year-old
>Mexican DOD sighting.

Yes. It appears that the initial radar target is "promoted" to
TRUFO while the flir lights are "demoted" to IFO (barring
contradictory evidence that only the Mexican DOD could provide
by doing an experiment to confirm or deny the suggested
explanation(s)).

>>>Some British Ufologists feel that the number of (non
>>>obvious) IFO cases is as low as 2%.

>>I suppose this implies that "non-obvious IFO cases" constitute
>>the percentage that others might classify as TRUFOs. That is 100
>>UFOs = 98% IFOs and 2% "non-obvious IFOs".

>Sorry that was a typo The 2% are what you would call TRUFOs

>>In the Battelle Memorial Institute study of 1947-1952 sightings
>>- published by the USAF in 1955

>>3,201 sightings of 2199 "objects" were analyzed - there was a
>>division as follows:

>>K = known (IFOs) 70%
>>U = Unknown (probable or likely TRUFOs) 20%
>>I.I. = Insufficient Information (can't be sure it was an IFO) 10%

>These figures don't seem to replicated today. Was this the
>result of poor investigation, much less sophistication as to the
>extremity of misperception/misidentification/misremembering than
>here is now or that there was something in the early 1950s
>which was boosting up the then TRUFO figure but which isn't here
>now, or were the number of unknowns being manipulated upwards?
>or a mixture of all the above

If anything the number of Unknowns was manipulated downward. As

Brad pointed out in a previous message and I seconded in another message, Project Blue Book (Ruppelt) in early 1953 admitted to the Air Defense command that they could positively identify only 11% of the sightings. Other identifications were "probable" or "possible". Then they combined "definitely" with "probable and possible" and arrived at the percent "knowns" (K).

The Battelle study also showed that the better the sighting (more credible the witness, more consistent report, more credible details) the higher the percentage of unknowns as compared to the worst reports considered in this study (less credible witness, less consistent report, fewer details). When only military witnesses were considered alone, the U rose to "whopping" 37% for the best sightings and 21% for the worst sightings. For civilian observers alone the best sightings about 30% were unknown and for the worst civilian sightings U= 18%.

>>Of course, TRUFO sightings will also be argued... with new >>explanations being proposed as old ones fall by the wayside. A >>sighting classified as TRUFO (after investigation) remains a >>TRUFO sighting unless some previously unproposed explanation is >>>found to be reasonable. On the other hand it remains a TRUFO >>sighting if, eventually, there are no more conventional >>explanations and if it appears that no conventional explanation >>could ever be found for the sighting. Of course, this last >>criteria is quite stringent in that it "predicts" the future: >>no conventional explanation will ever be found. Very few >>sightings have this level of evidence. One that I would suggest >>is New Zealand, Dec. 1978.

>But I have seen others have a very low opinion of this case,

Does that mean you know someone has an explanation that is satisfactory, or is this statement based on the opinions of people who don't know much about the case? So far as I know it is the only civilian case that involves multiple witnesses and radar and film and tape recordings made during the sighting, with the occurrence of what may be the only known radar-visual case that includes color movie film.

>while no doubt you have a low opinion of others that other >people hold to be permanent TRUFOS

Yes and this applies mostly to contactee type cases.

>>>Though CSICOP-ers know >>>that the null hypothesis is true and Ufologists know that it >>>is false, in reality very little of the detailed critical >>>investigation that would be needed to resolve the issue has gone >>>on. Most UFO investigation is really just the assemblage of >>>evidence to bank up the investigators preconceptions and both >>>sides spin like Mandelson and Campbell

>>The above statement underestimates the level of investigation >>that has happened in some cases. I will agree that most UFO >>sightings don't receive sufficient investigation... there just >>isn't the man/womanpower available to tackle everything. But >>some sightings have been investigated thoroughly... often >>requiring years of (sporadic if not continuous) activity. And >>the results of the investigations are argued both ways until >>either there is a final agreement or there is an agreement to >>disagree.

>>In the famous Arnold case, some may recall the heated dispute in >>the UpDates (and other) email lists about 6 years ago when the >>pelican hypothesis was put forth.

>>This was about the 8th explanation presented over the then-52 >>year period since the Arnold sighting.

>Speculation on these cases can go on for ever but after a time >any real reinvestigation is ruled out by passage of time, >witnesses die or disappear from view, memories become >transformed, sites change, documents get lost and so on.

True, which is a reason I like the New Zealand sightings because of the evidence that remains and allows one to almost "relive" the event through the audio tapes and the movie.

>I suspect that the TRUFOS are not representative of a unique >phenomenon but like IFOS are a heterogeneous collection of many

>different things, though not perhaps the same things which
>generate the vast bulk of IFOs.

Of course, the only way to find out is to concentrate on TRUFO cases (investigated sightings) that appear to contain evidence that would contradict all known explanations based on known phenomena.... but of even more interest, contain evidence that points toward non-human intelligence.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 14:40:02 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:56:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:09:03 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:53:30 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>Placing limitations on them, putting them in our image, as error
>>prone beings is very hard to accept.

>I am not putting them in our image. We have no idea how error
>prone they are unless you have insider info. Whether crashes are
>rare or frequent we don't know. Why do you act as though you do?
>We don't know how many mother ships there are and how many earth
>excursion modules each carries or how many sorties of how many
>miles they do each day.

I have no info. Maybe I am overestimating them. I think the
advancement of technology provides a bias in any space faring
culture to a high reliability.

Also, we don't know if there are any mother ships.

I comes down to the fact that you think they will allow a
vehicle to fail (total loss or crew and ship) and I do not think
so.

It doesn't matter really if there are a million of sorties a
day, if they seem so interested in not influencing our culture
by "coming out", then they are not goin to allow hard evidence
to appear. If this means perfect reliability/redundancy or
automatic complete disintegration, they aren't leaving anything
to be picked up for messing with the pristine primeval culture
resident on Earth.

>>Combined with automated
>>hardware manufacture and assembly and testing, most >uncertainty
>>can be removed. Add the artificial intelligence(s) to the flight
>>control loop then how can it crash???

>You say "most" uncertainty. That is not all. Something
>unexpected happens. The Titanic was unsinkable.. but it sank.
>James can't you understand how ignorant we are?

You are right, it is not all uncertainty. Since some other races
(likely more advanced) may have weapons that could destroy the
most well planned vehicle, I cannot say "all". I just think
these kind of weapons do not in all likelihood exist on this
planet. I do not subscribe to the notion of a interstellar
police force protecting us from contamination by blasting errant
alien visitors focusing on anal probing (if that were the case,
the crash residue would be cleaned up prior to human arrival,
ala MIB).

The Titanic was the product of a primitive culture. Why do you
keep equating our backward race with its primitive technology

with space faring, interstellar aliens races?

Why is it so hard to make my point that if we are truly being visited by such aliens, a conservative estimation of the technology level they have is roughly at least 1000 years beyond ours? Its hard to imagine how much can happen in 100 years. 1000 years makes my head hurt. What about 10000 years? No way can I imagine that. But I can imagine that they do things alot better than we do. That will be an intrinsic feature of life.

So, it doesn't matter how ignorant we are. That is pretty clear I think. But this bias on your part to pigeon hole these advanced alien visitors into a category of technical imbecility is annoying.

>>Placing human limitations on them again. Look at what we have >>done in the past 100 years and it doesn't seem unlikely that in >>100 more years that robots, real artificial intelligence will be >>ubiquitous. Organic pilots will not even be needed (a quaint >>notion really).

>These are theoretical hypothetical notions backed by your >imagination and nothing else.

Well, I think they are backed up by logical, "theory of technology" ideas. You need imagination sure because we would not progress otherwise.

>>Not know about lightning? Do you think these spacecraft are >>designed on the fly? They will have likely seen many worlds and >>have been purposely designed to deal with a wide range of >>hazards. Likely some craft are specially designed for gas->>giants, but worlds like ours have standard phenomena which they >>really MUST have encountered many times before.

>Maybe it has been a long time since they encountered beings as >primitive as we are. James, we don't know.

It is of course a possibility. But I believe that the probability, which you choose to accept and I don't, that this was their first landing seems so remote to me that it might as well be impossible.

We must simply disagree. Hell, I have a small following compared to you so its not a big deal.

>>You somehow have proof of alien ET spacecraft crashing. Do you >>have any DNA sample, spacecraft metal? Its a difficult thing to >>accept such an extraordinary experience. Why is it that there is >>no crashed alien evidence? There had to have been many crashes >>prior to the government secrecy but I have not seen any items >>from those events either.

>What is your basis for saying "had to have been"? Are you >omnipotent?

I think you mean omniscent.

I say "had to have been" because if you assume a moderate crash rate, then there must have ALWAYS been crashes. Some of these would have been prior to secret government coverup conspiracies. Maybe they happened during the Ming Dynasty, the Middle Ages, 1800's, 1920's.

If not, then you are suggesting that as of Roswell time period, we got alien visitors (due to nuclear testing?). None before that. However, this seems unlikely based on lots of UFO reports that occured prior to nuclear testing. But if you rule out that data you are okay.

The other possibility is that aliens prior to Roswell had more reliable/safe spacecraft. A technology deevolution. Yeah, right.

Of course there is the other possibility that we were so lucky that the 1 in a million event occurred at Roswell. That alien spacecraft ARE highly reliable, but the 1 in a million chance event occurred and it was destroyed. Sure, this is a possibility, but when you look at the odds, it seems very unlikely.

If you assume a moderate-low crash rate and assume alien

visitors for >10000 years, then we should have a helluva lot of crashed spacecraft (which the aliens never clean up because they don't care and which haven't been boxed by the government minions).

>There is a great deal of evidence. Eyewitness testimony to >wreckage of very strange characteristics is evidence. Do you see >me saying proof?

Okay, I agree there is evidence. Something happened. I do not jump to the conclusion it is an alien spaceship though. Personally, I would like there to be aliens visting us and would be delighted to have the opportunity to view their technology, even from a distance. But I would be very dissappointed if they were so fallible and human-like to allow crashes of their (or our) craft.

>>They don't need to be perfect. In fact they can be as dumb as >>us. But they really should have better computers than us.

>They may well have better computers. And 747s have much better >computers than Cessnas. They still have crashed.

Yes, but the crash rate of 747s is less than Cessnas.

Extrapolate computers 1000 years into the future and the crash rate should be unmeasurable. Also, both vehicles are energy and power and mass limited. If a Cessna could carry 100 tons, then do you not think it would have backup systems galore. Same for the 747. Why doesn't the 747 have a ejectible cabin compartment with a parachute? Multiple cold and hot engine backups? Thick shielding?

>You are suffering from a bad case of 'will not to >believe'. Better see somebody about that.

Perhaps I am being too pragmatic and engineerlike.

Anyway, I recommend that you not underestimate the capabilities of alien visitors. They might be insulted.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 19:57:34 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:57:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Allan

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:26:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 16:28:20 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>This shock-and- awe effect
>>would spill over into public life and would be reported in the
>>press - "Truman and Forrestal were seen today looking ashen and
>>pale in this morning's meeting in the White House. Reporters
>>asked the White House press secretary if some bad news had been
>>learned, but secretary said he knew of nothing bad or otherwise.
>>Later in the day, the White House announced postponement of
>>Soviet summit talks, and abruptly dropped plans to implement the
>>new National Security Act legislation, saying that unspecified
>>further modifications had become necessary, and consultations
>>with Congress were in the works to amend the Act. Today, the
>>White House changed its plan for national security but would
>>give no details." Etc. etc. Even though no one was "letting out"
>>any ET secret, the sudden confrontation with ET reality still
>>would have a policy impact in Washington that would be visible.

>Does anyone remember a study by Michael Swords that touched on
>this? There was - if I remember the details correctly - a lot
>interest in UFOs at high levels in the military, at the time of
>the Roswell event. And for a time shortly after the event, some
>of those involved in military UFO concerns began complaining of
>a "silence topside" - meaning that higherups were all at once
>not responding. Or so Swords wrote. The implication, of course,
>was that the high-ranking "topside" officers suddenly found out
>the truth, and for a while weren't sure how to respond to UFO-
>related communications from those who reported to them.

>Does anyone else remember this study? And does Swords'
>contention hold up in the light of further research? I'd
>especially love to hear what Wendy thinks.

This was Swords' 30-page study in the CUFOS publication "The
Roswell Report, a Historical Perspective" (ed. George
M.Eberhart), July 1991.

About half of the paper consists of documents, e.g. FBI papers,
the Twining memorandum, and the infamous Schulgen document of
Oct 28, 1947, now known to be a forgery (a 1985 retype of the
original with certain phrases altered). Dr Swords relies a lot
on these fake passages to bolster his case that certain
"topside" officers knew the truth in late 1947.

The interest in UFOs by the military was due to it being a new
phenomenon at the time. Swords did not demonstrate that it had
anything to do with Roswell. So I would answer 'No' to your
second question.

The article is worth re-reading with the knowledge that the main
supporting document is a fake.

CDA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 15:31:57 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:58:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:16:52 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:33:13 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 16:35:57 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>If however, you wish to accept the idea of a huge range of alien
>>societies ranging from our equivalent to 1000000 years advanced
>>from ours, doesn't it seem that the center of the bell (or even
>>flat) probability distribution curve more likely in the center
>>than at the extreme end as you wish it to be? Given the above
>>range, the likelihood of less than .000001% seems appropriate
>>for alien race near our own level visiting and crashing. The
>>more likely range is >1000 years (my opinion) in advance of
>>our own. Thus technology is likely better than
>>ours such that crashes are unlikely.

>You keep acting as though you had data on visit rates, crash
>rates, mileage, etc. James. we know nothing about these things.
>Unlikely doesn't mean zero.

<snip>

As I have argued many times before here on UpDates, we need to model this quantitatively or at least semi-quantitatively. What a scientist or intelligence analyst would do is model the various possibilities for ETH beginning at about our own 21st century technological level because the scientific method requires that one start with the simplest before resorting to the more complex (Occam's Razor), it also requires that one break down hard problems into easier ones to solve - instead of the UFO community's constant insistence in solving everything all at once or nothing. Ideas have consequences. Each idea modeled into an array of ETH models will have consequences and limitations on ET behavior that can be tested against the UFO data.

By gradually winnowing through these we can get a better grip on what UFO's could or could not be.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 24](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 15:56:00 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:02:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Gates

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:22:43 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

David, Brad Listers,

In the official report of the Arnold Sighting which he gave we have this quote: "They seemed to hold a definite direction but rather swerved in and out of the high mountain peaks." Also we have another quote: "I observed the chain of these objects passing another high snow-covered ridge in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams"

I recall seeing an estimate that the objects traveled approx 50 miles in 102 seconds which translated to about 1,750 MPH. Darn those Pelicans are fast!!

I would make the personal observation, having been quoted in the press in my life, the only so called "quotes" I would trust is those where we have an actual recording of the interview. Secondly I just don't see pelicans or meteors doing what Arnold said these did.

From the Official Arnold Report we have the following excerpt:

"The sky and air was clear as crystal. I hadn't flown more than two or three minutes on my course when a bright flash reflected on my airplane. It startled me as I thought I was too close to some other aircraft. I looked every place in the sky and couldn't find where the reflection had come from until I looked to the left and the north of Mt. Rainier where I observed a chain of nine peculiar looking aircraft flying from north to south at approximately 9,500 foot elevation and going, seemingly, in a definite direction of about 170 degrees.

They were approaching Mt. Rainier very rapidly, and I merely assumed they were jet planes. Anyhow, I discovered that this was where the reflection had come from, as two or three 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 plane.

These objects being quite far away, I was unable for a few seconds to make out their shape or their formation. Very shortly they approached Mt. Rainier, and I observed their outline against the snow quite plainly.

I thought it was very peculiar that I couldn't find their tails but assumed they were some type of jet plane. I was determined to clock their speed, as I had two definite points I could clock

them by; the air was so clear that it was very easy to see objects and determine their approximate shape and size at almost fifty miles that day.

I remember distinctly that my sweep second hand on my eight day clock, which is located on my instrument panel, read one minute to 3 P.M. as the first object of this formation passed the southern edge of Mt. Rainier. 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 another up or down, but they were pretty much on the horizon to me which would indicate they were near the same elevation as I was.

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. Their speed at the time did not impress me particularly, because I knew that our army and air forces had planes that went very fast.

What kept bothering me as I watched them flip and flash in the sun right along their path was the fact that I couldn't make out any tail on them, and I am sure that any pilot would justify more than a second look at such a plane.

I observed them quite plainly, and I estimate my distance from them, which was almost at right angles, to be between twenty to twenty-five miles. I knew they 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 with them - 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 fuselage of the DC-4.

The more I observed these objects the more upset I became, as I am accustomed and familiar with most all objects flying whether I am close to the ground or at higher altitudes. I observed the chain of these objects passing another high 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. I could quite accurately determine their pathway due to the fact that there were several high peaks that were a little this side of them as well as higher peaks on the other side of their pathway.

As the last unit of this formation passed the southern most high snow-covered crest of Mt. Adams, I looked at my sweep second hand and it showed that they had travelled the distance in one minute and forty-two seconds. Even at the time this timing did not upset me as I felt confident after I would land there would be some explanation of what I saw."

Excerpt thanks to NICAP site at:

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/arnoldka.htm>

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 16:43:14 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:04:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:26:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 16:28:20 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>This shock-and- awe effect
>>would spill over into public life and would be reported in the
>>press - "Truman and Forrestal were seen today looking ashen and
>>pale in this morning's meeting in the White House. Reporters
>>asked the White House press secretary if some bad news had been
>>learned, but secretary said he knew of nothing bad or otherwise.
>>Later in the day, the White House announced postponement of
>>Soviet summit talks, and abruptly dropped plans to implement the
>>new National Security Act legislation, saying that unspecified
>>further modifications had become necessary, and consultations
>>with Congress were in the works to amend the Act. Today, the
>>White House changed its plan for national security but would
>>give no details." Etc. etc. Even though no one was "letting out"
>>any ET secret, the sudden confrontation with ET reality still
>>would have a policy impact in Washington that would be visible.

>Does anyone remember a study by Michael Swords that touched on
>this? There was - if I remember the details correctly - a lot
>interest in UFOs at high levels in the military, at the time of
>the Roswell event. And for a time shortly after the event, some
>of those involved in military UFO concerns began complaining of
>a "silence topside" - meaning that higherups were all at once
>not responding. Or so Swords wrote. The implication, of course,
>was that the high-ranking "topside" officers suddenly found out
>the truth, and for a while weren't sure how to respond to UFO-
>related communications from those who reported to them.

>Does anyone else remember this study? And does Swords'
>contention hold up in the light of further research?

<snip>

Yeah I remember the paper or two in JUFOS as I recall. The
"silence topside" (not the exact quote) was in Col George D.
Garrett, Jr.'s memo of July 30, 1947, in the Collection Branch
of AFBIN Army Air Forces Intelligence at the Pentagon. I'm not
sure what "contention" you mean but because this was the wrong
agency and not involved in the TOP SECRET Roswell policy process
and planning that I discovered by accident, I'm not sure how
much it helps. I interviewed Col Garrett in 1979.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:03:57 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:06:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sparks

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:50:31 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 16:28:20 EST
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>Later in the day, the White House announced postponement of
>>Soviet summit talks, and abruptly dropped plans to implement the
>>new National Security Act legislation, saying that unspecified
>>further modifications had become necessary, and consultations
>>with Congress were in the works to amend the Act. Today, the
>>White House changed its plan for national security but would
>>give no details." Etc. etc. Even though no one was "letting out"
>>any ET secret, the sudden confrontation with ET reality still
>>would have a policy impact in Washington that would be visible.

>You have created an interesting scenario for a book. You are not
>a psychiatrist and the MJ-12 guys were certainly not like
>Stalin. You and James Smith need to understand 'We don't know'.
>Remember that they had lived through bombings killing 100,000
>people in one night. Were they all mentally deranged because of
>it?

What Washington policymaker "lived through bombings killing
100,000 people in one night"?? Tibbetts was not a policymaker.
Stalin had not lived through any such thing as of June 1941.
Plenty of psychiatrists have studied the likely effects of ET
visitation on earth society including those based on such things
as the New Guinea cargo cults and how contact with modern
civilization adversely impacted the primitive natives. Isn't
this dreadful impact on economics, religion, etc., one of the
reasons MJ-12 keeps the ET secret, to prevent panic and massive
disruption of society? So why do you now deny that knowledge of
ET visitation would have a similar heavy impact on the US
policymakers keeping the ET secret?

>Tibbetts didn't wind up deranged by Hiroshima.

Tibbetts wasn't a policymaker.

>>>>>>With the Manhattan Project as a close model, one would expect a
>>>>>>multidisciplinary organization separate from the Army, the Navy,
>>>>>>the AF, the AEC etc to handle things. Call it Majestic 12.

>>>>>>The "Manhattan Project" (that was never its official name) was
>>>>>>not set up by the President and run by a committee of top
>>>>>>interagency directors, generals and scientists. Yes, that refutes
>>>>>>the "Majestic 12" model right there.

>>>Not at all. Surely FDR authorized Manhattan?

>>Again I did not say that! FDR did not "set up" the Manhattan
>>project. But Truman purportedly set up MJ-12! Right from the

>>intro to the alleged EBD (Eisenhower Briefing Document) it says:

>>"... the Majestic-12 (Majic-12) Group ... was established by
>>special classified executive order of President Truman on
>>24 September, 1947...."

>Read the spacial classified EO to Forrestal. "you are hereby
>authorized to proceed... upon your undertaking". It does not
>say "I hereby establish". Or "I am setting up"...

>>There is nothing similar from FDR "establishing" the Manhattan
>>project. Manhattan was set up by a simple classified Army
>>General Order.

>What could be simpler than Truman's 3 sentence memo?

What could be simpler than a similar Roosevelt 3-sentence memo
"authorizing Manhattan to proceed"?? It doesn't exist! Find it
Stan. Find the "close model" of FDR having anything to do with
the setting up of the Manhattan project or "authorizing" anyone
else to "proceed" with setting it up. You can't find it because
it does not exist. So you do not in fact have a "close model"
for MJ-12 with the Manhattan project.

>>Therefore the Manhattan project does not provide
>>an historical precedent supporting the alleged structure and
>>existence of MJ-12, it is not a "close model" but a very distant
>>model or no model at all. Like many military organizations the
>>Manhattan project under the Army had direct interaction with
>>other agencies, many scientists, etc. I do not see how this
>>provides a "close model" for MJ-12, since interactions are
>>routine and prove nothing. Also, why would FDR's way of doing
>>things be a good model for the way Truman did things?
>>Historians note that Truman broke away from FDR's science
>>policy methods and rejected his science advisor Vannevar Bush,
>>as Bush himself said in 1950 to Truman's science policy
>>investigator William T. Golden. Bush was rejected from the very
>>outset as a possible first Presidential Science Advisor, which
>>Truman was considering appointing.

>Note also that Bush was the 2nd oldest of the group and had been
>under enormous stress for many years.

>I asked Geroge Elsey (who served under Truman during his entire
>tenure at the White House) if he had any reason to believe that,
>if there had been something as important as the crash of a
>flying saucer, that Truman would not have appointed any of these
>people to a group to deal with it. He said NO.

I didn't see Elsey's name come up in any of the at least 176 top
scientists and science/military policy officials that Truman's
science policy investigator interviewed at length in 1950.
Elsey's field was foreign policy not science policy and
obviously did not know what Bush himself knew and told Truman's
science policy investigator William T. Golden in 1950 which was
that he (Bush) was shut out of official Washington circles and
that Truman never trusted him or used him but snubbed him and
had since the beginning of Truman's administration, including a
painful episode in 1946-7 when Truman snubbed Bush and appointed
John Steelman to Chairmanship of the President's Scientific
Research Board instead of Bush which Bush resented.

Truman's science policy investigator Golden interviewed most of
the people on the alleged MJ-12 Committee membership list and
did not get high recommendations from them on appointing Bush as
the first Presidential Science Advisor (one of the suggestions
that Golden had been assigned to look into, among others).
Golden got lots of strong warnings to not consider Bush
because of his gross incompetence in mishandling the RDB while
he was Chairman, which Bush left in such bad condition that for
years afterward top scientists such as Oppenheimer and others
literally feared the "collapse of the RDB." Another alleged MJ-
12 member, Lloyd Berkner, was held to be jointly responsible
with Bush for the mismanagement of RDB. Obviously Elsey did not
know about this and/or chose not to talk about it but just
adhere to the public's naive perception of Vannevar Bush as some
kind of scientific war hero.

Today Vannevar Bush's name is so reviled in technology circles
because of his ignorant or bigoted opposition to digital
computers and space travel (he scuttled von Neumann's digital

computer projects in favor of his own hopeless analog dinosaur, he testified against the ICBM, helping kill the project, he held back a-bomb research during the initial 2 critical years despite top physicists begging him to accelerate development, etc.) that his name has become an epithet:

"vannevar - A bogus technological prediction or a foredoomed engineering concept...."

In any case by your own admission you had come up with almost all of the MJ-12 names by 1982 in researching possible or likely members of any secret Roswell recovery and your list was supplied to the AFOSI agent, and the DIA-SAC Colonel working with the AFOSI agent, by Bill Moore, if not by you as well. The scientist-military chiefs list then "majically" appeared in the MJ-12 documents in 1984.

>>When the CIA and NSA were set up under Truman, they were
>>required to have Directors and Deputy Directors who were either
>>military or civilian but not both at the same time, in order to
>>balance civilian and military interests. Where is MJ-12's
>>military Director and civilian Deputy Director, or civilian
>>Director and military Deputy? Who were the alleged MJ-12
>>Directors and Deputy Directors?

>Notice the mix of civilian and military on MJ_12, please.

<snip>

Who was the military Director of MJ-12 and who was the civilian Deputy Director of MJ-12, or civilian Director and military Deputy Director? Here is the actual Truman "model" for national security operations and MJ-12 seems to fail the test. Who was the "General Groves"-type hard-driving leader of MJ-12?

The question was how does the Manhattan project provide a "close model" for MJ-12 as you claimed. I responded by pointing out how remote not close a model the Manhattan project is for MJ-12, if anything it refutes the MJ-12.

Before you try to force-fit the Truman NSC (National Security Council) into some kind of alleged "close model" role for the alleged (and I believe nonexistent fabricated hoax) MJ-12 Committee, let me point out the President was and is still today the Chairman of the NSC - unlike MJ-12 where the President is not even a member! Also, the civilian control over military was forcefully asserted by Truman in the NSC and in the DOD. The official NSC history states that Truman made sure the civilian State Dept controlled the NSC over the protests of the military:

"... Truman named the Secretary of State as the ranking member of the Council [NSC] in his absence and expected the Department of State to play the major role in formulating policy recommendations. This decision disappointed Defense officials who hoped that the Secretary of Defense would be allowed to preside in the President's absence and had offered to locate the NSC staff in the Pentagon. Clifford managed to resist Secretary of Defense Forrestal's efforts to gain control of the NSC."

Where is the State Dept represented on the alleged MJ-12 Committee? Where is State Dept Intelligence (INR) on the MJ-12 Committee? Seems to me the MJ-12 hoaxers had a very limited imagination and poor knowledge of national security history, basically depending for the most part on historical data supplied by Bill Moore and you in your Archives research, so they never thought to include the State Dept in their MJ-12 Committee, even though alien ET visitation is the most "foreign" of all policy developments and ought to necessitate the most careful foreign policy development of all as an entire planet's survival could hang in the balance.

>Are you going to tell us what is wrong with the documents? Or do
>we have to wait for the book? Your theories and speculations are
>not a basis for rejection... so far as I can see.

First off you have the burden of proof to prove the MJ-12 EBD is genuine and not a fraud, not me to prove it is a fraud, and you have yet to convince me or most other researchers. And yeah you'll have to wait till I can edit down my 3,100 pages into a publishable book, which obviously can't be compressed into an email upon demand.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: A Definite Maybe - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:37:55 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:07:34 -0500
Subject: Re: A Definite Maybe - Sparks

>From: Terry Grof <terrygroff.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:14:35 -0600
>Subject: A Definite Maybe

>Source: The Star-Ledger, Newark, New Jersey

<http://tinyurl.com/3gchb>

>There was a fair bit of skepticism, even sneering, when ABC News
>announced that anchor Peter Jennings' newest primetime
>documentary would tackle the UFO phenomenon.

<snip>

>The most intriguing part of the special is its middle section,
>which tracks UFO sightings to the start of the Cold War era
>(which began after World War II and stretched into the
>early '90s) and suggests the sightings were unconscious
>expressions of America's fear of being invaded and dominated by
>an all-powerful alien force (at that time, the Soviet Union was
>our national bogeyman).

>Is it possible that UFO hysteria is a manifestation of a
>superpower's fear of being exposed as powerless, then
>annihilated by forces ranging from communists to right-wing
>militias and foreign terrorists?

If so, then this alleged fear of Soviet attack and
"annihilation" should have caused the "UFO hysteria" in 1948
when the historically documented "war scare" actually occurred
along with the well-known Berlin Crisis and Airlift when people
really did think World War III was imminent. But 1947 was when
the actual UFO modern era began with the US sighting flap, which
was a time of relative international peace and there were no
WWIII-type crises. Instead 1947 had the supposed "UFO hysteria"
and the international crisis year of 1948 was virtually UFO
silent. Same thing in 1961-2 when the world was again on the
brink of nuclear war with Berlin again and with the Cuban
Missile Crisis, and the media was filled with books and movies
scaring people about nuclear holocaust, yet it was one of the
quietest periods in UFO history. So much for this theory of "UFO
hysteria caused by threat of Cold War annihilation."

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 18:57:54 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:10:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 15:22:43 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 17:49:41 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 15:54:37 EST
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>I am convinced that Arnold saw daytime meteor fireballs,
>>>>does that make me a "pelicanist" too? There is nothing
>>>>"scientifically unsustainable" about that.

>>Hi Dave - First off we're going to have to agree to disagree
>>here. I did not intend to present a full case for Arnold seeing
>>meteor fireballs here and it is unfair to expect me to just jump
>>into it. <snip>

I told you I cannot present my full case and I have no time for
this yet you insist on dragging me into an argument over this
after I said we will have to agree to disagree. This is getting
to be borderline rude Dave.

>>>>Concerning the Arnold case, I think we can stipulate from the
>>>>outset that if the objects passed in front of Mt. Rainier then
>>>>the objects could not have been meteors because they would have
>>>>been much too low and flying much too slow. Let us now examine
>>>>what Arnold described.

>>>>>Arnold could not make up his mind about whether he saw tiny
>>>>>objects flashing light in front of the mountain(s) or behind
>>>>>them, and in his first published interview with the morning
>>>>>Chicago Tribune (which beat the afternoon East Oregonian) he
>>>>>said specifically the objects "went behind Mt. Rainier."

>>>>The Chicago Tribune story was the only one that ever claimed
>>>>Arnold said the objects passed behind Rainier. All other
>>>>quotes from Arnold are of the objects clearly passing in front
>>>>of Rainier and of him seeing the outline of the objects against
>>>>the background snow. E.g., Arnold's first radio interview from
>>>>either June 25 or June 26:

>>The Chicago Tribune was not the only time Arnold said the
>>objects went behind Mt Rainier - you yourself quote another such
>>statement below. The June 26, 1947, East Oregonian story you
>>quote, states that Arnold saw the objects go behind an
>>"intervening peak." That peak was Mt Rainier itself as Arnold
>>makes clear in his other longer statements he personally wrote

>>of his sighting.

>Brad, that's an absurd interpretation. A dictionary definition
>of "intervene" is "to lie between." What peak lay behind Rainier
>so that Rainier could intervene?

The "intervening peak" was Mt Rainier itself - he said that peak
(Rainier) blocked his view of the object at one point.

Furthermore, Arnold's only known drawing of his view, made on
the back of one of his company's manila envelopes circa June 25,
1947, shows Mt Rainier but the trail of the objects is dotted
on Rainier itself but a solid line in the sky, showing that
the objects were not seen in front of Rainier but had to be
assumed to have followed the dotted line course behind Rainier
which of course he could not see only could assume, hence the
dotted lines (dotted lines that also trail off, too, making it
even more inconsistent with continuous viewing of anything in
front of Rainier). The drawing was published on the front cover
of IUR several years back.

>Rainier is absolutely massive,
>and if Arnold meant that the objects passed behind Rainier, he
>would have simply said they passed behind Rainier. He wouldn't
>have referred to Rainier as an "intervening peak." Sheesh!

He had already said the objects passed behind Rainier in his
Chicago Tribune interview - all of these interviews happened
within minutes or hours of each other on the same day or two,
late June 25 and 26, 1947. And yes Rainier is massive and has a
major secondary peak, jagged Little Tahoma that juts out,
exactly as Arnold later describes in his detailed full accounts.

>Not that it matters, but you are also trying to make a case for
>"intervening peak" by taking it completely out of context. Let's
>look at the complete quote where Arnold was saying he was able
>to determine distance using an "intervening peak" that blocked
>his view and also compare it to another quote where he again
>says that he could figure the distance because the objects
>flew behind a subpeak of Mt. Rainier:"

>Pendleton East Oregonian (June 26):

>"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."

Yes by seeing the full context of the quote we can see that the
objects were not seen in front of the "peak" (Mt Rainier) but
behind it. The "peak" "intervened" between Arnold and the
objects.

And Arnold was telling the press on that same day June 25-26
that the objects were about 25-30 miles away, which would put
them miles behind the "intervening peak" (Mt Rainier's summit)
not in front of it.

>INS, Portland Oregonian/Austin Statesman, July 11:

>"I reckoned the saucers were 23 miles away," he said, "because
>they flew behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier. I can show
>on the map exactly where the peak is and where I was."

Which "peak of Mt. Rainier" did the objects fly "behind"?
Again Arnold does not say the objects flew in front of anything
but "behind" a peak of Mt Rainier. From Arnold's later
descriptions this peak is clearly Little Tahoma which was behind
and off to the right, and the objects were still farther away
behind Little Tahoma.

>Saying he could determine distance because "an intervening peak
>once blocked his view" and "because they flew behind one of the
>peaks of Mt. Rainier" both mean the same thing.

And that is entirely consistent with meteors flying "BEHIND" Mt
Rainier at a much greater distance. Saying he "reckoned" a
distance is not the same thing as saying he "determined" a
distance, it's just an estimate or even a guess. Estimates of
distance are wrong all the time. Now if Arnold had said the
objects flew a loop around Rainier's summit that could pretty
well bracket the distance with reasonable upper and lower

bounds, but he didn't say that. If the distance was so easily "determined" how come Arnold's distances keep jumping all over the place from 20-25, 23, 25-30 miles (and probably a few others I've forgotten)?

>Essentially the same "intervening peak" quote also appeared in
>the AP version of the story I found in the Portland Oregon
>Journal from June 26. In addition to this, the story also had
>the following quote, making it unambiguously clear what side of
>Rainier Arnold was saying the objects were on:

>"He also said they flew on the west sides of Rainier and [Mt.]
>Adams_, adding this would make it more difficult for them to be
>seen from the ground."

I said from the start that sometimes Arnold would say the objects went behind Rainier and other times in front. But here this is not a direct quotation of Arnold but a reporter's paraphrase. The Chicago Tribune directly quoted Arnold's own words saying he saw the objects go "behind Mt. Rainier."

As I said we will have to agree to disagree. I accept Arnold's direct behind-Rainier statements and you accept Arnold's alleged front-of-Rainier paraphrases, where Arnold never in his own words ever says "I saw the objects in front of Rainier," it's always some one-step-removed inference from which "side," or some juggling of ever-shifting distance numbers or a nebulous statement of seeing something in front of snow but not stating what snow where on which location, etc.

>>I will dig out these other statements later, as I have no time
>>for this now. As for the visual acuity data you need to get data
>>on tiny moving objects, not stationary cards that someone can
>>look at for however long they want 5 minutes even.

<snip>

>I provided a very simple test anyone could do to verify this for
>themselves. Get some small print which you can read with slight
>effort at arms' length (to simulate Arnold just being able to
>make out the shapes). Then slowly move the print at about 1/2
>inch/sec to simulate the angular speed reported by Arnold. You
>will find that you can still read the print when it is moving,
>no problem. You will also find you can move it much faster than
>that and still be able to read it.

This is not a fair test or simulation! The book or paper itself is a huge object that the eye can easily track and a uniform background to see contrast with - unlike Arnold who had tiny nearly invisible specks that he basically could only see when they would intensely flash light, and seen against variegated backgrounds once every 9 seconds or so.

A fairer test is to see if anyone has ever seen in daylight a military supersonic jet at 1200-1800 mph from 20-30 miles away like Arnold's 100-foot objects at 23-30 miles away. And since that was only the minimum distance to Arnold, who has ever been able to see jets out to 50+ miles like the beginning and end of his sighting?

>Could Arnold have described some details in slowly moving
>objects? Sure he could.

Test it out with military jets at 20 to 50 miles like I describe above.

>>Furthermore
>>if you read Arnold's personal accounts where he goes into
>>greater detail than in newspaper articles, he indicates the
>>objects were not continuously visible. He could only see them
>>when they flashed intense light - like a meteor fireball
>>flashing as pieces break off and flame out - every 9 seconds or
>>so. With all 9 objects that meant, he said, that about once
>>every second but at irregular intervals, he could see 1 of the 9
>>objects. So any one of the objects could be seen only about once
>>in 9 seconds. He is vague about what else he could see of the
>>objects. At closest approach he describes "thin black lines."
<snip>

I told you I can't get into all this, I don't have time to review hundreds of pages of files. This is not fair to demand

that I present my full case in an email posting, when others get entire books to present their cases. I simply made a comment and you chose to disagree. I didn't say I was going to get into a big debate about it.

>Arnold's sighting lasted at least 2 minutes if not 3 minutes,
>and I don't know of any documented meteor fireball sightings
>anywhere near that duration.

I dispute Arnold's famous "timing" based on what he actually says about the timing in his own personal accounts, which again I cannot go into here in an email posting.

>These would have had to have been very large meteors to have had
>any hope of lasting as long as Arnold reported. They would have
>been continuously glowing as they skimmed the atmosphere, not
>blinking on and off like Christmas lights. Nor would they ever
>look black when he viewed them against the white backdrop of
>snow and ice. (How could they even do that if they passed behind
>Rainier? Did Arnold have X-ray vision?). Let's get real here.

Did Arnold say the objects were mainly seen when they flashed so bright they were like "blinding arc" light or did he not? This is one of the main grounds on which I disputed Easton's "pelican" theory - birds don't flash sunlight so bright that it is "blindingly" bright like an "arc light."

You should know very well that the retinal afterimage of seeing an intensely bright light is a black or dark spot in the visual field - anyone can test this out by trying it on a sunlit object. Arnold kept seeing alternating bright flashes (which would have been elongated by the objects' velocity into bright lines) and "black lines."

I do not see how it would even have been possible for Arnold to have prevented the "blinding arc-like" flashes from causing black retinal afterimages. I do not see how it is possible for Arnold to have prevented these black retinal afterimages from involuntarily getting projected onto the image of Mt Rainier as he tried to track the objects as they headed into Rainier, even if he had wanted to prevent afterimages from doing that.

>Your meteors would have had to have been hundreds of miles away
>in eastern Washington or over Idaho. They would have been
>visible from the ground for hundreds of miles in any direction,
>as are other large, long-duration meteor fireballs. There should
>have been numerous sighting reports from people in eastern
>Washington, Idaho, Oregon, etc. Where are these reports? They
>don't exist, virtually impossible to explain if these objects
>really had been unprecedented, giant, very long duration meteor
>fireballs.

<snip>

These other reports do exist but again I'm not going to get into it here for the same reasons that it would take way too long and I don't have time for this. I made a comment and you disagree. Let's agree to disagree.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:25:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:12:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Aldrich

>From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:38:23 -0600
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>4. Don't forget that old reports about this planet may have
>>misled the aliens who were taken aback by new and unplanned
>>technological progress on our part that never would have
>>happened had there not been WW 2. There was a tendency on the
>>part of the USA to think that the Russians post WW 2 were just a
>>bunch of dumb peasants without ivy league educations. But they
>>put up the first satellite, the first animal, the first man, the
>>first rocket around the moon. It took a while for us to catch
>>up.. Do notice the enormous difference in our technology between
>>1937 and 1947.

>'They' were not so equipped as you might be lead on to believe,
>however none of those things that you mentioned would be
>possible had they not captured German scientists and technicians
>following WW 2, whom perfected the technology.

>Research can show that, as Red Army marched into Berlin,
>largely, it was the first time they had seen or been made aware
>of possibilities for, indoor plumbing and toilets.

><http://www.aeroscientists.org/rockets2.html>

If you want to believe this mythology. Go ahead. I have one word
for you GiRD.

Thank God, Stalin threw them in jail before WWII, or the world
might be different today.

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947

[[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: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Aldrich

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Good Job Peter Jennings And ABC!

From: **Brian Adams** <ufosource.nul>
Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 21:36:26 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:15:01 -0500
Subject: Good Job Peter Jennings And ABC!

I just finished watching the UFOs Seeing Is Believing special tonight! I give it a good 2 thumbs up! Or four thumbs if you're an ET.

When Dr. J. Allen Hynek to Stanton Friedman to Budd Hopkins to Dr. Michio Kaku to Peter Davenport are shown on the same program... even Art Bell and his wife it came across very well done.

Kudos to SETI's appearance for balance.

I'll say it. "Good job Peter Jennings and ABC!" It's been long overdue. We'll appreciate it very much in seeing more productions like this one.

To all of the others from this List who contributed material and time on the show like Jerome Clark did I say congratulations for a job well done.

Maybe they're holding back some of the other interviews and contributors like Dr. Mack for a followup program if this one gets high enough ratings.

Brian Adams

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:17:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Ledger

>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:58:50 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:54:58 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 20 Feb 2005 16:50:47 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>Finally, of course, the phrase was meant to be amusing, taking
>>off from a fairly recent, rather egregious case of the sort of
>>excess described above. Those who whine that it's "no longer
>>funny" were - here's a shock - not amused in the first place.

>This definition is riddled with subjective judgements. A
>simpler more objective one is; a Pelicanist is someone who
>prefers explanations which do not involve non human
>intelligences to ones that do. The reverse of a Pelicanist is a
>Mysterian, one who prefers explanations involving non human
>intelligences to ones that do not.

Negative Peter,

You don't get to define-or redefine-the meaning of the term. It reads as presented. One who continuously supports an unsupportable theory [often a ridiculous solution at that] to a UFO report.

The ETH has nothing to do with it.

Pelicanists are normally poor readers as well and quite often ignore glaring details in a UFO report. Maybe these poor reading skills have something to do with it. Whatever the reason they ignore most of the report and pick on a small segment of it [in the Ken Arnold case the UFOs were flying through the air so James Easton chose Pelicans-since they too can fly and can be found in North America] and try and run with that.

The first to carry the title proudly was James Easton. But he's had many followers.

The competition for this honor is fierce.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:20:50 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:19:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Kaeser

>From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 18:26:01 -0600
>Subject: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

>Has there ever been talk about an annual subscription fee to
>subscribe at ufoupdates?. I for one, would like to pay a fee so
>that I can post to the list in the future.

>I would imagine that running a site like this takes time and
>it's annoying to edit all those typos like my own. So my
>question to the list is just how do you feel about some fee to
>EBK group for the work performed to keep this site going ?

>I'm not one to bark but I'm thinking somewhere in the range of
>50-100 \$US per year what do you think? Perhaps someones elses
>figure are less that live outside the Canada-US border.

<snip>

For what it's worth. I have an aversion to paying for
information that I can usually find free. The commentary and
information on UpDates is interesting and I would acknowledge
that EBK deserves a lot of credit for hard work and dedication,
but I wouldn't pay for it.

But I'm becoming one of the dinosaurs in this genre and those
who follow will ultimately define how the information is
discussed and released.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Jennings Is Toast - Weber

From: **Bill Weber** <wweber1.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:39:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:21:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Jennings Is Toast - Weber

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <jl.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 21:23:57 -0600
>Subject: Jennings Is Toast

Hi, Alfred,

>Chumped Stanton Friedman and dismissed him and Kevin Randle as
>opportunists!

I agree with you here, and it was a despicable hatchet job.

They weren't particularly genuine when it came to abduction and Hopkins, either, but that was the worst of it.

On the other hand, I have never before seen a credible, network TV anchor ask for further scientific research on the matter of UFOs - and all of it backed up with two hours of supremely credible witnesses.

No, it wasn't as good as it could have been - or even as good as it should have been, but it was far better than anything else I've seen on the networks - or even PBS (the infamous Nova production comes to mind).

There were problems, but I thought it was a positive first step. I hope there's more to follow.

>The ufological fencesitter was in no way encouraged to ask
>difficult questions of Government, Institution, or Agency.

I saw the Jennings production fairly scoff at Air Force rationale as they juxtaposed credible witness testimony with official explanation.

Alfred, our mainstream hasn't yet been able to deal with an immoral war and having a boob for a president, let alone this.

Best,

Bill

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:39:19 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:23:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:09:03 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 10:53:30 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>Placing limitations on them, putting them in our
>>image, as error prone beings is very hard to accept.

>I am not putting them in our image. We have no idea
>how error prone they are unless you have insider
>info. Whether crashes are rare or frequent we don't
>know. Why do you act as though you do? We don't
>know how many mother ships there are and how
>many earth excursion modules each carries or
>how many sorties of how many miles they do
>each day.

I have no info. Maybe I am overestimating them. I think the
advancement of technology provides a bias in any space faring
culture to a high reliability.

Also, we don't know if there are any mother ships.

I comes down to the fact that you think they will allow a
vehicle to fail (total loss or crew and ship) and I do not think
so.

It doesn't matter really if there are a million of sorties a
day, if they seem so interested in not influencing our culture
by "coming out", then they are not goin to allow hard evidence
to appear. If this means perfect reliability/redundancy or
automatic complete disintegration, they aren't leaving anything
to be picked up for messing with the pristine primeval culture
resident on Earth.

>>Combined with automated
>>hardware manufacture and assembly and testing,
>>most uncertainty can be removed. Add the
>>artificial intelligence(s) to the flight
>>control loop then how can it crash???

>You say "most" uncertainty. That is not all.
>>Something unexpected happens. The Titanic
>>was unsinkable.. but it sank.
>James can't you understand how ignorant we are?

You are right, it is not all uncertainty. Since some other races
(likely more advanced) may have weapons that could destroy the
most well planned vehicle, I cannot say "all". I just think
these kind of weapons do not in all likelihood exist on this
planet. I do not subscribe to the notion of a interstellar
police force protecting us from contamination by blasting errant
alien visitors focused on anal probing (if that were the case,
the crash residue would be cleaned up prior to human arrival,

ala MIB).

The Titanic was the product of a primitive culture. Why do you keep equating our backward race with its primitive technology with space faring, interstellar aliens races?

Why is it so hard to make my point that if we are truly being visited by such aliens, a conservative estimation of the technology level they have is roughly at least 1000 years beyond ours? Its hard to imagine how much can happen in 100 years. 1000 years makes my head hurt. What about 10000 years? No way can I imagine that. But I can imagine that they do things alot better than we do. That will be an intrinsic feature of life.

So, it doesn't matter how ignorant WE are. That is pretty clear I think. But this bias on your part to pigeon hole these advanced alien visitors into a category of technical imbecility is annoying.

>>Placing human limitations on them again. Look at
>>what we have done in the past 100 years and it
>>doesn't seem unlikely that in 100 more years that
>>robots, REAL artificial intelligence will be
>>ubiquitous. Organic pilots will not even be needed
>>(a quaint notion really).

>These are theoretical hypothetical notions backed by
>your imagination and nothing else.

Well, I think they are backed up by logical, "theory of technology" ideas. You need imagination sure because we would not progress otherwise.

>>Not know about lightning? Do you think these
>>spacecraft are designed on the fly? They will have
>>likely seen many worlds and have been purposely
>>designed to deal with a wide range of
>>hazards. Likely some craft are specially designed
>>for gas-giants, but worlds like ours have standard
>>phenomena which they
>>really MUST have encountered many times before.

>Maybe it has been a long time since they encountered beings as
>primitive as we are. James, we don't know.

It is of course a possibility. But I believe that the probability, which you choose to accept and I don't, that this was their first landing seems so remote to me that it might as well be impossible.

We must simply disagree.

>>You somehow have proof of alien ET spacecraft
>>crashing. Do you have any DNA sample, spacecraft
>>metal? Its a difficult thing to accept such an
>>extraordinary experience. Why is it that there is
>>no crashed alien evidence? There had to have been
>>many crashes prior to the government secrecy
>>but I have not seen any items from those events either.

>What is your basis for saying "had to have been"? Are
>you omnipotent?

I think you mean omniscient.

I say "had to have been" because if you assume a moderate crash rate, then there must have ALWAYS been crashes. Some of these would have been prior to secret government coverup conspiracies. Maybe they happened during the Ming Dynasty, the Middle Ages, 1800's, 1920's.

If not, then you are suggesting that as of Roswell time period, we got alien visitors (due to nuclear testing?). None before that. However, this seems unlikely based on lots of UFO reports that occured prior to nuclear testing. But if you rule out that data you are okay.

The other possibility is that aliens prior to Roswell had more reliable/safe spacecraft. A technology deevolution. Yeah, right.

Of course there is the other possibility that we were so lucky

that the 1 in a million event occurred at Roswell. That alien spacecraft ARE highly reliable, but the 1 in a million chance event occurred and it was destroyed. Sure, this is a possibility, but when you look at the odds, it seems very unlikely.

If you assume a moderate-low crash rate and assume alien visitors for >10000 years, then we should have a helluva lot of crashed spacecraft (which the aliens never clean up because they don't care and which haven't been boxed by the government minions).

>There is a great deal of evidence. Eyewitness
>testimony to wreckage of very strange
>characteristics is evidence. Do you see
>me saying proof?

Okay, I agree there is evidence. Something happened. I do not jump to the conclusion it is an alien spaceship though.

Personally, I would like there to be aliens visiting us and would be delighted to have the opportunity to view their technology, even from a distance. But I would be very disappointed if they were so fallible and human-like to allow crashes of their (or our) craft.

>>They don't need to be perfect. In fact they can
>>be as dumb as us. But they really should have
>>better computers than us.

>They may well have better computers. And 747s
>have much better computers than Cessnas. They
>still have crashed.

Yes, but the crash rate of 747s is less than Cessnas. Extrapolate computers 1000 years into the future and the crash rate should be unmeasurable. Also, both vehicles are energy and power and mass limited. If a Cessna could carry 100 tons, then do you not think it would have backup systems galore. Same for the 747. Why doesn't the 747 have a ejectible cabin compartment with a parachute? Multiple cold and hot engine backups? Thick shielding?

>You are suffering from a bad case of 'will not to
>believe'. Better see somebody about that.

Perhaps I am being too pragmatic and engineerlike. Anyway, I think you underestimate the capabilities of alien visitors.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

50 Years On UFO Interest Still Intense

From: Loren Coleman <lcoleman.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:13:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:27:02 -0500
Subject: 50 Years On UFO Interest Still Intense

Source: ABC News

<http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Primetime/story?id=3D528711&page=3D1>

02-25-05

50 Years On, UFO Interest Still Intense

=46rom Flying Saucers to Alien Invaders, a Brief History Feb. 24, 2005

Aliens and UFOs have been such a staple of American pop culture it's hard to believe the fascination only began about 50 years ago.

It started with a spark of interest, exploded, and continues to this day in a constant burn.

The UFO era began on June 24, 1947, with a recreational pilot named Kenneth Arnold, says Jerome Clark, author of "The UFO Encyclopedia."

Clark describes Arnold as a guy with not a lot of imagination. He didn't read science fiction. He didn't have any occult interests. "He lived pretty close to the ground, mentally," Clark told ABC News.

So, Clark says, when Arnold saw nine disc-shaped objects flying at some considerable speed over Mount Rainier in Washington, the pilot thought that he was witnessing a secret military experiment.

Arnold died in 1984, but in an interview at the time, he said the objects "looked something like a pie plate that was cut in half with a sort of a convex triangle in the rear. I'd be glad to confirm it with my hands on a Bible, because I did see it."

The press called the nine objects Arnold described "flying saucers." Because Arnold was regarded as a credible witness, Clark said the press didn't believe he was making up the story.

Sightings Spike

In the next two or three weeks there were many hundreds of sightings, Clark said.

In response, the Army Air Force (the precursor to the U.S. Air Force) launched an investigation, and on Sept. 23, 1947, Gen. Nathan Twining categorically stated "the phenomenon reported is something real and not visionary or fictitious."

It was the beginning of the Cold War and Americans feared a national security problem =8B that airspace was being penetrated by the Soviet Union. The government established a full-time office to investigate the sightings, and quickly came to realize that they were not dealing with Soviet aircraft. Nothing man-made performed like the reported flying saucers.

Then two experienced commercial pilots, Clarence Chiles and John Whitted, reported their own encounter with a UFO immediately after it happened over Alabama on July 24, 1948.

They said it was a cigar-shaped object, perhaps 100 feet long, flying faster than any aircraft they had ever seen. It had two rows of windows and they could see lights inside and orange-red flames shooting out of the tail.

Air Force investigators trusted the testimony of these experienced pilots. More pilot accounts emerged.

In the fall of 1948, Air Force investigators sent a top-secret report to Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, the Air Force's chief of staff, saying Earth was being visited by alien spaceships.

Threat to National Security

Vandenberg remained unconvinced. The Air Force wanted the flying saucer phenomenon to go away, but the popular fascination with mysterious flying objects was growing.

In 1952, the Air Force received more UFO reports than any other year in history. "Most alarmingly, the sightings were focused on Washington D.C.," Clark said. "At least three radar systems in Washington, in the area, were picking up unidentified targets." It looked like the most important airspace in the country was being penetrated.

An Air Force Air Intelligence Report in December 1948 said there was a public hysteria.

The reports of flying saucers had become an indirect threat to national security, said Robert Goldberg, author of "Enemies Within: The Culture of Conspiracy in Modern America." So many calls were clogging the Pentagon's communications channels, the nation was being left vulnerable to a Soviet attack, he said.

President Truman ordered the CIA to make recommendations on how the Air Force should handle the UFO problem.

The CIA convened a panel headed by the physicist H.P. Robertson. The panel said it was important to remove the aura of mystery from the UFO phenomenon, so that people would no longer take them seriously and would stop reporting them.

Flying saucers were to be made the subject of ridicule. But it proved impossible to control the public interest. One of the most respected publications in America, Life magazine, published photographs of a UFO taken by a farmer in its June 26, 1950, issue.

Hollywood further inflamed the public appetite with movies like "The Day the Earth Stood Still" (1951) and "Earth Versus the Flying Saucers" (1956).

Interest continues to this day. Recent years have seen an explosion of interest in the form of books, TV shows like "The X-Files" and movies like "Independence Day."

A remake of "The War of the Worlds" =8B the H.G. Wells classic that Orson Welles turned into a radio broadcast that terrified U.S. audiences in 1938 =8B is even due to hit theaters this year.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 07:20:22 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:29:53 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>Last night on C2C AM, Richard C. Hoagland spouted how he got
>"inside information" that the ABC UFO special going to be
>"groundbreaking TV". I immediately deprogrammed the special from
>my Tivo. I knew that it was going to be crap. I'm glad I saved
>the hard drive space.

Richard is also artificial structures on planets and moons with
the latest being evidence that Saturn's moon Iapetus is
artificial! Hmmm... those photos make it look like the Death
Star from Star Wars.

>I watched the Jennings special, and besides seeing the face
>behind Jerry Clark's prose, saw nothing of any revelatory,
>scientific, or even much entertainment value.

>Stan Friedman was offered up as a UFO "nut", with zero mention
>of MJ-12 or any "Cosmic Watergate" except as hyperbolic talk
>show fodder. Although many of the supposed MJ-12 "players" were
>noted. If my recent characterization of the Friedman perception
>was that of a "mad scientist" was misplaced, one can scarcely
>argue it now. Network prime time no less.

I was disappointed that Stanton did not get his characteristic
rebuttal to the Mogul balloon explanation for Roswell, but Karl
Pflock got in more than his two cents.

>Roswell? The holy grail of Ufology? Nope, just a money machine
>for charlatans per Mr. Jennings.

Someone tell Bill Moore that as he constantly complained about
being poorer than a church mouse even after his money-making
Roswell book came out. Maybe Berlitz took the lion's share of
the profits.

>Budd Hopkins was painted as little more than a Svengali.

Budd also had no rebuttal time regarding the accusations of sleep
paralysis by skeptical psychologists. I had to restrain my wife
(an abductee) from getting very angry when hearing this. She
remarked, "they should be taken".

>Either I missed Dick Hall, or they left him on the cutting room
>floor along with John Mack.

>Seth Shostak was presented as one of the few really smart ET
>guys on the planet, even though all the millions spent on SETI
>have resulted in nada, zip, bupkis, just like the search for
>hard evidence of UFO crashes.

Seth was a little too adamant IMO.

<snip>

>It was a pure puff piece, except that now network television can

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>state with a straight face..."been there, done that, nothing to
>see here... move along". Case closed.

You are probably right unfortunately.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Jennings Blinded By Skepticism Ignorant Or

From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 07:25:35 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:04:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Jennings Blinded By Skepticism Ignorant Or

>From: William Hand <ufotruth.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 23:17:35 -0500
>Subject: Jennings Blinded By Skepticism Ignorant Or What?

>The Peter Jennings UFO special on ABC was overall very under
>researched, very narrow-minded, quite short in length, and
>barely touched the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the most
>stunning evidence that extraterrestrials are visiting our
>planet.

>Countless extraordinary cases were not even mentioned by this
>program. Instances where nuclear missiles were remotely turned
>off by UFOs, in which UFOs were captured by the space shuttle,
>instances where energy pulses were seen shooting at these UFOs
>in orbit, even other cases in which craft were captured on radar
>while being chased by jets, the numerous Mexico City sightings
>of the 1990's to present day, the UFOs encountered by the Belgium
>Air Force that were seen by so many, the Kecksburg case, the
>Rendalsham Forest incident, many high level government/military
>witnesses to the coverup, and so many other important aspects to
>the UFO phenomenon were not even considered!

>For goodness sakes, the entire MJ-12 issue was not even
>discussed!

>Additionally, skeptics were given lots of time to talk but
>Ufologists that could have easily refuted their claims (like the
>Phoenix lights were just flares) were not even interviewed.
>Also, they did not even interview city council woman Francis
>Barwood who went on a single person _crusade_ to get to the
>truth about the Phoenix lights only to have the Governor of
>Arizona announce an emergency press conference to bring out two
>of his goons dressed in kooky alien costumes to try and belittle
>all the eye witnesses who saw a huge solid object. His quote
>was, "You guy's need to stop taking this stuff so seriously."

I was called to be interviewed on the Phoenix Lights, but the
producers decided that James McGaha of Tucson was a better bet.
As an arch UFO skeptic, he never sees anything but airplanes and
stars in the sky. UFOs - _not_.

>However, what _really_ upset me the most was his complete
>bashing and debunking of the Roswell UFO crash. Instead of doing
>any real research into Roswell he basically refused to question
>anything the Airforce said, labeled all Roswell researchers as
>"gold diggers", claimed that no one can be certain if Jesse
>Marcel was even telling the truth, and that all new witnesses
>were frauds that were just jumping on the bandwagon!

<snip>

No interview with David Rudiak on the analysis of balloon
material. Mogul - _not_. Oh, would someone please explain how a
crashing balloon and radar reflector makes such a gouge in the
earth. The Air Force thrived on its handy explanations: balloons
or the planet Venus.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Jennings Is Toast - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:35:50 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:06:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Jennings Is Toast - Sandow

>From: Bill Weber <wweber1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:39:29 -0500
>Subject: Re: Jennings Is Toast

>No, it wasn't as good as it could have been - or even as good as
>it should have been, but it was far better than anything else
>I've seen on the networks - or even PBS (the infamous Nova
>production comes to mind).

>There were problems, but I thought it was a positive first step.
>I hope there's more to follow.

<snip>

>I saw the Jennings production fairly scoff at Air Force
>rational as they juxtaposed credible witness testimony with
>official explanation.

I agree. Later on in the show, the SETI scientists could just as well seem smug, instead of scientific. Hard to know what the show's position was on that. Except that when they brought in Kaku, he more or less demolished his scientific colleagues. One thing the show might have done, but didn't - ask the SETI scientists how much they really know about UFO research.

On balance, the show seemed to call for more research. By scientists, no less. Score one for our side, no matter how lame parts of the presentation were.

Another plus - the way they let witnesses speak for themselves, especially in the Minot case. Their testimony was, for all practical purposes, not refuted. The SETI scientists talked in general terms, but didn't touch any actual cases. The testimony of the witnesses resonated clear to the end of the show.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Hamilton

From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 07:46:52 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:07:51 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Hamilton

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:26:03 -0500
>Subject: ABC Jennings Special

>The first segment was weighted positive by the number of
>witnesses. Unfortunately they combined the "8 o'clock hour"
>events over Phoenix (triangle) with th 10 PM videos that
>probably show flares, as described on my web site.

>The astronomer guy clearly didn't know anything about the 8:30
>PM triangle or else simply ignored all that testimony in favor
>of commenting only upon the "lights in the sky" that were
>videod at 10 PM.

Bruce, aside from our disagreement about the so-called flares, a
young man reported to the Phoenix Arizona Republic that he had
seen 5 airplanes fly over on the night of March 13th, 1997 which
probably inspired James McGaha's statement.

There were suggestions the formation of lights seen traveling
from North to South at around 8:15 - 8:30 p.m. were airplanes.

In an article by Tony Ortega in the New Times mentions Amateur
astronomer Mitch Stanley, 21, who said he had a brief look at
the lights through his Dobsonian telescope and could see very
bright lights on the wings of airplanes.

That night he was with his mother, Linda, and noticed the lights
coming from the north. When he looked through his 10-inch
telescope, he claimed that he could see the lights on the
underside of squarish wings.

Aside from the fact that planes do not usually have lights on
the underside of the wings, his report is almost unique in this
respect.

Other witnesses who saw the formation (object) saw it at closer
range and could not detect any aircraft sounds or see any wings
with conventional navigational lighting patterns at the wing
tips. All agree, in fact that no strobe lights or blinking
lights were seen on the mystery object (or formation).

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

The Definitive Special About Alien Life

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 07:50:16 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:10:16 -0500
Subject: The Definitive Special About Alien Life

Review of Peter Jennings Report on UFOs

Peter Jennings ABC special:

The definitive special about alien life ...has yet to be made.

by Will Bueche
John E. Mack Institute

Peter Jennings' report on UFOs was awaited with much excitement by people such as myself who have an interest in the subject of alien contact - excitement which was only partially tempered by the unfortunate news that the final interview given by Harvard's Dr. John Mack, a leading authority on the subject of alien contact, would not be presented in the finished program. Still, the potential for a powerful program remained, due to the high quality work which Peter Jennings Productions are known for. I duly tuned in the broadcast this evening.

It seems that the best of what Peter Jennings Productions (and the filmmakers at Springs Media) delivered was a strong 20 or 30 minute introduction to the UFO subject, and then (much later in the program) an all-too-brief couple of minutes of modern perspectives on how alien visitation could be possible (from internationally recognized authority in theoretical physics Dr. Michio Kaku).

The first segment persuasively argued that early investigations of flying saucers on the part of the Air Force or government were so weak as to be considered a squandered opportunity for knowledge. But from that segment on, the program seemed rather uninspired.

If the program had taken the lead of modern scientists such as Dr. Michio Kaku or Brian Greene this program could have been a grand statement about the current theories and ideas about ufos/alien encounters, and how we might investigate them if we apply this modern knowledge. I refer to knowledge which - as anyone who has looked into alien encounters would appreciate - involves theoretical physics' insights into the structure of reality as well as theories of consciousness or, to put it more simply, theories of how perception of reality is affected by different states of consciousness.

Instead, modernity was given a couple minutes of limelight (in the form of Dr. Kaku explaining how modern physics believes that seemingly vast distances between worlds could be crossed in an instant) followed by people who are retreading theories of the 1970s - including present day researchers who are parroting theories from that era (the people from SETI, Harvard's Dr. McNally, and - to be entirely fair - even some "pro" ufo folks).

If only Jennings' program had been as fascinated by contemporary theories as they were by the early days of the UFO era. It was evidently not to be, and therefore this special was itself an opportunity squandered.

Sadly, the definitive special about alien life has yet to be made.

Viewers Respond

Reaction to the Peter Jennings Special, sampled from the web:

"...thank god for the Dr. Kaku segment; as he said, I believe most of our skeptics are only thinking 100 years in the future; not 1 million. The arrogance [of some scientists who] think we know the way the universe works is amazing to me - especially because science has been revised and proven wrong so many times in the past. Considering the age of the universe, why would we assume that any race near us would be as young as we are? And using radio waves for god's sake?"

"John Mack, whose interview was cut, was sorely missed here as plenty of abduction stuff was offered up, only to be coolly dismissed by pretty Dr. Clancy, with little or no rebuttal or debate presented."

"...the 'experts' have that haughtiness that indicates they think they know what is going on in the universe. Well, nobody knows. I'm inclined to think that what actually is going on is so bizarre that any one of us would be hard pressed to believe it [unless it] were it presented to us in a way we would understand -- an unlikely prospect in itself. There's likely more to it than we can imagine."

"I was left with the feeling that [Jennings] wants the audience to give the topics serious consideration, and that scientists should give it serious study."

"It seems as if a number of the Scientists, Psychologists, Psychiatrists and others interviewed for these and similar topic shows pound the drum of the fallibility of memory and the concept that the mind is weak storage device because everything is filtered through perception and that the information within is prone to be rewritten and edited over time. To some extent I believe that most would agree this is true, but I hardly believe this means that memory should never be trusted. After all, some folks put these little PhDs, MDs, and other markers of learned knowledge behind their names, which I would assume, means they don't doubt their own experience, suggest that we should trust their memory, and what they say should somehow hold some weight because of the memory of their past educational experience, which is somehow immune to be rewritten or edited. Is that faulty logic? Are these two different concepts?"

"It's easy to tell the smart people from the dumb people. Compare some of those skeptics on the show with their smirks and blank eyes to the bright light of Michio Kaku's eyes and his clear passion for learning and physics. I think there are really two kinds of people in the world - those who are fascinated by the universe and what it might contain, and those who want to just plain contain it within a predetermined idea structure."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:04:05 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:12:50 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

<snip>

>Anyone who honestly felt that this was going to be anything
>other than a play for sweeps ratings was sorely disappointed. To
>those who were duped into providing grist for this "pap mill"
>have my sympathies.

>It was a pure puff piece, except that now network television
>can state with a straight face..."been there, done that, nothing
>to see here... move along". Case closed.

<snip>

>In the end, I was more entertained by Project Runway. And I was
>more informed by the Daily Show... the fake news.

>A dark day for Ufology, and is that the distant sound of a bell
>tolling?

Hi Kyle,

Pretty much my take on it, as well. There was a little light,
perhaps a big one, at the end of the tunnel or the program. That
was the observations by Michio Kaku.

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:08:47 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:14:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 15:56:00 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>In the official report of the Arnold Sighting which he gave we
>have this quote: "They seemed to hold a definite direction but
>rather swerved in and out of the high mountain peaks." Also we
>have another quote: "I observed the chain of these objects
>passing another high snow-covered ridge in between Mt. Rainier
>and Mt. Adams"

>I recall seeing an estimate that the objects traveled approx 50
>miles in 102 seconds which translated to about 1,750 MPH. Darn
>those Pelicans are fast!!

>I would make the personal observation, having been quoted in the
>press in my life, the only so called "quotes" I would trust is
>those where we have an actual recording of the interview.
>Secondly I just don't see pelicans or meteors doing what Arnold
>said these did.

>>From the Official Arnold Report we have the following excerpt:

>"The sky and air was clear as crystal. I hadn't flown more than
>two or three minutes on my course when a bright flash reflected

<snip>

>As the last unit of this formation passed the southern most high
>snow-covered crest of Mt. Adams, I looked at my sweep second
>hand and it showed that they had travelled the distance in one
>minute and forty-two seconds. Even at the time this timing did
>not upset me as I felt confident after I would land there would
>be some explanation of what I saw."

>Excerpt thanks to NICAP site at:

><http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/arnoldka.htm>

This is all presented in great detail, along with excerpts from
his book for side-by-side comparison and detailed analysis of
the "explanations" (including meteors and pelicans) at:

<http://brumac.8k.com/KARNOLD/KARNOLD.html>

Also included at that site is a transcript of his first radio
interview.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Website Traffic Increase Last Night

From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:18:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:20:14 -0500
Subject: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

Hi Errol, List.

I was curious as to whether anybody else with a website saw an increase in traffic last night as a result of the ABC show.

The NICAP site usually averages around 15 -20 hits an hour and maybe 150-200 hits a day but during the 8pm to 9pm hour last night the hits increased to 400 and 150-200 an hour for a few hours afterwards. A weekly total for the site is averaging around 1300 lately but the total for yesterday alone was 1222. I'd guess that somewhere near 1000 occurred after the show began airing.

Adam

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:27:40 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:13:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 18:57:54 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>Did Arnold say the objects were mainly seen when they flashed so
>bright they were like "blinding arc" light or did he not? This
>is one of the main grounds on which I disputed Easton's
>"pelican" theory - birds don't flash sunlight so bright that it
>is "blindingly" bright like an "arc light."

>You should know very well that the retinal afterimage of seeing
>an intensely bright light is a black or dark spot in the visual
>field - anyone can test this out by trying it on a sunlit
>object. Arnold kept seeing alternating bright flashes (which
>would have been elongated by the objects' velocity into bright
>lines) and "black lines."

>I do not see how it would even have been possible for Arnold to
>have prevented the "blinding arc-like" flashes from causing
>black retinal afterimages. I do not see how it is possible for
>Arnold to have prevented these black retinal afterimages
>from involuntarily getting projected onto the image of Mt
>Rainier as he tried to track the objects as they headed into
>Rainier, even if he had wanted to prevent afterimages from doing
>that.

I actually did an experiment in which I used a mirror at a distance to reflect the sun into my eyes. The afterimage from staring at the reflection was not black, but rather colored and pale.... Looking at a metallic reflection of the sun is like looking at the sun. Whenever I look at the sun (briefly!) it "burns" a hot spot on the retina which remains looking bright for a second or so. Then it fades to a pale afterimage with a pale greenish center and with a reddish halo around. It does not look black. The pale afterimage can last for a minute or more.

Of course, the angular size of the sun is about 1/2 degree which is considerably larger than the angular size of the objects Arnold saw. Each one would have reflected only a portion of the sun's light. In a detailed analysis done 5-6 years ago during the previous "tempest in a teapot" over Arnold, I calculated that to appear blindingly bright from a distance of 20 some miles, a solar reflection would have to be from a rather flat surface. A noticeably curved surface would have caused the reflected light to diverge and dissipate too much.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 06:33:16 -1000
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:16:18 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 00:30:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 12:59:07 -1000
>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 13:51:19 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

<snip>

>>As for the rest of Dr. Salla's post, the description of SAP/CAP/
>>etc. is all very interesting but one wonders what to do with it.
>>My own opinion is that we will never get the straight story from
>>the government until we have found it out on our own... at which
>>point the government may say, "Oh yeah, we knew that all along!"

>>How can we find out what's going on with SAP/CAPs if we ignore
>>the very whistleblowers telling us what's happening because we
>>can't confirm their school records or some other arbitrary
>>criterion a parsimonious researcher stipulates as a necessary
>>condition? One might think they are doing 'good science' by
>>raising the evidentiary bar up high that only watertight
>>whistleblower testimonies make it over the hurdle. In the
>>process, you eliminate witnesses like Lazar, and all you have
>>left are those like former FAA Air Chief John Callahan with some
>>records of radar sightings of fast moving UFOs around a Japanese
>>Jumbo jet, and evidence that the government didn't want the FAA
>>seriously investigating this
>>(<http://www.ufoevidence.org/documents/doc1324.htm>). If that's
>>the sort of hard evidence with credible whistleblower testimony
>>that will be universally accepted, then this field of UFO
>>research will grow very very slowly, lose innovative researchers
>>capable of understanding what's going on in the SAPs/CAPs
>>dealing with ETV/EBE research, and become increasingly irrelevant
>>to the general public who seek answers to what is happening.

>Don't disparage Mr. Callahan. At least you can believe him
>because what he says is backed up by documentary evidence and
>witnesses. The most complete report on the Japan Airlines
>sighting, even more complete than the FAA's own report, is at:

><http://brumac.8k.com/JAL1628/JAL1628.html>

Aloha Bruce,

I'm not disparaging Mr Callahan. I'm disparaging the myopic
focus on sightings cases that dominates contemporary UFO
research.

The best documented sightings analyses were done by Donald
Keyhoe back in the 40s and 50s. He used the testimony and radar
evidence of Airforce pilots and other military professionals.

Keyhoe was a giant in the UFO field and had the best evidence to work with because of his contacts and acumen, yet this still wasn't enough to tip the scales. Once the military services introduced JANAP 146, the tap was turned off and the best evidence drained to a trickle, at least in the US. Obviously, political and national security factors had come into play to stop the evidence getting out.

These political and national security factors are what we need to focus on. Why bother with more sightings cases and analyses?

Keyhoe's work has shown the legitimacy of UFO sightings research, let's move into the more difficult areas of waived Special Access Programs and whistleblower testimonies concerning these.

People like Bob Lazar, Robert Dean, Clifford Stone, Dan Sherman, etc., reveal much of what is happening but many UFO researchers don't want to go there.

Those researchers who do venture into that field are criticized for being credulous and sloppy, and not having the right emphasis on hard evidence when the role of national agencies in manipulating hard evidence is ignored. UFO research needs to move on.

Nevertheless, I respect Mr Callahan's courage in coming forward and those acknowledging what he has to offer to contemporary UFO researchers.

In peace

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:04:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:17:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:34:49 -0800>
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>It might be that he was referring to some intervening peak along
>his line of sight N.W. to Mt. Rainier. But I don't know of any
>peaks around there in the Cascade foothills to the S.W. of Mt.
>Rainier that are taller than around 6500 ft, while his flight
>altitude was around 9200 ft. Yet if the saucers flew low enough
>and close enough behind such a peak they could briefly have been
>out of sight. But such a peak shouldn't be called a sub-peak of
>Mt. Rainier. Yet if Arnold was later able to identify the sub-
>peak as having been 25 miles away from his plane at some point,
>it should be a peak well marked on a topo map.

>Prospector Fred Johnson was in the Mt. Adams area then, probably
>at around 6000 ft-- he was probably above timberline but not
>trying to scale Mt. Adams. He estimated the saucers were only
>some 1000 ft above him when they flew south past him, or perhaps
>at around 7000 ft. This argues against their having been briefly
>eclipsed by any small irregularity of Mt. Rainier's broad peak,
>since I don't think Arnold ever said that they changed their
>altitude grossly, as from near 14,000 ft to 7000 ft, as they
>traveled southwards.

My interpretation is that, whereas Arnold estimated that the
objects were at 9500 ft as they passed Rainier (not at 14,000
ft), they were actually about 2000 ft lower, at least when they
passed Rainier, and maybe also while crossing Rainier's face.

This would place them low enough to "dip into canyons" south of
Rainier and to be at an altitude consistent with the 7000 ft
estimate based on Fed Johnson's sighting.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:08:37 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:19:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Maccabee

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 19:57:34 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:26:18 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>not responding. Or so Swords wrote. The implication, of course,
>>was that the high-ranking "topside" officers suddenly found out
>>the truth, and for a while weren't sure how to respond to UFO-
>>related communications from those who reported to them.

>>Does anyone else remember this study? And does Swords'
>>contention hold up in the light of further research? I'd
>>especially love to hear what Wendy thinks.

>This was Swords' 30-page study in the CUFOS publication "The
>Roswell Report, a Historical Perspective" (ed. George
>M.Eberhart), July 1991.

>About half of the paper consists of documents, e.g. FBI papers,
>the Twining memorandum, and the infamous Schulgen document of
>Oct 28, 1947, now known to be a forgery (a 1985 retype of the
>original with certain phrases altered). Dr Swords relies a lot
>on these fake passages to bolster his case that certain
>"topside" officers knew the truth in late 1947.

Actually the reference to "topside officers" comes from an AF
document I found in the FBI file in 1977 which is definitely NOT
a fake. The Schulgen document was altered by addition of a
phrase mentioning "interplanetary". However, by far most of it
was not a fake.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:45:36 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:20:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Tonnies

>From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 18:26:01 -0600
>Subject: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

>Has there ever been talk about an annual subscription fee to
>subscribe at ufoupdates?.

I would personally be willing to pay. I think \$50-\$100 is unreasonable. But where else can you find an orderly, modified List of this caliber?

I would guess a \$25 annual subscription would primarily keep die-hard subscribers while a \$10 or \$5 subscription might fare better as far as retaining readers. And with no readership, what's the point - unless the goal is to make UpDates a "research" speciality list?

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot.nul)

Website: <http://www.mactonnies.com>

Daily blog: <http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

"After the Martian Apocalypse" available from Amazon!

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/074348293X>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

June 24th '47 & January 7th '48

From: Loren Coleman <lcoleman.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:54:00 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:23:11 -0500
Subject: June 24th '47 & January 7th '48

Who are these people in Jasper, Alabama? And what do they have to gain by flooding the newslines with UFO historical stories today?

:-) Loren

Fri, 25 Feb 2005

Famous UFO Sightings: Cascade Mountains

http://www.juiceenewsdaily.com/0205/news/ufo_cascade.html

juiceenewsdaily - Jasper, AL, USA

On June 24th 1947 pilot Kenneth Arnold was flying over the Cascade Mountains when his attention was drawn to a set of nine strange looking objects darting <snip>

Famous UFO Sightings: The Mantell Case

http://www.juiceenewsdaily.com/0205/news/ufo_mantell.html

juiceenewsdaily - Jasper, AL, USA

On January 7th 1948 at 1.20pm the Godman Air Field tower crew sighted a bright, disc shaped object. <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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Jennings Is Toast - Freeman

From: Kelly Freeman <Khfflsciufu.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:14:53 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:24:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Jennings Is Toast - Freeman

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 10:35:50 -0500
>Subject: Re: Jennings is Toast

>>From: Bill Weber <wweber1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 09:39:29 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Jennings Is Toast

<snip>

>>No, it wasn't as good as it could have been - or even as good as
>>it should have been, but it was far better than anything else
>>I've seen on the networks - or even PBS (the infamous Nova
>>production comes to mind).

>>There were problems, but I thought it was a positive first step.
>>I hope there's more to follow.

<snip>

>>I saw the Jennings production fairly scoff at Air Force
>>rationale as they juxtaposed credible witness testimony with
>>official explanation.

<snip>

>On balance, the show seemed to call for more research. By
>scientists, no less. Score one for our side, no matter how lame
>parts of the presentation were.

>Another plus - the way they let witnesses speak for themselves,
>especially in the Minot case. Their testimony was, for all
>practical purposes, not refuted. The SETI scientists talked in
>general terms, but didn't touch any actual cases. The testimony
>of the witnesses resonated clear to the end of the show.

Bill, Greg and List,

I tend to agree with both of your assessments. I was pleasantly surprised at how positive the first hour was by presenting the witness testimony along with animations that clearly defied the "explanations" put forth by Sostak and the others.

It certainly did have its low points. The segment on Roswell was unfortunate, and Mr. Friedman should have had adequate rebuttal time to the "wisdom" of Karl Pflock. Too little time to deal with such a complex issue. Same can be said with the segment on abductions. The McNally "team" scored on that one only because the issue wasn't explored more thoroughly.

In the final half hour, it was reassuring to hear Michio Kaku refute the myopic thinking of the "too far too travel" naysayer scientists by challenging them to open their minds. That, IMO, was a big_plus!

Finally, ending the show with Mr. Davenport demonstrating that UFOs continue to be seen/reported was also a plus. I think maybe

the show left the viewer wanting to know more. All in all, there were definitely more positive moments than negative ones. Perhaps in the days/weeks to come, we will begin to see the real impact, if any, this special will have on mainstream thinking regarding UFOs. It would also be interesting to find out how the videos/DVDs sell that were advertised at the end of the show. I am going to buy one.

Best,

Kelly

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:27:02 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:26:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:23:12 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:44:42 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>I suspect that the TRUFOS are not representative of a unique
>>phenomenon but like IFOS are a heterogeneous collection of many
>>different things, though not perhaps the same things which
>>generate the vast bulk of IFOs.

>Peter

>I agree with this. It's extremely unlikely that our
>investigative and deductive filters are so refined as to have
>sieved a perfectly pure sample of one class of phenomena. Since
>we have no idea what we are looking for this could only have
>happened by chance. It's inevitable that the residue is a
>complicated mixture of objective and subjective processes about
>which we are fairly ignorant.

>But this is not a satisfactory conclusion. It merely restates
>the question of interest to us (or the spectrum of questions) in
>a richer and more concentrated form. This is as far as
>investigation has brought us! Maybe not far, from an absolutist
>point of view, but science in reality is like all experience an
>endlessly reiterative activity. ("We shall not cease from
>exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to return
>back where we started and know the place for the first time."
>T.S.Eliot - a transatlantic emollient for the culturally
>polarised UFO community!)

>You wish to go further, and I think you are proposing that
>_none_ of those "many different things" is a truly remarkable
>thing. But to do this is actually to propose that this is an
>homogeneous sample, in terms of an underlying uniform
>unremarkability. This may not seem quite as unlikely as that the
>whole residue of TRUFOS is uniformly amazing, but it is somewhat
>unlikely. It masquerades as a "simple" option in the spirit of
>Occam's Razor by importing an unknown amount of explanatory
>complexity to impose an artificial uniformity on nature.

>In my opinion the messier but more realistic assumption is that
>the unknown causes of the sample will exhibit some
>heterogeneity, and that there will be a spectrum of remarkability.

That seems fair enough, but I think you need to define
"remarkability" in this context.

Peter Rogerson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Seeing Is Believing Naught

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:27:50 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:29:19 -0500
Subject: Seeing Is Believing Naught

"Seeing Is Believing," Naught

by Alfred Lehmborg
www.alienview.net

I saw Peter Jennings on a high-school trip to Sacramento when I was a kid in 1965 or thereabouts. A local-news guy in the California Capital, I think (who cares?), it was pretty obvious, even to a teen-aged, predictable, and oblivious moi, that he was one of "fair-haired lot" on his way up.

Hustled onto buses to see him from our sleepy little town of Elk Grove, I wondered what the big deal was. Verily, when he finished his talk, I still didn't know. All I heard then was "yadda yadda, blah blah-blah blah... blah."

That's all I heard for two hours last night, too, 40 years later: well traveled, safe, and predicable "yadda" with oppressive overdoses of the conventional "blah." Such was his ballyhooed ABC program on the subject of UFOs.

Flatly, Jennings took the easy way out, reader, fell back on the outmoded and invalidated "conventional wisdoms" exacerbating the cultural hole that we are in, and wiggled his ass for a mainstream as corrupt as it is canted... as irrelevant as it is fraudulent.

What did I expect?

I had no expectations. Like many, though, I had hopes.

It all seemed to be coming together. An unusual prime-time news special from the vaunted establishment taken in conjunction with a likely "discovery" of life on Mars, seemed serendipitous... at the very least. Are we, perhaps, being prepared for the more expansive future... I'd wondered.

No. Be not fooled...

And there will be kinder assessments than mine providing puerile protestations on the validity of ABC's little exercise of manipulative self-affirmation for the status quo. These will celebrate the "loss leader" admissions that ABC duplicitously injected so they could pretend that they were balanced, on balance...

They were not. These loss-leaders only serve to support the big lie. And ABC told the big lie, Sir and Madam! They contrived the lie of omission, folks... baldly, bluntly, and with malice aforethought.

Examples?

I was grossly disappointed with the obvious bias shown in several segments, especially the Roswell and Abduction subjects. These were badly handled, poorly chosen, and explicated incompetently with prejudice.

Jennings did no homework. ABC talked extensively, for months, with the ufological principals... Richard Hall, Dr. Swords, Jerry Clark et al... they could make their own comparisons to Dr. Shirmer, Mr. McGaha, Dr. Shostak... and this is forgetting that the latter have ever had their HATS handed to them in debate with the former. Jennings and ABC stacked the deck, dealt from the bottom, and changed games in the middle of the play over a huge pot! They implied equity between these conflicting groups, where there IS none!

Then, given a back stepping reliance on 19th Century philosophies/physics, there was ABCs treatment of interstellar travel. Ludicrous, reader! We could travel between stars right NOW if we wanted to. Not a NOD to that.

Moreover, consider the unchallenged nonsense of the SETI "Cultists." Guilty of every conceit and mal-intellectualism they would attribute to a rank "believer," they are studiously blind to that which they would only pretend to seek! ET can be anywhere reader, except here!

Additionally, one would think ABC could mention that Stanton Friedman is a bona fide scientist, a physicist with many degrees and honors respectably investigating, for over three freaking decades, the very subject of the program on which he is wrongly vilified! Outraged astonishment!

That Jesse Marcel Jr., who saw saucer parts as a boy, is now a medical doctor, just back from active duty in Iraq as a flight surgeon!

That Jesse Marcel Sr., the saucer finder, was the ranking Intelligence Officer of the only atomic bombing group in the world! Obviously, not a credulous dummy!

There was no mention of the literally thousands of physical trace cases, or of the blacked out FOIA documents obfuscating more of the truth, or "radar/visual" sightings... persons watching physical evidence actually being made...

Moreover, indicating that Hynek was the only scientist fighting the battle was patently preposterous... if it was not the very soul of duplicity, too. Dr. James McDonald (et sig al) did far more than Hynek ever did on his best day...

Why continue ad nauseum. The reader gets the point.

Reader, two of the finest men in the current ufological struggle were made out plainly to be money-grubbing sensationalists and opportunists. They chumped Stanton Friedman in this fashion... and made Peter Davenport look like a freaking nut-ball! More Outrage!

Yes, this Peter Jennings/ABC journalistic apostasy was a complete, if subtle, Hack-Job! It employed all the old discredited prejudices, subtly made out like ufologists operate, doggedly, on conflicted faith and are, most likely, mentally ill, misinformed, or misinforming... ..while Skeptibunkies, on the other hand, are hard nosed realists with the conviction of "real" science behind them! What nonsense this?

All in all, ufologists were given no, hoped for, "hand" at all, except for the back of one...Outrage beyond incredulity!

This program was an opportunity to begin to relearn a trust in government and the media, but the baffled ufological fence-sitter was in no way encouraged to ask difficult questions of Government, Institution, or Agency on this subject. He or she were informed and inculcated otherwise, again by the hijacked mainstream, that ET is a long-shot, credible evidence of interaction does not exist, and ET can't get here anyway, largely because we can't get there... oh, and all is right with the world... our arrogant hubris is intact. Human Beings remain the center of the universe and the jewel in God's crown...

Crap!

I was completely disgusted with this canted partisan display. No points for Jennings, at all... who should just follow Dan Rather into some journalistic elephant's graveyard and let his tiny

tusks bleach in the sun.

I'm not done. I'm just getting started. ABC doesn't know who they trifle with. We're righteous piranha and they're dead in the ufological water. Breaking out of the preceding metaphor, We don't need them... it's them needs us! As it stands, Peter Jennings and ABC are beneath my concern, my consideration and my contempt.

Read on.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: A Definite Maybe - Kimball

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:51:41 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:30:31 -0500
Subject: Re: A Definite Maybe - Kimball

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:37:55 EST
>Subject: Re: A Definite Maybe

>>From: Terry Grof <terrygroff.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:14:35 -0600
>>Subject: A Definite Maybe

>>Source: The Star-Ledger, Newark, New Jersey

<http://tinyurl.com/3gchb>

>>There was a fair bit of skepticism, even sneering, when ABC News
>>announced that anchor Peter Jennings' newest primetime
>>documentary would tackle the UFO phenomenon.

<snip>

>>The most intriguing part of the special is its middle section,
>>which tracks UFO sightings to the start of the Cold War era
>>(which began after World War II and stretched into the
>>early '90s) and suggests the sightings were unconscious
>>expressions of America's fear of being invaded and dominated by
>>an all-powerful alien force (at that time, the Soviet Union was
>>our national bogeyman).

>>Is it possible that UFO hysteria is a manifestation of a
>>superpower's fear of being exposed as powerless, then
>>annihilated by forces ranging from communists to right-wing
>>militias and foreign terrorists?

<snip>

>If so, then this alleged fear of Soviet attack and
>"annihilation" should have caused the "UFO hysteria" in 1948
>when the historically documented "war scare" actually occurred
>along with the well-known Berlin Crisis and Airlift when people
>really did think World War III was imminent. But 1947 was when
>the actual UFO modern era began with the US sighting flap, which
>was a time of relative international peace and there were no
>WWII-type crises. Instead 1947 had the supposed "UFO hysteria"
>and the international crisis year of 1948 was virtually UFO
>silent.

Brad, Terry:

I have to disagree, a bit, with Brad here (a rare occurrence) -
1947 was a year of significant developments and tensions. Fears
of the Soviet Union were on the rise, particularly within the
Truman administration. In a speech at the National War College
in mid-1947, for example, William Bullitt of the State
Department summed up the attitudes then dominant in Washington:
"The Soviet Union's assault upon the West is at about the stage
of Hitler's manoeuvring into Czechoslovakia [and] the final aim
of Russia is world conquest." Because of the American atomic
monopoly, however, Soviet tactics were likely to be different -
no open, armed conflict, but rather internal subversion.

These comments followed, of course, Churchill's famous Fulton, Missouri speech about "the iron curtain." The British pull-out of Greece in the face of a communist insurgency that they could no longer contain, and the subsequent proclamation of the Truman Doctrine, confirmed the fears. Indeed, Truman's speech to a joint session of Congress on March 10, 1947, was specifically designed to convince both the public and the Republicans in Congress that there was a real and imminent threat that required American action. He had to describe the Greek crisis in universal terms, good versus evil, to get support for his policy of containment. As Stephen Ambrose wrote in *Rise to Globalism*:

"The Truman Doctrine came close to shutting the door against any revolution, since the terms 'free peoples' and 'anti-Communist' were thought to be synonymous. All the Greek government, or any dictatorship, had to do to get American aid was to claim that its opponents were Communist. It has often been noted that Americans expect their wars to be grand heroic crusades on a worldwide scale, a struggle between light and darkness with the fate of the world hanging on the outcome. The Truman doctrine met that requirement. At one of the meetings between the President and the congressional leaders, [Republican Senator Arthur] Vandenburg had warned Truman that if he wanted the public to support containment, he would have to 'scare the hell out of the American people.' Truman did... Truman had struck a responsive chord with the majority of his countrymen. As they had done on December 7, 1941, so again on March 12, 1947, the American people rallied behind their leader in a cause that transcended national, economic, social, and military interests: the cause of freedom itself."

Now, whether that all contributed to UFO sightings is another matter entirely. But it is not accurate to characterise 1947 as a year of even relative international peace, without any major crises (although Brad is correct that the war scare came in 1948). It was the critical turning point that really got the Cold War underway.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming6.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:16:55 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:32:33 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>List,

>Last night on C2C AM, Richard C. Hoagland spouted how he got
>"inside information" that the ABC UFO special going to be
>"groundbreaking TV". I immediately deprogrammed the special from
>my Tivo. I knew that it was going to be crap. I'm glad I saved
>the hard drive space.

>I watched the Jennings special, and besides seeing the face
>behind Jerry Clark's prose, saw nothing of any revelatory,
>scientific, or even much entertainment value.

<snip>

Generally, I agree with your assessment of the program. I could tell trouble was coming when I started hearing propaganda buzzwords like "true believers insist...". One of the lowest points was when Jennings referred to Stan Friedman as a 'Roswell promoter.' Why wasn't Phlock referred to as a Mogul balloon promoter' and Seth Shostak as a 'SETI promoter'? There was way too much Seth and Art Bell, and not enough substance.

Another low point was when they had those people from Harvard explaining away abductions, and left Mack's interview on the cutting room floor. After reading the earlier discussion on this list about Mack being left out, I was hoping the optimists were right that the program just wouldn't have enough time to cover abductions. But the optimists were wrong. They did cover it and did it badly. Personally, I'm not intensely interested in the alien abduction phenomenon, but I can't stand these blatantly one-sided propaganda treatments.

On the plus side, they did at least give some credible witnesses a chance to speak in complete sentences. I suspect that a lot of people in the audience would give a lot more credit to the police officers, whose word can put you in jail, than to the proclamations of scientists who exhibited no real knowledge of the subject.

Michio Kaku was another high point. It took some guts for him to differ with the other scientists on the program and say "let the investigation begin." The question that a less credulous person than Jennings would have asked is: why has it not begun yet?

Overall, I think the program was a non-event that will have no real impact on the public's and the scientific community's perceptions of the UFO issue one way or the other.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming6.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:16:55 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 17:42:44 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>List,

>Last night on C2C AM, Richard C. Hoagland spouted how he got
>"inside information" that the ABC UFO special going to be
>"groundbreaking TV". I immediately deprogrammed the special from
>my Tivo. I knew that it was going to be crap. I'm glad I saved
>the hard drive space.

>I watched the Jennings special, and besides seeing the face
>behind Jerry Clark's prose, saw nothing of any revelatory,
>scientific, or even much entertainment value.

<snip>

Generally, I agree with your assessment of the program. I could tell trouble was coming when I started hearing propoganda buzzwords like "true believers insist...". One of the lowest points was when Jennings referred to Stan Friedman as a 'Roswell promoter.' Why wasn't Phlock referred to as a Mogul balloon promoter' and Seth Shostak as a 'SETI promoter'? There was way too much Seth and Art Bell, and not enough substance.

Another low point was when they had those people from Harvard explaining away abductions, and left Mack's interview on the cutting room floor. After reading the earlier discussion on this list about Mack being left out, I was hoping the optimists were right that the program just wouldn't have enough time to cover abductions. But the optimists were wrong. They did cover it and did it badly. Personally, I'm not intensely interested in the alien abduction phenomenon, but I can't stand these blatantly one-sided propoganda treatments.

On the plus side, they did at least give some credible witnesses a chance to speak in complete sentences. I suspect that a lot of people in the audience would give a lot more credit to the police officers, whose word can put you in jail, than to the proclamations of scientists who exhibited no real knowledge of the subject.

Michio Kaku was another high point. It took some guts for him to differ with the other scientists on the program and say "let the investigation begin." The question that a less credulous person than Jennings would have asked is: why has it not begun yet?

Overall, I think the program was a non-event that will have no real impact on the public's and the scientific community's perceptions of the UFO issue one way or the other.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Scheldroup

From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:18:49 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 17:44:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Scheldroup

>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:25:51 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:38:23 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>4. Don't forget that old reports about this planet may have
>>>misled the aliens who were taken aback by new and unplanned
>>>technological progress on our part that never would have
>>>happened had there not been WW 2. There was a tendency on the
>>>part of the USA to think that the Russians post WW 2 were just a
>>>bunch of dumb peasants without ivy league educations. But they
>>>put up the first satellite, the first animal, the first man, the
>>>first rocket around the moon. It took a while for us to catch
>>>up.. Do notice the enormous difference in our technology between
>>>1937 and 1947.

>>'They' were not so equipped as you might be lead on to believe,
>>however none of those things that you mentioned would be
>>possible had they not captured German scientists and technicians
>>following WW 2, whom perfected the technology.

>>Research can show that, as Red Army marched into Berlin,
>>largely, it was the first time they had seen or been made aware
>>of possibilities for, indoor plumbing and toilets.

>><http://www.aeroscientists.org/rockets2.html>

>If you want to believe this mythology. Go ahead. I have one word
>for you GiRD.

>Thank God, Stalin threw them in jail before WWII, or the world
>might be different today.

Hello Jan,

Thanks for the info, kind of interesting to look again at
compiled data for countries which did have rocket clubs in the
1930's, I'm sure we'll likely find some were more or less robust
then others, however they probably all had one thing in common,
that is in all their experiments rocket propulsion exercises
were probably miniature on scale compared to development in the
Nazi era 1940's, somewhat in part due to its military purpose.

Although I understand Hitler, was not much interested in the
technology he was probably thinking 'rocket club' and Von Braun
was imprisoned for a brief period until Speer changed Hitler's
mind if memory recollect, IMHO

http://www.russianspaceweb.com/rockets_german_legacy.html

GERMAN LEGACY IN THE SOVIET ROCKETRY

http://www.frontierstatus.com/spacepolicyarticles/200004_Amateur_Rocketry.html

On August 17, 1933 the GIRD launched a rocket fueled by jelled gasoline and liquid oxygen. Though the engine burned through, the rocket reached a height of 400 meters. GIRD 10, a true liquid fueled rocket, was launched on November 25, 1932, rising to 80 meters. The engine, fueled by gasoline and LOX, was designed by IF. A. Tsander.

Goddard continued to work in relative isolation. In the summer of 1937, he launched a rocket with a gimbaled engine to a height of 2,055 feet. A rocket equipped with a barograph reached an altitude of 4,200 feet in Goddard developed small high-speed pumps to push fuel into the rocket engine. A rocket equipped with the pumps was launched on August 9, 1940 and reached a height of only 300 feet.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 25](#)

Re: UFOs: Seeing is Believing - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:59:10 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 17:45:39 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs: Seeing is Believing - Connors

I didn't expect much and wasn't disappointed.

Did observe, however, that the first hour was damn well done. 55 minutes of the second hour was, as usual, designed to kill the credible reporting of the first hour.

Where was Richard Hall's contribution?

Mr. Jennings' comment at the money made by Roswell pundits was absurd. Pot calls kettle black and loses credibility for fair and balanced reporting. Of course, with smiles of his own at the money made calling the Roswell incident a myth. How on earth can the word Myth be used? Something happened near Roswell. That's not a myth. What exactly happened is still open to investigation. The Mogul explanation has just as many holes as any other hypothesis.

Witnesses not a credible scientific piece of data? Absurd. A scientist who hasn't seen a UFO is much less credible than a person who was on the scene at the time of the incident. Who ya gonna believe that a stream is polluted by acid...a scientist who has never seen the stream or analyzed the water, or a person burned by swimming in the damn thing?

Who ya gonna believe what happened? The persons who survived the car accident or the scientist who measured the skid marks five days later and never asked for information data from the drivers or examined the destroyed vehicles?

Scheeesh..... Fourth Estate has become a hovel for the overly timid and science has become its own worst enemy.

Wendy Connors
www.fadeddiscs.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:07:42 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 05:42:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Smith

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 15:31:57 EST
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 15:16:52 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>You keep acting as though you had data on visit rates, crash
>>rates, mileage, etc. James. we know nothing about these things.
>>Unlikely doesn't mean zero.

>As I have argued many times before here on UpDates, we need to
>model this quantitatively or at least semi-quantitatively. What
>a scientist or intelligence analyst would do is model the
>various possibilities for ETH beginning at about our own 21st
>century technological level because the scientific method
>requires that one start with the simplest before resorting to
>the more complex (Occam's Razor), it also requires that one
>break down hard problems into easier ones to solve - instead of
>the UFO community's constant insistence in solving everything
>all at once or nothing. Ideas have consequences. Each idea
>modeled into an array of ETH models will have consequences and
>limitations on ET behavior that can be tested against the UFO
>data.

>By gradually winnowing through these we can get a better grip on
>what UFOs could or could not be.

I completely agree with your modelling idea. It would make a nice book. I think it is do-able. Sure we have to make a lot of assumptions. But if we put error bars around our input data/model formulae and run a probabilistic model then we should get some interesting results.

Part of the complexity in this is the sequential modelling of technology development required for Interstellar travel. Of course there are those who would claim it is too speculative to be of any use, but it seems to me that some useful data could be derived from such a study.

[[Next 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

From: Joachim Koch <koch.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 21:15:22 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 05:46:23 -0500
Subject: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 12:09:36 -0500
>Subject: Re: Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>I could have pointed to several surgeons who felt
>otherwise, but to what end?

>It all depends on what you, the reader, want to believe. If you
>accept the expert knows what he's talking about, then you can
>accept the theory as fact.

>I've seen a lot of annedotal evidence that the AA "film" was a
>fake, as well as a lot of annecdotal evidence otherwise.

>Show me physical evidence that doesn't rely on someone's say so,
>and it might be worth discussing again. Othwise, it's a
>neverending debate that won't resolve anything..... <IMO>

Dear List,

I am a surgeon and here I would like to re-present something I
have researched and published in 1995. It was the time when the
'International Roswell Initiative' was still underway and it was
right before Kent Jeffrey's (maybe forced) 180-degree-turnaround
destroyed so much.

Please click on this link:

<http://www.v-j-enterprises.com/roswell8.html#IRI>

and look for 'The Santilli Circus' document.

And if you would like to refresh you memory about the so-called
'Tent-Footage-Hoax' - here is another link:

http://www.outtahear.com/beyond_updates/autopsy_Kiviat_show.html

Two additional informations: Recently I had a telephone
call with Kent Jeffrey who is still in contact with Jesse
Marcel, Jr., somehow. And he read an email to me he had
received from Dr. Marcel. So one month ago, Dr. Marcel was
alive and - incredibly for me - really flying as an Army
Doctor with some helicopter around in this disrupted land.

The other one is regarding Mr. Heesemann. I think he is alive,
also. He disappeared from the scene - and only a few are sorry
about this here in Germany - and it is said that he has made
some new... well... connections to the Vatican. But I really
would like to state that this is only rumour.

Best greetings to the List,

Joachim Koch

<http://www.kochkyborg.de>

21:15:22 25.02.2005

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Groff

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:25:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 05:47:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Groff

>From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:18:11 -0500
>Subject: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>I was curious as to whether anybody else with a website saw an
>increase in traffic last night as a result of the ABC show.

>The NICAP site usually averages around 15 -20 hits an hour and
>maybe 150-200 hits a day but during the 8pm to 9pm hour last
>night the hits increased to 400 and 150-200 an hour for a few
>hours afterwards. A weekly total for the site is averaging
>around 1300 lately but the total for yesterday alone was 1222.
>I'd guess that somewhere near 1000 occurred after the show began
>airing.

I have no way of knowing since I operate my sites from my home
PC. I have a hit counter on my UFO Tools site but I didn't note
the count before the Jennings special aired.

Maybe there might be something in my FrontPage log files.

Terry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 20:26:04 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 09:09:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>You don't get to define - or redefine -the meaning of the term. It
>reads as presented. One who continuously supports an
>unsupportable theory [often a ridiculous solution at that] to a
>UFO report.

Fine with me, so long as the term also includes those
Pelicanists who continually support ridiculous and unsupportable
theories such as that the Trindade case was a 'structured craft'
witnessed by dozens of people, or that an extraterrestrial
spacecraft crashed at Roswell.

--
John Rimmer
Magonia 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Woods

From: Mike Woods <mike.woods.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:31:44 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 09:12:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Woods

Hey Listers,

I'd have no problem with an UpDates subscription of \$60. per year which works out to \$5 dollars a month or \$1.25 per week.

I get more than 125 messages a week, so this is a place where "A penny for your thoughts" is more than just a cheap ploy to appear sensitive.

Although, I'll admit, in some cases, we're still being overcharged!

Mike Woods

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:00:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 09:19:36 -0500
Subject: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell

Of interest to Listers, the following excerpt is from Bill Clinton's Blog - he discusses Area 51, Roswell etc.

Source: <http://tinyurl.com/6jvn4>

Thursday Janaury 6th 2005:

I liked National Treasure very much. Nicolas Cage is one of my favorite actors. Jerry Bruckheimer, the producer made a very entertaining and interesting movie. I'm a conspiracy buff. I like reading books about secret societies and cloak and dagger stories. I was on the inside of government, so I know there is more out there than meets the eye.

You know, when I was elected, but before I was inaugurated, someone, a total stranger, whom I met on the street asked me to look into Area 51 and Aliens in Roswell, New Mexico. I laughed, but decided to buy a book about the subject. It was very interesting. I asked my good friend Webster Hubbell to investigate the matter.

When Hillary talked about the fast right wing conspiracy, she was mocked. Maybe the conspiracy wasn't a right wing one, but something else.

I never did get a clear answer about Area 51 from the ones with the security clearance. And I was the president.

More than that you know what happened to me during my second term. And you know what happened to Hubble. He died.

Sometimes you shouldn't ask questions why, you just have to accept reality.

Somethings Presidents apparently don't know about.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:14:15 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 10:21:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:04:28 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:34:49 -0800>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

><snip>

>>It might be that he was referring to some intervening peak along
>>his line of sight N.W. to Mt. Rainier. But I don't know of any
>>peaks around there in the Cascade foothills to the S.W. of Mt.
>>Rainier that are taller than around 6500 ft, while his flight
>>altitude was around 9200 ft. Yet if the saucers flew low enough
>>and close enough behind such a peak they could briefly have been
>>out of sight. But such a peak shouldn't be called a sub-peak of
>>Mt. Rainier. Yet if Arnold was later able to identify the sub-
>>peak as having been 25 miles away from his plane at some point,
>>it should be a peak well marked on a topo map.

>>Prospector Fred Johnson was in the Mt. Adams area then, probably
>>at around 6000 ft-- he was probably above timberline but not
>>trying to scale Mt. Adams. He estimated the saucers were only
>>some 1000 ft above him when they flew south past him, or perhaps
>>at around 7000 ft. This argues against their having been briefly
>>eclipsed by any small irregularity of Mt. Rainier's broad peak,
>>since I don't think Arnold ever said that they changed their
>>altitude grossly, as from near 14,000 ft to 7000 ft, as they
>>traveled southwards.

>My interpretation is that, whereas Arnold estimated that the
>objects were at 9500 ft as they passed Rainier (not at 14,000
>ft), they were actually about 2000 ft lower, at least when they
>passed Rainier, and maybe also while crossing Rainier's face.

>This would place them low enough to "dip into canyons" south of
>Rainier and to be at an altitude consistent with the 7000 ft
>estimate based on Fed Johnson's sighting.

One such possible subpeak would be Pyramid Peak, a well-known
landmark on the SW flank of Rainier:

<http://ericbasecamp.net/trips/MRNP/PyramidPk.jpg>

Maximum elevation is about 6940 feet. There's a saddle point
behind Pyramid Pk. and Rainier at an altitude of about 6600
feet.

If the objects were on a ground-hugging trajectory and flying in
and out of peaks and dipping into canyons, as Arnold described,
then the base of Pyramid, roughly 1500-2500 feet wide (depending
on how high above the surface the objects were), would have been
wide enough to conceal the objects for a sufficient time to see
them noticeably disappear.

Assume the objects were flying at Arnold's clocked maximum,

~1700 mph, or about 2500 ft/sec, and, again, close to the surface. Arnold also said he could clearly see their outlines against the white backdrop of snow on Rainier, except when they seemed to go into profile and appeared as thin black lines that were difficult to see. The point is, when they were passing in front of Rainier, they were visible most of the time.

Thus Arnold's objects could have been conceivably concealed for around 0.6-1.0 seconds as they passed behind Pyramid Peak. If they disappeared one after one as they passed this landmark, Arnold would have had good reason to believe they passed briefly behind Pyramid, and could have used this to determine distance.

There are several other candidate subpeaks. Pyramid is just one example.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:17:35 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 10:26:17 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming6.nul>
>To: UFOUpdates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:16:55 -0600
>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>Last night on C2C AM, Richard C. Hoagland spouted how he got
>>"inside information" that the ABC UFO special going to be
>>"groundbreaking TV". I immediately deprogrammed the special from
>>my Tivo. I knew that it was going to be crap. I'm glad I saved
>>the hard drive space.

>>I watched the Jennings special, and besides seeing the face
>>behind Jerry Clark's prose, saw nothing of any revelatory,
>>scientific, or even much entertainment value.

<snip>

>Michio Kaku was another high point. It took some guts for him to
>differ with the other scientists on the program and say "let the
>investigation begin." The question that a less credulous person
>than Jennings would have asked is: why has it not begun yet?

>Overall, I think the program was a non-event that will have no
>real impact on the public's and the scientific community's
>perceptions of the UFO issue one way or the other.

Hi Lan,

I sincerely hope you are right. The supposed legitimacy Jennings'
chops bring to the table is what makes me fear that it will fuel
the argument that "Jennings did it... nothing big there."

But I hope you are right, and that Kaku's "gamble" pays off with
some serious scientific attention, perhaps not even from this
country.

Perhaps best so..."Big Science" in the US is in an odd state
indeed.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:20:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:15:51 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

<snip>

>It was a pure puff piece, except that now network television can
>state with a straight face..."been there, done that, nothing to
>see here... move along". Case closed.

So... does the idea of doing a Ufologists' own documentary seem
a little more appealing now?

Eleanor White

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:37:49 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 14:28:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - King

>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:25:51 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 09:38:23 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 11:54:33 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET?

<snip>

>>Research can show that, as Red Army marched into Berlin,
>>largely, it was the first time they had seen or been made aware
>>of possibilities for, indoor plumbing and toilets.

>><http://www.aeroscientists.org/rockets2.html>

>If you want to believe this mythology. Go ahead. I
>have one word for you GiRD.

>Thank God, Stalin threw them in jail before WWII, or
>the world might be different today.

Hi Jan and John,

I felt compelled to mention the old classic army film, No Time For Sergeants, with Andy Griffith. Toilets were quite a novelty to the bumpkin, and the character he portrayed was reflective of an abundant number of our boys, including both my grandfathers. Running water via a pump handle and outhouses in both cases before going off to war. One could make a case for them thinking that toilets were back-engineered from one of them flyin disks...

None of their neighbors had them, or new of their existence or possibility. So what if the Red Army was largely fresh off the same boat?

Regardless of the input of the Germans, the Russians or anyone else, technology of day to day life exploded as a result of the discoveries resulting from war, and the waging thereof.

Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:40:09 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 14:34:35 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Maccabee

>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 07:46:52 -0800
>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:26:03 -0500
>>Subject: ABC Jennings Special

>>The first segment was weighted positive by the number of
>>witnesses. Unfortunately they combined the "8 o'clock hour"
>>events over Phoenix (triangle) with th 10 PM videos that
>>probably show flares, as described on my web site.

>>The astronomer guy clearly didn't know anything about the 8:30
>>PM triangle or else simply ignored all that testimony in favor
>>of commenting only upon the "lights in the sky" that were
>>videod at 10 PM.

>Bruce, aside from our disagreement about the so-called flares, a
>young man reported to the Phoenix Arizona Republic that he had
>seen 5 airplanes fly over on the night of March 13th, 1997 which
>probably inspired James McGaha's statement.

>There were suggestions the formation of lights seen traveling
>from North to South at around 8:15 - 8:30 p.m. were airplanes.

>In an article by Tony Ortega in the New Times mentions Amateur
>astronomer Mitch Stanley, 21, who said he had a brief look at
>the lights through his Dobsonian telescope and could see very
>bright lights on the wings of airplanes.

>That night he was with his mother, Linda, and noticed the lights
>coming from the north. When he looked through his 10-inch
>elescope, he claimed that he could see the lights on the
>underside of squarish wings.

>Aside from the fact that planes do not usually have lights on
>the underside of the wings, his report is almost unique in this
>respect.

>Other witnesses who saw the formation (object) saw it at closer
>range and could not detect any aircraft sounds or see any wings
>with conventional navigational lighting patterns at the wing
>tips. All agree, in fact that no strobe lights or blinking
>lights were seen on the mystery object (or formation).

The "TRUFO" was the object seen "in the 8 o'clock hour" which
was large, dark and blocked the stars. Jennings said in his
monologue that hundreds of people also saw the lights at 10 p.m.
However, to the best of my knowledge there were only a few who
saw those, but hundreds did see the "thing" at about 8:30.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:57:30 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 14:41:36 -0500
Subject: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

Wow!!!

I couldn't believe my eyes and ears!

I was bowled over. Left aghast!

I had to blink my eyes at what I was seeing after all these years!

A soldering tool that used a light beam to weld stuff and when it touched metal it was hot but when you moved it it went cool. It was for only \$19.95 at that!!!

Then there was that ladle and spatula turner that easily scooped up broth and veggies with ease!

Will wonders never cease? Where did they come up with these things? It had to be from back engineering alien technology from crashed UFO spaceships or something. Mankind could never have figured it out.

Oh, my bad, those were the commercials. Here in Los Angeles the special was sponsored by some really nifty household and tool and gardening products that just blew me away. Must've spent a hundred bucks last night.

The special? The much awaited Peter Jennings UFO Special?

That was about the most piss pitiful excuse for a documentary/special I've seen yet. It was all over the place. It started out swell and even had Jerome Clark as more informative and calming than Jennings. Heck, they should have hired Clark to do the special instead. I wonder if he'll say I'm paranoid now.

In all my years I've always been bright-eyed and bushy-tailed (AP style book forgive me if I've not followed that) whenever a UFO documentary, story or tidbit hit the airwaves.

This is the very first time ever I've fallen asleep during a major UFO news event. One of the neighbor's kids had to spark me up to point out that 'Jesse' was on. I looked up and I saw footage of Jesse Marcel Sr. on the screen. I says to the kid, "How do you know him?" and the kid, who tells everybody here in Hollywood that he's a reincarnated alien, just rattled on about what happened in Roswell back then and this and that. The kid was more interesting than Jennings and the special.

Now I recall why I got out of the mainstream news business. I feel like a new chap!

How in the world a veteran newsman like Jennings allowed the sloppy storytelling, unbalanced review and erratic focus is beyond me.

Either he's been faking it for decades or he was taken in for a sap.

If I was these old time newsmen I'd suspect someone was after my job by feeding me bs information to discredit me!

I hope his company isn't just a 'name game' company to sell product to the networks.

He had 2 hours to do what none had done before, present the facts. Without the mood music, oddball cracks, pop culture nonsense. He started out fine. Just the statistics would have told the whole story then go in for the kill by asking the authorities, researchers both pro and con to back up their claims and explain the gross errors.

That's how ya' do news.

Glad to see they went as soon as possible to Art Bell. Art's been doing the job the mainstream should have been doing and he's the man now and they're jealous.

Sure we all love Art and Ramona Bell. They're like kinfolk to us because they share not only their lives and loves but tell us what's happening. Yet the special should have focused more on Art's growth as the people trust him more than any major newsman anyway. Art earned that trust by delivering the goods, not by force feeding the public pabulum. If we didn't like Art and George Noory and C2C we wouldn't be tuning in.

That's the facts jack!

Same with Jeff Rense, Errol Bruce-Knapp, and everyone else who risks all to just give us a voice that the mainstream doesn't because we don't want to sell sex and violence. I've never heard of a donnybrook breaking out at a UFO convention, may have, so correct me if I'm wrong. Mainly at a UFO convention a few heated debates but it's usually on to hand shaking, hugs, howdy's and on to the grub!

ABC should be ashamed of itself and should have taken Jennings over the coals for providing that as commercial and newsworthy product. It is literally the worst UFO special and documentary I've seen and I've seen some pretty rotten UFO documentaries!

A pal of mine back home said that Jennings' UFO special was like the: "Ed Wood Jr. Plan 9 From Outer Space of UFO Specials".

It makes me fearful that if that's the best Jennings and his staff could do and we all see the glaring outpoints especially with the Roswell segment, now we know why things like 9-11 happen because the mainstream press is either too busy in a box-head mindset or someone is putting the arm on them. (uh oh, I can see that email from Jerome Clark callin' somebody paranoid again...).

The only thing this special needed to measure up is something us baby boomers remember:

Winky Dink.

Remember that old cartoon show where you would put a piece of clear plastic on your TV screen and during the adventure they'd ask you to draw with a crayon a boat or a bridge so that Winky Dink and Woofie could escape? Hey, the first interactive TV show!

That's what this special needed.

Finally I'll say this, the only thing this special brought to light is that the people have realized they can't depend on others to serve their best interests. The fans of C2C, the books bought, the number of websites visited all show the people are going to you guys and gals for their information because they don't trust the mainstream. They'd be fools to do so.

Did you notice how after all was said and done, all the hoo-rah this and that, that the only guys holding the fort if you have a UFO problem is good ol' Peter Davenport? Is that scary or what? Here we could be in the middle of a massive invasion by whomever and some lone gent in his home with a phone and tape recorder is all humanity has left?

They should give Davenport the Congressional Medal of Honor out of respect.

I've said it before, UFO researchers, witnesses, abductees etc.

Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

you don't need the mainstream press to legitimize you. If you're true to yourself and the people it will be the mainstream that will need you in the long run.

That's what I got from this special, which got it's butt kicked ratings-wise, that integrity and credibility start at home.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:09:12 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:55:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Hatch

>From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:18:11 -0500
>Subject: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>Hi Errol, List.

>I was curious as to whether anybody else with a website saw an increase in traffic last night as a result of the ABC show.

>The NICAP site usually averages around 15 -20 hits an hour and maybe 150-200 hits a day but during the 8pm to 9pm hour last night the hits increased to 400 and 150-200 an hour for a few hours afterwards. A weekly total for the site is averaging around 1300 lately but the total for yesterday alone was 1222. I'd guess that somewhere near 1000 occurred after the show began airing.

>Adam

Hello Adam:

Hard to say here. My hit counter is getting screwed up because GoStats is apparently applying visits from some other site to mine as well as my real traffic. A mess.

Allowing for that, I estimate traffic up 25% over average for the day. Oddly, this bulge started Monday, and more or less continued thru Thursday. I'll know more at midnight when I study my access logs for Thursday-Friday.

Those statistics are much more accurate, but are split between days because time/date is registered GMT instead of PST (California).

Best

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Pelicanist - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:18:39 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:58:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - King

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:27:40 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 18:57:54 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

><snip>

>>Did Arnold say the objects were mainly seen when they flashed so
>>bright they were like "blinding arc" light or did he not? This
>>is one of the main grounds on which I disputed Easton's
>>"pelican" theory - birds don't flash sunlight so bright that it
>>is "blindingly" bright like an "arc light."

>>You should know very well that the retinal afterimage of seeing
>>an intensely bright light is a black or dark spot in the visual
>>field - anyone can test this out by trying it on a sunlit
>>object. Arnold kept seeing alternating bright flashes (which
>>would have been elongated by the objects' velocity into bright
>>lines) and "black lines."

>>I do not see how it would even have been possible for Arnold to
>>have prevented the "blinding arc-like" flashes from causing
>>black retinal afterimages. I do not see how it is possible for
>>Arnold to have prevented these black retinal afterimages
>>from involuntarily getting projected onto the image of Mt
>>Rainier as he tried to track the objects as they headed into
>>Rainier, even if he had wanted to prevent afterimages from doing
>>that.

>I actually did an experiment in which I used a mirror at a
>distance to reflect the sun into my eyes. The afterimage from
>staring at the reflection was not black, but rather colored and
>pale.... Looking at a metallic reflection of the sun is like
>looking at the sun. Whenever I look at the sun (briefly!) it
>"burns" a hot spot on the retina which remains looking bright
>for a second or so. Then it fades to a pale afterimage with a
>pale greenish center and with a reddish halo around. It does
>not look black. The pale afterimage can last for a minute or
>more.

>Of course, the angular size of the sun is about 1/2 degree which
>is considerably larger than the angular size of the objects
>Arnold saw. Each one would have reflected only a portion of
>thesun's light. In a detailed analysis done 5-6 years ago during
>the previous "tempet in a teapot" over Arnold, I calculated that
>to appear blindingly bright from a distance of 20 some miles, a
>solar reflection would have to be from a rather flat surface. A
>noticeably curved surface would have caused the reflected light to
>diverge and dissipate too much.

Hi Bruce,

Even better, a slightly concave surface on top would, when tilted just right, focus more sunlight into a smaller point of convergence, which could account for the single really bright flash on Arnold's plane, and how the flashes reduced in intensity later in the sighting as the focal point changed. Such a shape is also aerodynamically sound, like a wing. A more convex shape to the underside would also conversely diffuse any reflected light (unlikely illuminated by direct sunlight in the movement described by Arnold), making the craft less noticeable from below.

Your flat "mirror" analogy is apt as well, but less likely in light of the curved aspect already found in the circumferential shape of the objects as described. Curves make sense.

While Arnold's drawing doesn't specifically imply a concave upper surface, it is still indeed plausible as the craft were "weaving" as described and capable of reflecting a relatively large amount of sunlight to an object 10s of miles away. A "saucer" in the truest sense... less a nibble.

Best,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Pelicanist - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:22:33 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:00:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - King

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:58:50 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>The first to carry the title proudly was James
>Easton. But he's had many followers.

>The competition for this honor is fierce.

Don,

Agreed. <g>

Simple people apply simple answers to complex questions, because it is easy. Results in headache... Complex people apply complex answers to even simple questions, because it's hard. Results in endorphin release...

There is little common ground there. But it is there.

To build a consensus requires rare imagination from the former, and requires even more rare objective realism from the latter.

If those one might call pelicanist sense derision therein, I believe it is self-created as I am sure that Jerry Clark and others here would not engage the debate at all if derision was at the heart of the matter. A waste of time. No, the debate serves as a test...of wills, vocabulary, knowledge, logic, and hopefully even good taste. At the very least it frames the greater field so that fence-sitters can read the points and draw their own conclusions. This is an invaluable resource, whatever the side on which one might come down.

Reasonable people can reasonably discuss things, but when either side becomes overly dismissive of any but their own position, the debate, the List, and the field overall is not well-served. And this deserves a descriptive noun for either party. Not of derision, but for memorializing the small defeat, to remind and to describe. There is a queer nobility in it, and I think folks like Lehmborg appreciate it in a manner far beyond any insult or derision. UFOlogy is chock-full of colorful characters, and derision is nothing new, even when using a term like Ufologist.

Since skeptic is not precisely what pelicanist is, how can one say pelicanist is invalid. Apt, descriptive, even illustrative, say like "Roswellian" or "RendalSchmoe" or perhaps "Orbiac". It alone is what it is, by definition as coined.

Kindergarten example? Trekkies, who used to hate the term, now realize the value of the term, and even embrace it. Proudly,

humorous pseudo- derision and all. I think a lesson therein lies.

Pelicanist is a jibe. Apt, descriptive, a bit taunting in a humorous way. Like when a Harvard MBA snickers, "So, you're a...Ufologist...".

Enjoy the term. Wear it. You don't have to believe the pelican story to appreciate the underlying mindset, if that is the mindset you find most satisfying. And you should see the humor of it without presuming the derision in it.

My 2 and a half cents worth, Best to all,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:56:12 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:03:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Rudiak

>From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:18:11 -0500
>Subject: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>I was curious as to whether anybody else with a website saw an
>increase in traffic last night as a result of the ABC show.

>The NICAP site usually averages around 15 -20 hits an hour and
>maybe 150-200 hits a day but during the 8pm to 9pm hour last
>night the hits increased to 400 and 150-200 an hour for a few
>hours afterwards. A weekly total for the site is averaging
>around 1300 lately but the total for yesterday alone was 1222.
>I'd guess that somewhere near 1000 occurred after the show
>began airing.

My RoswellProof website normally get about 150 hits a day, but
there seems to be about a 7-fold increase in traffic after the
ABC special. (It was also spiking upward before the special even
began.)

Some fraction of the viewers are obviously seeking more
information. There are a lot of search engine inquiries about
Project Mogul and a lot of people are also looking over my
Roswell debris descriptions section plus my work on the Ramey
memo. (The ABC special barely touched on the debris and said
nothing about the Ramey memo, so this seems to be mostly
secondary reading.)

Main page with links to all the important Roswell witnesses and
evidence that ABC couldn't bring itself to mention:
www.roswellproof.com

Project Mogul section, including links to Charles Moore's Mogul
trajectory hoax:

www.roswellproof.com/ProjectMogul.html

ABC's chief Roswell debunker, Karl Pflock, knows very well that
Moore hoaxed the trajectory and that Moore's lost Mogul wouldn't
have gotten anywhere near the Brazel ranch, but "mythmaking" and
moneymaking "hucksterism" also runs deep in the debunking
community. Did ABC mention Pflock's past CIA employment or that
he got caught red-handed in a cattle-mutilation hoax back in the
1980s, Pflock apparently trying to land one of those
moneygrubbing book deals? Nope.

UFO sightings by Mogul and Skyhook balloon personnel:

www.roswellproof.homestead.com/Mogul_UFOs.html

Irony of ironies, they were seeing them too, including Charles
Moore, and were all "believers" according to Blue Book head Cpt.
Edward Ruppelt.

Debris description sections:

www.roswellproof.com/debris_main.html

Please note the large number of witnesses to anomalous debris. In the shallow and highly biased hatchet-job treatment by ABC, the naive viewer would think that only Roswell intel chief Jesse Marcel described such things.

For an almost forgotten 1950 mass sighting similar to the famous 1948 Chiles-Whitted pilot sighting mentioned in the ABC special, I've added a new section last week:

http://www.roswellproof.com/UFO_CalNev_1950.html

This cigar-shaped object spewing red flames out the back left a highly anomalous, huge spiral trail that was visible for hundreds of miles in California, Nevada, Utah, and Arizona. Witnesses included multiple military and civilian pilots in the air, dozens of pilots on the ground, many CAA controllers, and at least hundreds of others. Multiple witnesses in scattered locations clearly saw the object maneuver. One very impressive report from Nevada had a witness actually seeing the object flying at very high speed in 3 giant circles to generate the spiral, then rapidly disappearing. Included is a section with about a dozen regional and national news articles on the 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:10 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:05:47 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 06:33:16 -1000
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 00:30:06 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

Michael:

You wrote, in part:

<snip>

>Why bother with more sightings cases and analyses?

Because that is where the best evidence is to be found.

<snip>

>People like Bob Lazar, Robert Dean, Clifford Stone, Dan Sherman,
>etc., reveal much of what is happening but many UFO researchers
>don't want to go there.

>Those researchers who do venture into that field are criticized
>for being credulous and sloppy, and not having the right
>emphasis on hard evidence when the role of national agencies in
>manipulating hard evidence is ignored. UFO research needs to
>move on.

Those "researchers" are criticized for being credulous and sloppy for a very good reason - because they are credulous and sloppy. Again with Lazar. What is your response to Stan Friedman, who posted a detailed critique of Sideshow Bob here just a couple of days ago? Do you have one?

Oh, yes, I recall it now. If I had \$1 for everytime you hemmed and hawed in your defence of Lazar, or said "perhaps" followed by some ridiculous, unsubstantiated speculation, I'd have a nice pocketful of change.

Can you not even acknowledge the possibility (I would say probability, but for the sake of argument I'll go with possibility) that these whistleblowers, who cannot provide the "hard evidence" you so casually dismiss, might actually be lying? Perhaps even working (to enter your world here for a moment) for the government as disinformation agents, sent to distract our attention from the real evidence? Is this any less likely than your theories? If so, why? Your gut feeling?? As Stan might say, "psychic powers"??

Your say that "UFO research needs to move on."

That is a siren call that, if followed as you propose, will probably finish ufology as a place for serious research.

So here's my siren call...

I would suggest that UFO research needs to move on, all right - away from you and your whistleblowers (unless they can offer some proof other than their word), and back to serious study of serious evidence.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:48 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:06:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:27:40 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 18:57:54 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>Did Arnold say the objects were mainly seen when they flashed so
>>bright they were like "blinding arc" light or did he not? This
>>is one of the main grounds on which I disputed Easton's
>>"pelican" theory - birds don't flash sunlight so bright that it
>>is "blindingly" bright like an "arc light."

>>You should know very well that the retinal afterimage of seeing
>>an intensely bright light is a black or dark spot in the visual
>>field - anyone can test this out by trying it on a sunlit
>>object. Arnold kept seeing alternating bright flashes (which
>>would have been elongated by the objects' velocity into bright
>>lines) and "black lines."

>>I do not see how it would even have been possible for Arnold to
>>have prevented the "blinding arc-like" flashes from causing
>>black retinal afterimages. I do not see how it is possible for
>>Arnold to have prevented these black retinal afterimages
>>from involuntarily getting projected onto the image of Mt
>>Rainier as he tried to track the objects as they headed into
>>Rainier, even if he had wanted to prevent afterimages from doing
>>that.

>I actually did an experiment in which I used a mirror at a
>distance to reflect the sun into my eyes. The afterimage from
>staring at the reflection was not black, but rather colored and
>pale.... Looking at a metallic reflection of the sun is like
>looking at the sun. Whenever I look at the sun (briefly!) it
>"burns" a hot spot on the retina which remains looking bright
>for a second or so. Then it fades to a pale afterimage with a
>pale greenish center and with a reddish halo around. It does
>not look black. The pale afterimage can last for a minute or
>more.

Again being dragged into an argument I told you I don't have
time (or resources right now) to get into. Just because I dare
to disagree about the sacred Arnold case. Your sun Bruce is over
30 arcminutes in diameter and round, whereas Arnold's tiny
little flashes were at closest approach less than 3 arcminutes
in length and anywhere from ten to twenty times thinner than
that in vertical thickness, according to his drawing and
statements, or around 0.1 to 0.3 arcmins in thickness. This is
at or below the smallest resolvable image with human acuity.

They would have been much LESS than HALF that size at first appearance and at the end of the sighting. They were moving horizontally and thus tending to smear the image in that same direction. Now when that afterimage on Arnold's retina was projected onto the snowfields of Mt Rainier as he moved his head and eyes to try to follow the objects would the afterimage be a dark line when seen against white or what? ("Dark line" of whatever color if color could even be resolved clearly in a tiny image briefly flashed and briefly afterimaged.)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Freeman

From: Kelly Freeman <Khfflsciifo.nul>
Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 21:07:59 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:09:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Freeman

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:27:50 -0600
>Subject: Seeing Is Believing Naught

<snip>

>Flatly, Jennings took the easy way out, reader, fell back on the
>outmoded and invalidated "conventional wisdoms" exacerbating the
>cultural hole that we are in, and wiggled his ass for a
>mainstream as corrupt as it is canted... as irrelevant as it is
>fraudulent.

Careful, Alfred. Let's not be too quick to judge Mr. Jennings in
this manner. Seems to me he stuck his neck out a little bit to
try and bring the UFO phenomenon into the prime time arena.
We should encourage such endeavors by ABC and the other networks
so that meaningful debates can take place.

>What did I expect?

>I had_no_expectations. Like many, though, I had hopes.

Sounds to me like your expectations were too high and your hopes
unrealistic. You just can't expect the mainstream media to
suddenly pronounce everything "UFO" valid as if overcome by a
sudden revelation of truth. One step at a time, my friend, one
step at a time. We're looking at a process that could take a
very long time. Unless, of course, UFOs land tomorrow on the
White House lawn.

<snip>

>I was grossly disappointed with the obvious bias shown in
>several segments, especially the Roswell and Abduction subjects.
>These were badly handled, poorly chosen, and explicated
>incompetently with prejudice.

I agree with you here.

<snip>

>There was no mention of the literally thousands of physical
>trace cases, or of the blacked out FOIA documents obfuscating
>more of the truth, or "radar/visual" sightings... persons
>watching physical evidence actually being made...

Too much to cover in just two hours. On the flip side, there
were also no Raelians, Space Brothers and channeling, orbs and
other meaningless lights in the sky, and I don't remember
hearing the word 'conspiracy' even once in the program.
Sometimes, it's what's not there that counts.

<snip>

>Then, given a back stepping reliance on 19th Century
>philosophies/physics, there was ABC's treatment of interstellar
>travel. Ludicrous, reader! We could travel between stars right
>NOW if we wanted to. Not a NOD to that.

Again, I disagree. Introducing the viewers to Michio Kaku as a "leading theoretical physicist" and then letting him go on to explain the concept of traveling through a wormhole literally made Shostak and the other SETI proponents look quite foolish/narrow minded. Then Mr. Kaku goes on to suggest extraterrestrials could be a million years ahead in technological achievement, instead of just hundreds. He then challenges them to "open their minds".

>Moreover, indicating that Hynek was the only scientist fighting
>the battle was patently preposterous... if it was not the very
>soul of duplicity, too. Dr. James McDonald (et sig al) did far
>more than Hynek ever did on his_best_day...

Again, Alfred, I believe your hopes and expectations were too high or unrealistic. I didn't get that impression at all. As a matter of fact, portraying Hynek the way they did by acknowledging his about face from a skeptic to a "believer" through his years of investigation into the UFO phenomenon served to lessen the credibility of Shostak, McGaha, and the other SETI know it alls, who have never seriously investigated a UFO sighting, IMO.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Morton

From: Dave Morton <Marspyrs.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 05:39:24 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:11:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Morton

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:27:50 -0600
>Subject: Seeing Is Believing Naught

>"Seeing Is Believing," Naught

>by Alfred Lehmborg
>www.alienview.net

<snip>

>These loss-leaders only serve to support the big
>lie. And ABC told the big lie, Sir and Madam! They contrived
>the lie of Omission, folks... baldly, bluntly, and with malice
>aforethought.

If it's Omission they gave us, then why not, in the future,
omit the name of the anchorage who presented the program?
And the network?

For example, "...that UFO program presented in Feb 2005 on
some TV network"? Or better yet, "the 02/24/05 UFO show".
It's classless, nameless, almost irrelevant sounding and
game-show-like in its abbreviated description.

Add the generic "anchorperson" or "anchor" or "spokesperson"
and you've got watery pabulum in a plain cardboard box.

Similarly, A Believer in a SETI future with Pflocks of Pelicans
scurrying from earthly peak to earthly peak, such as Seth
Shostak, becomes "Believer Shostak". Arrogant, tasteless,
adolescent, I admit - but fair. (I'm not really opposed to SETI
even if it's a long shot; I'm embarrassed at the public
statements on UFOs made by those naive kids. I won't call the
SETI people 'children' in a degrading way, because pure,
childlike hope and belief is a good and wonderful thing, it
seems to me, and SETI provides some of that for all of us - even
if some of 'them' from 'out there' are already here...)

I didn't bother to watch. I've seen my (large) saucers starting
in the 1950s, fairly close up - and none of them were darting
behind (or in front of) mountain peaks in the distance. They
exist, and they're definitely not from around here. I just want
to learn something from them and always have.

Sorry for the huge snip. I really did enjoy the quality of the
post, but get almost physically ill and angry with producers for
belittling good people, or omitting their names, etc. We all
have sophisticated little hatchets we can use on them too, if we
want to.

Dave Morton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 08:44:41 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:14:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Lehmborg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 20:26:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>You don't get to define - or redefine -the meaning of the term. It
>>reads as presented. One who continuously supports an
>>unsupportable theory [often a ridiculous solution at that] to a
>>UFO report.

>Fine with me, so long as the term also includes those
>Pelicanists who continually support ridiculous and unsupportable
>theories such as that the Trindade case was a 'structured craft'
>witnessed by dozens of people, or that an extraterrestrial
>spacecraft crashed at Roswell.

<ROTFL>

A knee slapper for sure! Almost like a Benny Hill re-run, just not up to Monty Python... so, no points made. Still, a stifled guffaw was provoked. Good show, Sir! You continue to meet the minimum standard as alternative entertainment.

tick...tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...
tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...
tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...
tick...tock...tick...tock...tick...tock...tock...tick...tock...

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Stevenson

From: Colin Stevenson <colswweb.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:15:43 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:16:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Stevenson

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:25:13 -0600
>Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>>From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:18:11 -0500
>>Subject: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>>I was curious as to whether anybody else with a website saw an
>>increase in traffic last night as a result of the ABC show.

>>The NICAP site usually averages around 15 -20 hits an hour and
>>maybe 150-200 hits a day but during the 8pm to 9pm hour last
>>night the hits increased to 400 and 150-200 an hour for a few
>>hours afterwards. A weekly total for the site is averaging
>>around 1300 lately but the total for yesterday alone was 1222.
>>I'd guess that somewhere near 1000 occurred after the show began
>>airing.

>I have no way of knowing since I operate my sites from my home
>PC. I have a hit counter on my UFO Tools site but I didn't note
>the count before the Jennings special aired.

>Maybe there might be something in my FrontPage log files.

Hi Terry and Adam

Yes there was an increase in hits to my new look web too from
near a thousand a day to approx 1870. Many of them were mil or
gov etc.

col
<http://www.colswweb.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 05:06:09 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:17:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Hatch

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 14:25:13 -0600
>Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>>From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:18:11 -0500
>>Subject: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>>I was curious as to whether anybody else with a website saw an
>>increase in traffic last night as a result of the ABC show.

<snip>

Hi again Adam, Terry: I can finally come up with some numbers. I
download the access_log files for my site:

<http://www.larryhatch.net/>

... daily. I no longer rely on the rather rinky-dink 'hit-
counter', don't get me started on that!

Instead, I save the log files and run a very nice free utility
called Weblog Expert (lite version). There is also a
professional paid version which I am considering.

Since Access-log starts and ends at midnight UTC (London time),
days are split, so it took me until the wee hours of Saturday to
get the results of the Jennings program. This means the Thursday
night results are included as the first part of Friday
statistics, now in.

For the last week, for comparison, numbers look like this

Day-date Page Unique
(UTC) Views Visitors*

SAT/19FB	1887	786
SUN/20FB	2999	927
MON/21FB	4152	1383
TUE/22FB	4043	1224
WED/23FB	2942	1155
THU/24FB	3110	1234
FRI/25FB	5642	1635

<== Jennings show appeared

* 'Unique Visitor' is variously defined, often as anyone who
views any page on your site, but who hasn't done so for the
previous 30 minutes or so.

There is a clear jump in statistics for 'Friday' (UTC) which
included the Jennings show and a few hours after it concluded. I
have no reason to doubt that the show was the main reason.

What I don't understand is the run-up in statistics before the
show. Are TV viewers telepathic? Maybe all the hype for the show
brought my site more hits than the show itself!

Another odd thing: The MSN search engine gave me really great

positioning for the search term "UFO", near bottom of the very first page. Two days before the show itself, that vanished and was replaced by a listing for (guess what?) the Jennings UFO Special!

My listing sank about 55 slots to the sixth page. I hope that will recover now that the show is over. I also hope that Jennings and HypeCouncil will forgive me for not running the 15-cents-per-click banner ad promoting the show.

Google and Yahoo ratings (search engine placement for 'UFO') were unaffected by all this.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: UFOs: Seeing is Believing - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 05:14:16 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:18:49 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs: Seeing is Believing - Hatch

>From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:59:10 -0700
>Subject: Re: UFOs: Seeing is Believing

>I didn't expect much and wasn't disappointed.

>Did observe, however, that the first hour was damn well done.

<snip>

>Witnesses not a credible scientific piece of data? Absurd.

<snip>

Hello Wendy:

Generally speaking, and unless I have this wrong, received wisdom seems to decree that those who have not seen a UFO are better witnesses than those who have.

Best wishes

- Larry

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 26](#)

Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 08:58:52 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:21:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Lehmborg

>From: Mike Woods <mike.woods.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:31:44 -0500
>Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

>I'd have no problem with an UpDates subscription of \$60. per
>year which works out to \$5 dollars a month or \$1.25 per week.

>I get more than 125 messages a week, so this is a place where "A
>penny for your thoughts" is more than just a cheap ploy to
>appear sensitive.

>Although, I'll admit, in some cases, we're still being
>overcharged!

Seems to me, and based on more than a few years experience, that
this might be one of those rare occasions where contributing to
some kind of subscription mechanism vis vis UpDates would make
the experience better for all of us, take advantage of current
technologies to fully feature it, and do creative thinking in
the service of our interests. I'd support something along those
lines, for sure. Put the hammer down, yea and verily.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:36:39 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:37:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Ledger

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 20:26:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>You don't get to define - or redefine -the meaning of the
>>term. It reads as presented. One who continuously supports an
>>unsupportable theory [often a ridiculous solution at that] to a
>>UFO report.

>Fine with me, so long as the term also includes those
>Pelicanists who continually support ridiculous and unsupportable
>theories such as that the Trindade case was a 'structured craft'
>witnessed by dozens of people, or that an extraterrestrial
>spacecraft crashed at Roswell.

First it was Peter who was trying to redefine.

Second, though I've looked at the Trinidad case I am still sitting on the fence about it. I've seen details about this object that makes a pretty good case for it being a Beech 18 aircraft. The only problem I have with the Beech 18 theory is that it would have had to fly sideways to maintain it's profile throughout the duration of the photo-op. Or the angulkar shift of the aircraft going away was matched a corresponding changing angle of the photographer's position.

Third, I think Roswell has some issues surrounding it that are yet to be resolved. I believe something happened there but I don't know what. I think there is the possibility of a crash of something [don't know about the alien occupants-that's another story]however I'm not convinced of the Mogal-balloon theory either. Jesse Marcel maintained he couldn't break/damage the parts with a hammer. Titanium? And there is the memory type metal [I don't buy tin/aluminum foil] that returned to its original shape. Either that was an outright lie on his part and Marcel Jr.'s. or it wasn't.

Obviously I'm being extremely brief on the subjects of two and three. A few sentences can't cover the arguments, one way or the other.

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' -

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:28:07 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:42:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' -

>From: Joachim Koch <koch.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 21:15:22 +0100
>Subject: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

<snip>

>Recently I had a telephone
>call with Kent Jeffrey who is still in contact with Jesse
>Marcel, Jr., somehow. And he read an email to me he had
>received from Dr. Marcel. So one month ago, Dr. Marcel was
>alive and - incredibly for me - really flying as an Army
>Doctor with some helicopter around in this disrupted land.

Dr. Marcel was in the recent UFO documentary by Peter Jennings.
Evidently he was interviewed last summer or fall.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell - Wise

From: William Wise <will.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:42:27 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:44:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell - Wise

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:00:38 -0500
>Subject: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell

>Of interest to Listers, the following excerpt is from Bill
>Clinton's Blog - he discusses Area 51, Roswell etc.

I can't find any information that verifies that the original
source of these statements:

<http://www.billclintondailydiary.blogspot.com/>

Reading the posts, it seems likely to be a hoax - spelling
errors and such.....

Will

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Deardorff

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 09:21:03 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:47:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Deardorff

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:14:15 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:04:28 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:34:49 -0800>
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>My interpretation is that, whereas Arnold estimated that the
>>objects were at 9500 ft as they passed Rainier (not at 14,000
>>ft), they were actually about 2000 ft lower, at least when they
>>passed Rainier, and maybe also while crossing Rainier's face.

>>This would place them low enough to "dip into canyons" south of
>>Rainier and to be at an altitude consistent with the 7000 ft
>>estimate based on Fed Johnson's sighting.

>One such possible subpeak would be Pyramid Peak, a well-known
>landmark on the SW flank of Rainier:

><http://ericibasecamp.net/trips/MRNP/PyramidPk.jpg>

>Maximum elevation is about 6940 feet. There's a saddle point
>behind Pyramid Pk. and Rainier at an altitude of about 6600
>feet.

>If the objects were on a ground-hugging trajectory and flying in
>and out of peaks and dipping into canyons, as Arnold described,
>then the base of Pyramid, roughly 1500-2500 feet wide (depending
>on how high above the surface the objects were), would have been
>wide enough to conceal the objects for a sufficient time to see
>them noticeably disappear.

>Assume the objects were flying at Arnold's clocked maximum,
>>~1700 mph, or about 2500 ft/sec, and, again, close to the
>surface. Arnold also said he could clearly see their outlines
>against the white backdrop of snow on Rainier, except when they
>seemed to go into profile and appeared as thin black lines that
>were difficult to see. The point is, when they were passing in
>front of Rainier, they were visible most of the time.

>Thus Arnold's objects could have been conceivably concealed for
>around 0.6-1.0 seconds as they passed behind Pyramid Peak. If
>they disappeared one after one as they passed this landmark,
>Arnold would have had good reason to believe they passed briefly
>behind Pyramid, and could have used this to determine distance.

>There are several other candidate subpeaks. Pyramid is just one
>example.

Thanks for pointing these out, David. Pyramid Peak at 6900 ft looks like a good bet to me. There's a topo map of it at:

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=46.8069&lon=-121.8111>

The terrain actually slopes down to about 6200 ft on the east side of the peak, where upper Pyramid Creek lies. And Pyramid Peak could appropriately be called a sub-peak of Mt. Rainier, being on its S.W. flank.

One of your lesser probabilities is Copper Mtn. just to the S.W. of Pyramid Peak. It's about 6300 ft high and has a little valley with steep walls to its immediate N.E. The valley floor is at 5540 ft, which the UFOs also might have dipped down into. But Pyramid Peak seems to best fit the bill.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 18:25:15 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:51:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Shough

>From: Peter Rogerson <progeron.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:27:02 +0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:23:12 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Peter Rogerson <progeron.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:44:42 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>I suspect that the TRUFOS are not representative of a unique
>>>phenomenon but like IFOS are a heterogeneous collection of many
>>>different things, though not perhaps the same things which
>>>generate the vast bulk of IFOs.

>>I agree with this. It's extremely unlikely that our
>>investigative and deductive filters are so refined as to have
>>sieved a perfectly pure sample of one class of phenomena. Since
>>we have no idea what we are looking for this could only have
>>happened by chance. It's inevitable that the residue is a
>>complicated mixture of objective and subjective processes about
>>which we are fairly ignorant.

>>But this is not a satisfactory conclusion. It merely restates
>>the question of interest to us (or the spectrum of questions) in
>>a richer and more concentrated form. This is as far as
>>investigation has brought us! Maybe not far, from an absolutist
>>point of view, but science in reality is like all experience an
>>endlessly reiterative activity. ("We shall not cease from
>>exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to return
>>back where we started and know the place for the first time."
>>T.S.Eliot - a transatlantic emollient for the culturally
>>polarised UFO community!)

>>You wish to go further, and I think you are proposing that
>>_none_ of those "many different things" is a truly remarkable
>>thing. But to do this is actually to propose that this is an
>>homogeneous sample, in terms of an underlying uniform
>>unremarkability. This may not seem quite as unlikely as that the
>>whole residue of TRUFOS is uniformly amazing, but it is somewhat
>>unlikely. It masquerades as a "simple" option in the spirit of
>>Occam's Razor by importing an unknown amount of explanatory
>>complexity to impose an artificial uniformity on nature.

>>In my opinion the messier but more realistic assumption is that
>>the unknown causes of the sample will exhibit some
>>heterogeneity, and that there will be a spectrum of remarkability.

>That seems fair enough, but I think you need to define
>"remarkability" in this context.

Hi Peter,

I think we should defer, in the first instance, to the body of

scientific thought and opinion about the nature of the world and derive our definition of "remarkability" from that. Call it that element of nature responsible for scientific surprise. An array of possible scientific interpretations for various types of experiential phenomena can then be associated to different degrees of scientific surprise. (Note: Not demonstrable interpretations, but possible interpretations, else we deny science its capacity for surprise.)

In these terms some interpretations would not be very remarkable at all, others would be very remarkable indeed; but they would all be inside the realm of scientific naturalism. One of these remarkable naturalistic interpretations is ET intelligence. It would surprise some scientists out of their underpants, but so would some others. It is not an occult notion beyond the pale of scientific naturalism. On the contrary the notion that "intelligent life" is a spontaneous attribute of chemical and informational complexity, and not a unique earthly miracle, was birthed by, and has matured in tandem with, the growth of science, the only method of "knowledge" which enshrines the inevitability of surprise.

We don't have to specify ahead of time which of these interpretations will work where. The only way we can find out is to try them (this is Bridgeman's "operational criterion of meaning") and in doing so the body of scientific thought continually transforms itself, altering the relative remarkability of some ideas and introducing some new ones. So the complete definition of "remarkability" is an operational one, and I think the process of defining it is just the activity of science itself.

Which is where devising testable forms of remarkable hypotheses comes in. It may be very difficult and contentious in the case of ETH. But doing this devising and testing is the science. We can't in conscience just exclude the difficult questions.

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 12:26:07 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:53:56 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:20:19 -0500
>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

><snip>

>>It was a pure puff piece, except that now network television can
>>state with a straight face..."been there, done that, nothing to
>>see here... move along". Case closed.

>So... does the idea of doing a Ufologists' own documentary seem
>a little more appealing now?

Hi Eleanor,

I'd take the worst of what Peter Jennings can do over the best we could expect from a project funded by the likes of conspiracy profiteers like Alex Jones.

Perhaps a better idea might be to approach say, Coast to Coast AM, with the following...

A series of round-table discussions...

UFO - Panel includes researchers of Unidentifieds, strictly on craft and "best case" issues. 3 hours of discussion and an hour of call-in. I would think that 4 people could be elected from the List, by vote of members approved by Errol, based on adherence to guidelines, stature, and availability.

Abduction - Panel includes researchers of alien abductions, strictly on process, implants, procedures, etc. 4-person panel again elected as above.

ET - Panel includes researchers of ET types, panel elected as above.

More subjects that suitable researchers can provide could be added.

If we approached C2C AM with such a proposal, and could build 3 or more 4- person elected groups to represent each aspect, I think we could keep the momentum going...sort of a "fill in the blanks" of the ABC special. With such persons as Jerry Clark, Friedman, and Budd Hopkins, who actually participated in the special, we could pitch it as their opportunity to more fully outline their positions and take questions that I'm sure the viewers of the ABC special wish they could have asked.

It would also provide a chance for fellows like Dick Hall to get their two cents in, and especially if ABC does a followup with their omitted material later. People would be getting a scoop,

and get to interact as they could not with a documentary or network special.

In the end, fancy graphics and high production values are of less value than hearing the voices, and asking the questions, and of course, getting some answers. Such a series of discussions would keep interest high, and would provide impetus for ABC to produce a followup, if they had any inkling to do so.

Plus, C2C provides archived recordings for purchase, and even Wendy could perhaps sell nicely produced recordings as a series package.

With such a series, we might even attract some such as Kaku, who might be encouraged to bring a fresh insight into the fray. Even the List might attract some new faces...relevant scientific faces.

C2C wins, the UFO community wins, the participants win, the listeners win, it doesn't cost us anything, and the message can be dished with consistency, authority, and credibility. It can all be done by phone, and wouldn't require wardrobe or special effects. Although we could create a web site for each "episode" with illustrations and links to the panels' own publications or sites. A little promotional aid, and a central site for information on the series as a whole.

Each discussion, by focusing on one aspect, would not be muddled by trying to address everything at once, or with counterpoint rebuttal. By keeping each "episode" on a single aspect, listeners could choose the "areas of interest" they most want to hear about without having to listen to the rest. By presenting only the Ufology viewpoint, the effectiveness would lie in the quality of research presented rather than the comparative "charisma" of the participants (which often hampers such debates as on C2C). Perhaps after the initial series, a listener poll could determine further such series.

If the format proved popular, it could be spread to other radio shows (SDI?), and perhaps Internet shows as well.

What I'm suggesting would not be so much a debate as an enhanced (more detailed) discussion of the most compelling cases for each researcher. Each could pitch in his own research on a given case. If some disagreement arises, the listener is more informed and if curious, is more likely to dig into the issue.

That's what I would like to see.

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <mshough.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 18:41:42 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:55:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Shough

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 20:26:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>You don't get to define - or redefine -the meaning of the term. It
>>reads as presented. One who continuously supports an
>>unsupported theory [often a ridiculous solution at that] to a
>>UFO report.

>Fine with me, so long as the term also includes those
>Pelicanists who continually support ridiculous and unsupported
>theories such as that the Trindade case was a 'structured craft'
>witnessed by dozens of people, or that an extraterrestrial
>spacecraft crashed at Roswell.

Hi John

I'd be interested to know if you have any new information on the
Trindade case. Do you? If so please could you open it up for
discussion?

Best

Martin Shough

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 13:42:38 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:56:40 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Eleanor White <eleonor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:20:19 -0500
>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

><snip>

>>It was a pure puff piece, except that now network television can
>>state with a straight face..."been there, done that, nothing to
>>see here... move along". Case closed.

>So... does the idea of doing a Ufologists' own documentary seem
>a little more appealing now?

Eleanor White,

A physicist friend of mine mentioned this last night. I had to think for a minute how much would it cost to produce a documentary. Could egos be tucked away enough for logistics?

Well, may be a surprise coming down the road soon.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 13:45:33 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:59:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - Balaskas

>From: Mike Woods <mike.woods.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:31:44 -0500
>Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

<snip>

>I'd have no problem with an UpDates subscription of \$60. per
>year which works out to \$5 dollars a month or \$1.25 per week.

<snip>

Greetings Everyone!

Like Mike, I too would have no objections in paying an annual fee for a subscription to UFO UpDates.

I already have paid subscriptions to many journals that come out monthly or quarterly and membership in many organizations which send me weekly or monthly newsletters or magazines. A growing trend is to make the contents of these journals, newsletters and magazine available on-line to those members with access to the Internet so that not only publishing and mailing expenses can be reduced but notices of important upcoming events, news and current research can be made available to subscribers/members quickly.

Ufology has earned a respectability over the past few years from the efforts of responsible people like Errol Bruce-Knapp through his UFO UpDates e-mail List and weekly radio program about UFOs, 'Strange Days... Indeed', which can be heard all over the globe via the World Wide Web that provides current information and a forum for researchers in the UFO field.

Unlike other e-mail Lists/blogs, UFO UpDates has archived many years of important comments and facts by its subscribers that it has become not only a valuable resource for UFO researchers but an inexpendible public educational tool too. Important findings and ideas regarding UFOs and ufology which would have been read by a few at most on other Lists, before being forgotten, are still available to us in the UFO UpDates Archives Of course it takes money to maintain such a vast and important resource which, I think you will all agree, is certainly worthy of our support.

I also believe that UFO UpDates, once people pay to subscribe to it, has the potential of becoming the official newsletter or voice of a new professional association in ufology. This would not only make the subject of UFOs to be taken more seriously but will enhance the image of the new science of ufology. Any step leading to the creation of such a professional association is certainly worth a few dollars a month to us.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 12:57:50 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:00:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 20:26:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>You don't get to define - or redefine -the meaning of the term. It
>>reads as presented. One who continuously supports an
>>unsupportable theory [often a ridiculous solution at that] to a
>>UFO report.

>Fine with me, so long as the term also includes those
>Pelicanists who continually support ridiculous and unsupportable
>theories such as that the Trindade case was a 'structured craft'
>witnessed by dozens of people

John once again shows off his well-groomed feathers with the
above. For those who want to go beyond the squawking, preening,
and wing-flapping, here's where you want to be:

<http://trindade-island.mysite.wanadoo-members.co.uk/trindex.htm>

It will remind you, if you are not one, why you are not a pelicanist.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Friedman

From: **Stanton Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 14:36:39 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:02:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Friedman

>From: John Rimmer
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 20:26:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Don Ledger
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:47:17 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>You don't get to define - or redefine -the meaning of the term. It
>>reads as presented. One who continuously supports an
>>unsupportable theory [often a ridiculous solution at that] to a
>>UFO report.

>Fine with me, so long as the term also includes those
>Pelicanists who continually support ridiculous and unsupportable
>theories such as that the Trindade case was a 'structured craft'
>witnessed by dozens of people, or that an extraterrestrial
>spacecraft crashed at Roswell.

The ridiculous and unsupportable theory is that the Trindade
case was not a structured craft and that an ET craft didn't
crash near Roswell.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell -

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:43:44 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:03:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell -

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:00:38 -0500
>Subject: Bill Clinton Blog On Area 51 & Roswell

>Of interest to Listers, the following excerpt is from Bill
>Clinton's Blog - he discusses Area 51, Roswell etc.

Um... this isn't really Bill Clinton's blog.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot.nul)

Website: <http://www.mactonnies.com>

Daily blog: <http://posthumanblues.blogspot.com>

"After the Martian Apocalypse" available from Amazon!

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/074348293X>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:47:18 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:05:21 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Rudiak

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:40:09 -0500
>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 07:46:52 -0800
>>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:26:03 -0500
>>>Subject: ABC Jennings Special

>>>The first segment was weighted positive by the number of
>>>witnesses. Unfortunately they combined the "8 o'clock hour"
>>>events over Phoenix (triangle) with th 10 PM videos that
>>>probably show flares, as described on my web site.

>>>The astronomer guy clearly didn't know anything about the 8:30
>>>PM triangle or else simply ignored all that testimony in favor
>>>of commenting only upon the : "lights in the sky" that were
>>>videod at 10 PM.

>The "TRUFO" was the object seen "in the 8 o'clock hour" which
>was large, dark and blocked the stars. Jennings said in his
>monologue that hundreds of people also saw the lights at 10 p.m.
>However, to the best of my knowledge there were only a few who
>saw those, but hundreds did see the "thing" at about 8:30.

I noticed that they failed to draw a clear line between the
earlier and later sightings, but lumped them in together as one
and the same thing. Whether this was deliberate confusion or
simple ignorance on the part of the writer/director I don't
know. Judging by how he badly slanted Roswell and abductions, I
suspect the former.

Question: Was anybody on the List interviewed by ABC, such as
Jerry Clark, Stanton Friedman, or Dick Hall, used as an expert
consultant? Did the filmmakers express a real interest in
getting the facts, or were they just in for the sound bites?

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:13:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:10:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:57:30 EST
>Subject: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special?

>Wow!!!

>I couldn't believe my eyes and ears!

>I was bowled over. Left aghast!

>I had to blink my eyes at what I was seeing after all these years!

>A soldering tool that used a light beam to weld stuff and when
>it touched metal it was hot but when you moved it it went cool.
>It was for only \$19.95 at that!!!

Naw, it used metal to metal contact to melt solder.

>Then there was that ladle and spatula turner that easily scooped
>up broth and veggies with ease!

Wish I had invented that. But, where were the beer and wine
commercials?

<snip>

>This is the very first time ever I've fallen asleep during a
>major UFO news event. One of the neighbor's kids had to spark me
>up to point out that 'Jesse' was on. I looked up and I saw
>footage of Jesse Marcel Sr. on the screen. I says to the kid,
>"How do you know him?" and the kid, who tells everybody here in
>Hollywood that he's a reincarnated alien, just rattled on about
>what happened in Roswell back then and this and that. The kid
>was more interesting than Jennings and the special.

They portrayed the Roswell "bit" as an attempt by everyone
involved to make \$\$\$ and get famous. Including Pflock, I suppose
(and C.B. Moore). I wonder how much money Jesse Marcel made from
making up his basic Roswell story. I wonder how much money
Jenning made disparaging Marcel... and his son, the doctor, who
volunteered for work in Iraq.

<snip>

>ABC should be ashamed of itself and should have taken Jennings
>over the coals for providing that as commercial and newsworthy
>product. It is literally the worst UFO special and documentary
>I've seen and I've seen some pretty rotten UFO documentaries!

Awww, don't be too hard on the poor chap, After all this is
probably the first UFO documentary ever to go to press without
Klass or Randi or Oberg or Sheaffer. And I thought the
juxtaposition of the seemingly credible witness testimony
(including police and military) with the "know-it-all-pointy
headed gurus of science" made the scientists look foolish. The
segment with pilots (including the 30,000 hour guy) was good.

The history lesson was UFOS 101 (beginning college level) but at

least did no more than mention the Condon whitewash as a reason to end Blue Book. And they got Hynek contradicting himself (says no scientific proof in the 1960's but founded the Center in the 1970's). Of course, they portrayed him as a skeptic turned believer.... and emphasized "believer" as much as possible. Is this a religion? One might get that idea from Jennings's show.

Mainstream science and news can't get over the idea that most UFO sightings are made by people who have no interest in the subject and are thoroughly surprised by what they see happening. Instead, they seem to think that all sightings of "lights in the sky" etc. are a result of people wanting to see lights in the sky or having a great need for something exciting to happen. Tell that to the guys at Minot AFB (or numerous other SAC bases.... and no one has even mentioned the 1975 flyovers which opened a crack in the cover up of SAC base incidents over the years).

Now we find out that Roswell was all a grab for \$\$\$ even though we're told that Mogul balloon material (rubber, sticks, wood, strings/rope) can't be permanently bent or dented with a hammer (characteristics of the material as reported by Jesse Marcel). At least Jennings didn't go into the "dummy drop" explanation that the bodies were crash dummies dropped 6 years too late and in the wrong place.

Poor Budd got sandbagged as usual. What about abductees who recall everything without hypnosis? What about the abductees who are NOT asleep at the time of the incident but, instead, have Missing Time. Had Jennings never heard of Betty and Barney? I hope the abductees who were willing to appear don't feel too disappointed. I expect that others will be willing to come forward simply to spite Jennings.

So, all in all, it was a mixed bag. To the person like myself who spotted all the fake UFO photos combined with good stuff (those photo editors have to have something to show!) and the statements like "thousands" of people saw the 10 PM Phoenix lights (thousands? I am only aware of a few who videotaped them) and that there are "hundreds" of UFO conventions each year (gee, does each ufologist have his/her own convention), this show ranged from ho hum to tragedy. But I think there might have been enough positive during the first hour and at the very end when Michio Kaku stomped on the "they can't get here from there" guys to interest the casual listener and even spur the "casual witness" to tell his/her story.

Come to think of it, I wonder if Peter Davenport, who apparently is evidently the only ufologist outside of CUFOS, had an unurge of calls?

What say you, Peter?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 17:47:52 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:14:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:48 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:27:40 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 18:57:54 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>>I do not see how it would even have been possible for Arnold
>>>to have prevented the "blinding arc-like" flashes from causing
>>>black retinal afterimages. I do not see how it is possible for
>>>Arnold to have prevented these black retinal afterimages
>>>from involuntarily getting projected onto the image of Mt
>>>Rainier as he tried to track the objects as they headed into
>>>Rainier, even if he had wanted to prevent afterimages from doing
>>>that.

>>I actually did an experiment in which I used a mirror at a
>>distance to reflect the sun into my eyes. The afterimage from
>>staring at the reflection was not black, but rather colored and
>>pale... Looking at a metallic reflection of the sun is like
>>looking at the sun. Whenever I look at the sun (briefly!) it
>>"burns" a hot spot on the retina which remains looking bright
>>for a second or so. Then it fades to a pale afterimage with a
>>pale greenish center and with a reddish halo around. It does not
>>look black. The pale afterimage can last for a minute or more.

>Again being dragged into an argument I told you I don't have
>time (or resources right now) to get into. Just because I dare
>to disagree about the sacred Arnold case. Your sun Bruce is over
>30 arcminutes in diameter and round, whereas Arnold's tiny
>little flashes were at closest approach less than 3 arcminutes
>in length and anywhere from ten to twenty times thinner than
>that in vertical thickness, according to his drawing and
>statements, or around 0.1 to 0.3 arcmins in thickness. This is
>at or below the smallest resolvable image with human acuity.
>They would have been much LESS than HALF that size at first
>appearance and at the end of the sighting. They were moving
>horizontally and thus tending to smear the image in that same
>direction. Now when that afterimage on Arnold's retina was
>projected onto the snowfields of Mt Rainier as he moved his head
>and eyes to try to follow the objects would the afterimage be a
>dark line when seen against white or what? ("Dark line" of
>whatever color if color could even be resolved clearly in a tiny
>image briefly flashed and briefly afterimaged.)

Brad,

This is pretty weak stuff. There's nothing precious about the
Arnold case, though your getting upset about its existance is

bit strange.

We all know that this is not the first case, just the one that brought the phenomenon out in the open.

I fly a lot. I've seen flashes in the sky many, many times - some of them against backgrounds each of which has been an aircraft. Usually it's the Sun returning off the cockpit or an aircraft's polished aluminum surface. There were no after-images.

My wife and I watched two from the ground just the other day near sunset. Brilliant, but just jets flying west at probably 30-40 thousand feet, heading for Boston or New York.

Geez man if you want to solve the case find something a bit more persuasive than meteors and after-images.

I would have thought that since you are one of those who researches these cases very thoroughly that you would have come to a more reasoned conclusion than what you have.

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:28:06 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:19:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Lehmborg

>From: Kelly Freeman <Khfflsciufu.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 21:07:59 EST
>Subject: Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:27:50 -0600
>>Subject: Seeing Is Believing Naught

><snip>

>>Flatly, Jennings took the easy way out, reader, fell back on the
>>outmoded and invalidated "conventional wisdoms" exacerbating the
>>cultural hole that we are in, and wiggled his ass for a
>>mainstream as corrupt as it is canted... as irrelevant as it is
>>fraudulent.

>Careful, Alfred. Let's not be too quick to judge Mr. Jennings in
>this manner.

Really. After his sneering celebration of the suspicious status
quo and his re-inflation of the patently discredited, his
glossovers, and his character attacks I would think you'd pick
up your own torch or pitchfork.

>Seems to me he stuck his neck out a little bit to
>try and bring the UFO phenomenon into the prime time arena.

Seems to me he continued the insidious inculcation of ufological
dis-creditation and performed exactly as he was told to perform.
He, in no way, stuck his neck out, IMO.

>We should encourage such endeavors by ABC and the other networks
>so that meaningful debates can take place.

Problem is, the opposition lacks the requisite sack to engage in
that debate because of their lack of success, and I'm reluctant
to congratulate an institution for minimally doing its job,
especially when it's not even minimally doing its job.

>>What did I expect?

>>I had no expectations. Like many, though, I had hopes.

>Sounds to me like your expectations were too high and your hopes
>unrealistic.

This is one of those times ripe for an opportunity to agree to
disagree. Humanity has a long history of having to shoot to the
moon to barely cross the street. My intention is to cross this
street.

>You just can't expect the mainstream media to
>suddenly pronounce everything "UFO" valid as if overcome by a
>sudden revelation of truth.

Yes, I can. Edward R. Morrow would have, I suspect. Moreover,
that production company talked with the ufological principals

for months. Unless they were conflicted, derelict, or just plain stupid they knew what the real deal was.

>One step at a time, my friend, one step at a time.

Not me, leap to soar and cleave and trust in my bungee! <g>

>We're looking at a process that could take a very long time.

The preceding 50 years of wheel spinning indifference from our conflicted mainstream has been very long indeed.

>Unless, of course, UFOs land tomorrow on the White House lawn.

Thing is - they all but did that in 1952 to little avail... I suspect an actual landing would have made little difference.

><snip>

>>I was grossly disappointed with the obvious bias shown in
>>several segments, especially the Roswell and Abduction subjects.
>>These were badly handled, poorly chosen, and explicated
>>incompetently with prejudice.

>I agree with you here.

And remembering the fatuous, uninformed, and specious treatment of Stanton Friedman and Peter Davenport, two men who carry more validity in their pocket lint than the whole of ABC, we would appear to have very little to argue about after all.

><snip>

>>There was no mention of the literally thousands of physical
>>trace cases, or of the blacked out FOIA documents obfuscating
>>more of the truth, or "radar/visual" sightings... persons
>>watching physical evidence actually being made...

>Too much to cover in just two hours. On the flip side, there
>were also no Raelians, Space Brothers and channeling, orbs and
>other meaningless lights in the sky, and I don't remember
>hearing the word 'conspiracy' even once in the program.
>Sometimes, it's what's not there that counts.

Everything I mentioned could have been programmed into a minute, so drop one of McHaha's segments or snip a SETI "cultist" who all got carte blanche treatment by the way. And maybe you haven't seen my paper on a rational justification for conspiracy of all types. A mention of a "cosmic conspiracy" would not have been inappropriate.

><snip>

>>Then, given a back stepping reliance on 19th Century
>>philosophies/physics, there was ABC's treatment of interstellar
>>travel. Ludicrous, reader! We could travel between stars right
>>now if we wanted to. Not a NOD to that.

>Again, I disagree. Introducing the viewers to Michio Kaku as a
>"leading theoretical physicist" and then letting him go on to
>explain the concept of traveling through a wormhole literally
>made Shostak and the other SETI proponents look quite
>foolish/narrow minded.

Too little too late and in a manner baldly constructed to pretend balance, and besides, Dr. Kaku was speculating on 'magic' that the viewer can push comfortably off until the next millennium - no points here.

>Then Mr. Kaku goes on to suggest
>extraterrestrials could be a million years ahead in
>technological achievement, instead of just hundreds. He then
>challenges them to "open their minds".

'What ifs', 'wool gathering', and 'maybe so's' - a lettered reach with no grasp anywhere near it, and a tedious admonition to those with their minds already well open.

>>Moreover, indicating that Hynek was the only scientist fighting
>>the battle was patently preposterous... if it was not the very
>>soul of duplicity, too. Dr. James McDonald (et sig al) did far

>>more than Hynek ever did on his_best_day.

>Again, Alfred, I believe your hopes and expectations were too
>high or unrealistic. I didn't get that impression at all. As a
>matter of fact, portraying Hynek the way they did by acknowledg-
>ing his about face from a skeptic to a "believer" through his
>years of investigation into the UFO phenomenon served to lessen
>the credibility of Shostak, McGaha, and the other SETI know it
>alls, who have never seriously investigated a UFO sighting, IMO.

Hynek was painted as a lone wolf to the uninformed when nothing
could have been further from the truth. Ask Richard Hall.

No, a pox on them for their dissembling regression to the
seventh generation, at least. <g>

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:07:37 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:30:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rudiak

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:48 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:27:40 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 18:57:54 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 13:31:16 -0800
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

><snip>

>>>Did Arnold say the objects were mainly seen when they flashed so
>>>bright they were like "blinding arc" light or did he not? This
>>>is one of the main grounds on which I disputed Easton's
>>>"pelican" theory - birds don't flash sunlight so bright that it
>>>is "blindingly" bright like an "arc light."

>>>You should know very well that the retinal afterimage of seeing
>>>an intensely bright light is a black or dark spot in the visual
>>>field - anyone can test this out by trying it on a sunlit
>>>object. Arnold kept seeing alternating bright flashes (which
>>>would have been elongated by the objects' velocity into bright
>>>lines) and "black lines."

>>>I do not see how it would even have been possible for Arnold to
>>>have prevented the "blinding arc-like" flashes from causing
>>>black retinal afterimages. I do not see how it is possible for
>>>Arnold to have prevented these black retinal afterimages
>>>from involuntarily getting projected onto the image of Mt
>>>Rainier as he tried to track the objects as they headed into
>>>Rainier, even if he had wanted to prevent afterimages from doing
>>>that.

<snip>

>Again being dragged into an argument I told you I don't have
>time (or resources right now) to get into. Just because I dare
>to disagree about the sacred Arnold case. Your sun Bruce is over
>30 arcminutes in diameter and round, whereas Arnold's tiny
>little flashes were at closest approach less than 3 arcminutes
>in length and anywhere from ten to twenty times thinner than
>that in vertical thickness, according to his drawing and
>statements, or around 0.1 to 0.3 arcmins in thickness. This is
>at or below the smallest resolvable image with human acuity.

Brad,

I covered all the acuity arguments in my original post.

Gathering by your many erroneous comments here, either you didn't read it or absorb it. You are again arguing outside of your fields of expertise and muddling things.

The "less than 3 arcminutes in length" comes from Arnold's statements about the objects appearing to have about the same angular size as the distance between the outside engines of a DC-4 which he estimate to be about 15 miles in the distance.

You then procede to mix this up with another, separate measure of size from Arnold saying he could see the objects as thin black lines in profile, with the length being about 20 times greater than the thickness. You then use this separate measure to low-ball the objects angular thickness.

Your statement that he couldn't see lines thinner than his resolution acuity limit is absolutely false, which I have told you both in email and on my Updates post. You are confusing resolution acuity, the ability to see two closely spaced things, with detection acuity, the ability to see that something is there, like a thin line, when it is in isolation. Detection acuity for thin black lines on a white background measures in seconds of arc, not minutes of arc. When the angular thickness of the line is near resolution acuity limits it looks dark or black. The thinner it gets, the fainter and greyer it gets, until it gets so thin than it can no longer be detected.

Since the objects would not be seen as black lines unless they were close to his angular acuity limit, I estimated the angular thickness at about 0.5 minarc (assuming Arnold's resolution acuity limit was 20/15 or 0.75 minarc).

Using 0.5 minarc and multiplying by Arnolds' 20:1 length:thickness ratio gives 10 minarc for the length, not "less than 3".

The problem is that these two angular measure estimates of object size disagree by about a factor of 4. I then pointed out that both could easily have large errors in them. Arnold drew his picture of the object with a length:thickness ratio more like 10:1 instead of 20:1. It is very easy to make mistakes like this in estimating extreme length/thickness ratios. So the estimate of 10 minarc by this measure might be cut in two down to 5 minarc.

The engine distance estimate could also have large sources of error, from Arnold's estimate of plane distance to comparing sizes of the objects and the DC-4 by moving back and forth between them with his cowling tool in a vibrating airplane. That could also easily cause a factor of 2 underestimate of size, especially when the acuity task was nearing his resolution limits. The DC-4 engine angular size at 15 miles I calculated at 2.5 minarc, and doubling that again gives 5 minarcs.

This resolves the conflict between the two size measures. It also agrees with his statements that he couldn't make out the shape when he first spotted them and they were further away, but could easily make out the shape against the backdrop of white snow on Mt. Rainier when they were at closest approach. When they were first seen, perhaps twice as far away, they were below his shape resolution limit (estimated at 3.75 minarc based on 20/15, 0.75 minarc resolution acuity). But at closest approach, at ~5 minarc size, they would have been above his shape resolution limit.

On an eyechart of characters, the same thing is seen if you ask somebody to read the letters on the line just below their character resolution limit. But ask them to read the line just above their resolution limit, they can usually do it rather easily. This is an analagous shape recognition task as what Arnold was facing.

If you don't want to get into this now I understand. I have time conflicts of my own. But please don't keep repeating the same erroneous arguments when the mistakes have been previously pointed out to you.

>They would have been much LESS than HALF that size at first
>appearance and at the end of the sighting. They were moving
>horizontally and thus tending to smear the image in that same

>direction.

Again you are ignoring what I have written and presenting false arguments about our ability to track objects. Angular velocity from Arnold's descriptions was on the order of only 1 deg/sec. (I calculated closer to 1.2 deg/sec using Arnold's maximum estimate of velocity.)

We can easily track such slow angular movements using our smooth pursuit eye movements. Experiments show these to be accurate up to 30 deg/sec. The image does not smear because our smooth pursuit eye tracking keeps the image stabilized on our retinas. The eyes move with the object.

Again, you can easily demonstrate this for yourself by taking some small print held at arm's length and moving it at about 1/2 inch/sec to simulate the angular velocity. The image does not smear because you are smoothly tracking it and you will have no problems whatsoever reading the moving print.

>Now when that afterimage on Arnold's retina was
>projected onto the snowfields of Mt Rainier as he moved his head
>and eyes to try to follow the objects would the afterimage be a
>dark line when seen against white or what? ("Dark line" of
>whatever color if color could even be resolved clearly in a tiny
>image briefly flashed and briefly afterimaged.)

Afterimages could look darkish against a white background. But they can't keep changing from dots to thin lines and back again, nor would he continue to see them flashing. Afterimages also stay frozen on the retina and would not appear to weave like the tail of a kite.

It is also rather difficult to understand how meteor dots hundreds of miles away could create afterimages in the first place. Not only would the images be small (even at 5 minarc, the area would be less than 4% of that of the sun), but atmospheric absorption even on a very clear day would reduce intensity by 90% at the very least. These meteors would have had to have an intensity much greater than the sun to begin with.

These incredibly brilliant meteors should have attracted the attention of thousands of people from hundreds of miles in every direction. There isn't one such report from anywhere. This string of meteors should have left a very prominent smoke trail as well, again not reported by anyone, nor by Kenneth Arnold himself. How could these meteors do all these amazing things?

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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 13:32:37 -1000
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:34:15 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:10 EST
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 06:33:16 -1000
>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 00:30:06 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>Michael:

>You wrote, in part:

><snip>

>>Why bother with more sightings cases and analyses?

>Because that is where the best evidence is to be found.

Best evidence for what? The existence of UFOs? Major Keyhoe's early investigations were the best since he used military professionals. What's the point of coming up with more sightings data based on civilians when the military professionals were ignored and then silenced? If you want evidence of what's happening with waived Special Access Programs dealing with reverse engineering of ETVs, working with EBEs, you need to work with the whistleblower testimonies. That's where UFO research needs to go, unless you are dedicated to reinventing the wheel and doing in new novel ways what others such as Keyhoe have done before.

><snip>

>>People like Bob Lazar, Robert Dean, Clifford Stone, Dan Sherman, >>etc., reveal much of what is happening but many UFO researchers >>don't want to go there.

>>Those researchers who do venture into that field are criticized >>for being credulous and sloppy, and not having the right >>emphasis on hard evidence when the role of national agencies in >>manipulating hard evidence is ignored. UFO research needs to >>move on.

>Those "researchers" are criticized for being credulous and >sloppy for a very good reason - because they are credulous and >sloppy. Again with Lazar. What is your response to Stan >Friedman, who posted a detailed critique of Sideshow Bob here >just a couple of days ago? Do you have one?

Oh, I see, making your argument by assertion. Researchers are credulous and sloppy because you say so, hmm. You make no mention of different methodologies being used in analysing different sources of evidence as I've mentioned numerous times

in earlier posts. It seems methodology is not part of your lexicon. There is a rigorous alternative to the nuts and bolts approach to evidence but you don't want to acknowledge that. Argument by assertion is not very compelling. I posted my reply to Stan's critique of Lazar which you perhaps didn't read. <http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/feb/m23-013.shtml>

>Oh, yes, I recall it now. If I had \$1 for everytime you hemmed >and hawed in your defence of Lazar, or said "perhaps" followed >by some ridiculous, unsubstantiated speculation, I'd have a nice >pocketful of change.

>Can you not even acknowledge the possibility (I would say >probability, but for the sake of argument I'll go with >possibility) that these whistleblowers, who cannot provide the >"hard evidence" you so casually dismiss, might actually be >lying? Perhaps even working (to enter your world here for a >moment) for the government as disinformation agents, sent to >distract our attention from the real evidence? Is this any less >likely than your theories? If so, why? Your gut feeling?? As >Stan might say, "psychic powers"??

That is a possibility that needs to be part of any investigation into a whistleblower. Yet it does not follow that a person is lying because they don't have sufficient 'hard evidence' to back up their claims. There are many ways to determine if one is determining the truth aside from hard evidence: coherence, consistency, sincerity, integrity, etc. One can reach a rigorous conclusion that someone is telling the truth without hard evidence. We do that all time. Do you demand hard evidence to prove that your wife is telling you the truth when she says that she spent the afternoon shopping with friends? To say someone is lying simply because the hard evidence isn't there is a poor methodology.

I do believe Stan went overboard when he made that claim regarding Lazar. That is especially the case when it comes to credible claims that evidence tampering is going on and efforts underway to undermine witness credibility. Why wouldn't it be a logical policy for a Program Manager of a waived Special Access Program undermine the credibility of a whistleblower or remove any hard evidence possessed by the whistleblower? If a program is so secret that you don't even want members of Congress to know its existence, would you just sit back and allow someone like Bob Lazar to spill the beans if you were the Program Manager of such a program? If you take a look at the SOM1-01 Majestic Document, you'll see that Ch 3, section 1.12 refers to discrediting witnesses and outlines some of the methods of doing this.

As I've shown earlier, there is no effective civilian oversight of waived Special Access Programs in the military intelligence community to check up and restrain such program managers. So they can be very creative in how they set out to discredit witnesses or whistleblowers since they answer only to those within the chain of military command, and they may not want to know either what the Program Managers are up to - plausible deniability. But of course, the Program Managers are inspired by Kant's Categorical Imperative, and it's only bored political scientists like myself who believe they have a copy of the Prince's Machiavelli to instruct them on how to guard their little empire.

>Your say that "UFO research needs to move on."

>That is a siren call that, if followed as you propose, will >probably finish ufology as a place for serious research.

Again, serious research for what? That UFOs are real and exist. Do you need more evidence?

>So here's my siren call...

>I would suggest that UFO research needs to move on, all right - >away from you and your whistleblowers (unless they can offer >some proof other than their word), and back to serious study of >serious evidence.

Paul, let's be serious here. Lazar offered more than his word.

He had a W-2 form showing he worked for Naval Intelligence in 1989, he supplied the name of the checking officer for someone doing security checks for prospective Navy employees, he had witnesses to the testing of reverse engineered ETVs on three occasions while he claimed to be working at S4, he had a Los Alamos Monitor Article in 1982 which said he was employed as a 'physist' at Los Alamos in 1982. To be employed as a physicist you would need to have at least a Master's degree. So in addition to the completion of a Bachelor's degree in 1976 he must have completed a Master's degree to get the job at Los Alamos. Stan's assertion that Lazar was a technician and didn't have a Master's doesn't make sense given the Los Alamos Monitor story. Have a look yourself at the story:

<http://www.serve.com/mahood/lazar/jetcar.htm>

Also, investigators such as Knapp have provided more evidence that Lazar was employed at Los Alamos through the phone book entry and other employees verifying this. Yet this is not enough to be considered 'serious evidence' for his claims for working at S-4. What do you expect? What Lazar claims to have worked for is at the very least a waived Special Access Program. Don't you think there would be security team in place to ensure that such hard evidence dissappears, and that Lazar's credibility is undermined?

I want UFO research to move forward into the area of classified programs on ETVS, EBES, etc., and this is what many of the whistleblowers in Greer's Disclosure Project, and others such as Lazar, Robert Dean, Charles Hall, supply. You'd like more serious evidence for the 'serious study' of UFOs as a real phenomenon. Sorry to say, but I think you are caught in a time warp anomaly of some kind.

In peace,

Michael Salla

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Hamilton

From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:36:42 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:38:48 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Hamilton

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:40:09 -0500
>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skyman22.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 07:46:52 -0800
>>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:26:03 -0500
>>>Subject: ABC Jennings Special

>>>The first segment was weighted positive by the number of
>>>witnesses. Unfortunately they combined the "8 o'clock hour"
>>>events over Phoenix (triangle) with th 10 PM videos that
>>>probably show flares, as described on my web site.

<snip>

>>Bruce, aside from our disagreement about the so-called flares, a
>>young man reported to the Phoenix Arizona Republic that he had
>>seen 5 airplanes fly over on the night of March 13th, 1997 which
>>probably inspired James McGaha's statement.

<snip>

>The "TRUFO" was the object seen "in the 8 o'clock hour" which
>was large, dark and blocked the stars. Jennings said in his
>monologue that hundreds of people also saw the lights at 10 p.m.
>However, to the best of my knowledge there were only a few who
>saw those, but hundreds did see the "thing" at about 8:30.

Which one? There was more than one. Maybe you are not familiar
with the March 13th events.

Bill

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 27](#)

Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 12:05:41 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 12:05:41 -0500
Subject: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program

Source: The John E. Mack Institute

http://johnemackinstitute.org/center/center_news.asp?id=249

Feb 25, 2005

Budd Hopkins' Response
to the ABC Peter Jennings "Seeing is Believing" TV Program
Courtesy of the Intruders Foundation

During the past year Jennings' producers interviewed me a number of times, and because I sensed what they had in mind, I made, as a preemptive strike, a number of careful, highly specific observations about the UFO abduction phenomenon. All of these crucial points - recorded by ABC on videotape - were designed to underline the physical reality of UFO abductions and to demonstrate the implausibility of current skeptical explanations.

To its shame, ABC suppressed all of these observations.

I knew, of course, that the skeptics' favorite explanation du jour is impossibly simple: abduction reports, they believe, are all due to misperceived "sleep paralysis." Ranking as a distant second is another erroneous belief: abduction reports, they say, "ONLY emerge under hypnosis," and since hypnosis is "totally unreliable", all abduction reports must be discarded. In the light of these tediously familiar errors and misstatements, I made certain in my taped interviews to explain the following:

* In the first two decades of our research, all of the central abduction cases involved people who were outside their houses when they were taken none were lying paralyzed in their bedrooms. They were driving cars, walking, fishing, hunting and even, in one famous case, driving a tractor on a farm. "Sleep paralysis" as a blanket explanation of UFO abductions is therefore, ipso facto, a ludicrous non-starter. Nevertheless all of my insistent statements on this point were systematically eliminated by the producers.

* Second, I indicated that there are many abduction reports involving two, three, six or more people who were taken simultaneously and whose highly detailed recollections are virtually identical. This fact alone eliminates not only "sleep paralysis" but "fantasy-proneness" or any other idiosyncratic psychological aberrations as triggering causes. My descriptions of these many cases of multiple abductions were likewise completely suppressed by the producers

* Third, I showed the interviewers many photos of, again, virtually identical scoop marks, consistent straight-line scars and ground landing traces at abduction sites, and other physical sequelae. All of these vivid photographic examples of physical evidence were suppressed by the producers.

* Fourth, I was not alone in making these points. My colleague

Dr. David Jacobs was asked by ABC to carry out a hypnotic regression for the camera, but since the woman he chose had been abducted in the daytime while driving a car, the case did not fit ABC's "sleep paralysis" agenda and was thus not only suppressed, but Dr. Jacobs' many hours of taped interviews were also scrapped.

* Fifth, I made it very clear that perhaps 30% of all the abduction reports collected by researchers are recalled without the aid of hypnosis, a fact which renders the issue of hypnosis moot. This point was also suppressed by the producers whose only goal, it appeared, was to eliminate any data that contradicted their transparently false debunking hypotheses.

Despite my having presented - and reiterated - the points above, the producers chose to trot out on camera two debunking scientists (whose experiments with a mere handful of subjects have yet to be taken seriously by the psychological community) to buttress the untenable "sleep paralysis" theory, the false "no physical evidence" claim, and the demonstrably untrue "its all hypnosis" assertion. The smug presentations of these two would-be experts were accompanied by the producers' lurid "reenactments" of "sleep paralysis" phenomena, complete with flashing lights and spooky music. The taped testimony of a serious mental health professional like Dr. John Mack was likewise suppressed, along with my statement that over the years eight psychiatrists and numerous other mental health professionals had come to me about their own UFO abductions. The producers' obvious goal was to conceal the fact that within the mental health community there are many professionals who look with amusement on the "sleep paralysis" theory, and who accept the physical reality of UFO abductions.

So what can one say about such a deliberately dishonest presentation as Peter Jennings' "Seeing is Believing" take on abductions? Perhaps one can only shrug and warn, yet again, that the incurious members of the press and the many blinkered, conservative scientists had better collectively pull their heads up out of the sand and join us in our work. Whatever one's personal attitude toward the UFO abduction phenomenon, science insists that an extraordinary phenomenon demands an extraordinary investigation. What ABC served up on Thursday night was, instead, an extraordinary whitewash of the abduction phenomenon, and a brutal suppression of the evidence for what may well be the most portentous event in human history.

Peter Jennings and his staff should be ashamed

Budd Hopkins
New York

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' -

From: **Wendelle Stevens** <s18195a.nul>
Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 23:20:15 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 07:38:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' -

>From: Joachim Koch <koch.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 21:15:22 +0100
>Subject: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

Dear Joachim:

There seems to be a lot of unnecessary confusion about that Santilli autopsy film, and there is no reason for it, if one was to look at the realities.

When we screened the copy autopsy footage at our International UFO Congress that first year, when it came out and was being questioned by everybody, A man who offered credentials purporting to show that he was a government man from NRC, approached Graham Birdsall from England, publisher of the slick UFO Magazine out of Leeds, in England, and told him that the film was a fake produced by opportunists who had mutilated the body of a 12 year old dead girl from Dallas, for that film. Evidently that man was unaware of the second autopsy film, also filmed by the same cameraman, of another identical cadaver that did not have the severe wounds to the right leg and wrist, now requiring the mutilation of a PAIR of identical twins, if that story was the case. Of course that was the real falsehood, deliberately perpetrated by a man claiming he was from a government agency.

Let us not forget that the specimen of original film of that autopsy sequence, tested by Robert Shell, Editor of a popular American Photography Magazine, proved that the film was manufactured by Kodak in 1947, was bought in bulk by the U. S. Government and was used within 4 months of its manufacture. The actual photographer described the site of the UFO recovery, its exact location and the events of the time when the U. S. Army had closed off the area of the impact and moved all residents in the area within site of the residue to motels and away from the scene. He described these details to Michael Hesemann, who came over here from Germany, made up a team consisting of myself, Ted Loman and his crew and my daughter Cece Stevens, and we went over to the scene and worked the site and area for 3 days confirming the evidence we had.

That recovery was not from the Roswell crash as seems to be popularly believed, but was from the first of such crashes a month earlier on 1 June 1947, 7.2 miles west of Socorro. There were 4 living survivors at the scene when the Army team and photographer arrived. A general, heading the team from Washington, accompanied by the Army photographer, upon hearing that the occupants had never let go of the black boxes they clutched closely to their breasts, ordered a sentry to bring him one of the boxes.

The sentry went over and tried to take the box from the injured one. It would not let go, and the sentry bashed it in the head and took the box. That was the one autopsied in the film shown by FOX TV. The occupants were all taken away, supposedly to White Sands, and the wreckage was also recovered by the White Sands recovery team.

The second one, also autopsied a short time later was also

filmed by the same photographer.

To put Michael Hesseman down for his role in this is a disgrace, as he is the only one I know of who really went there and did the spadework. I was with him. I know this was strictly real, and there is no doubt about it in my mind.

The real 16mm film was so brittle from improper storage that it could not be run through a projector, and had to be transferred to video tape frame by frame to get what we all worked with.

To put this film down, in my view, reflects a certain amount of ignorance of the true facts.

Wendelle Stevens

[[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Backlash Jennings Style

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 04:48:10 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 07:48:33 -0500
Subject: Backlash Jennings Style

By now we've all read numerous rants against the Jennings UFO Special.

It's amazing to me to see old combatants in the UFO community stand shoulder to shoulder now.

Well except one broadcaster whom I thought would have been the biggest railer against the show.

Sure one day Jennings and his supporters in the UFO field may well be hoisted up by their own petards yet I'm going to wait on what the public and my betters have to say about the special.

Brad Steiger for one. I can't wait to read or hear what he has to say.

I'm proud of Linda Moulton Howe and I too wonder where she was during this tv special. I'm even proud of Whitley Streiber and George Noory who all came forward and didn't mince words.

For once our common enemy has been exposed. Believers and skeptics are now aware that the press and the psychiatric pros are in bed with one another and have been for years.

John E. Mack was the maverick and the thorn in their side because he had enough integrity to stand for the truth and not the dollar.

Budd Hopkins as well. He should have been given his own hour on his own. I may not always agree with his methods but he stood up when others ran away.

It's about time all of you see what side of the fence you're on as a whole and knock off the desire to be noticed by the mainstream because you don't need them. Look at what happened to that guy Michael Jackson. Fell for an ABC 20/20 interview that was a setup to tear him down.

Feel familiar? What's ABC's agenda?

I've gotten a ton of emails over my views of the special. All of them positive and several from old pals who are veteran ABC folk. I didn't know they worked there. Hadn't seen them in years.

Brother could I tell some stories now!

Best thing for the UFO community, pro or con is to just gather up their raw data and educate the public. Put the facts on the table and let the public roll with it. You can't depend or trust the mainstream press. You know the public is crawling over your websites so snazz them up and use your best weapon, the truth.

That's why I value Jan Aldrich's Project 1947 site. Just the facts.

Clark's UFO Encyclopedia too. Just those two works are enough for anyone with a smidgen of intellect to get the full picture.

Time to batten down the hatches folks, you've just gotten betrayed and it's time to go on the offensive.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

ABC News Special & Stan Friedman Offer

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 00:10:03 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 07:50:57 -0500
Subject: ABC News Special & Stan Friedman Offer

All:

I thought the ABC News special was quite good, which I realise places me at odds with the majority on the List. It was balanced and, for the most part, fair, particularly given that they only had two hours to cover a very, very broad subject.

I concur with the general consensus that the first hour was better than the second. However, any program where "your" side gets the last word, as was the case with the ABC special, cannot be all bad.

The one person in the whole thing that I thought was hard done by was Stan Friedman. One may disagree with Stan about Roswell, but to simply characterise him as a "Roswell promoter" was a mistake. Still, Stan's a big boy, and I'm sure he'll give as good as he got in the days and weeks to come.

For those who want to get a more in-depth look at Stan, I'd point them in the direction of our 2002 film Stanton T. Friedman IS Real, which follows Stan's career from beginning to the present day, and features Karl Pflock, Kevin Randle, and Don Ledger, among others.

The film usually sells for \$15 USD + 15% tax and \$7 S & H, but, for the month of March, I'll make the following offer to Listerions:

Send an order form, available at our website www.redstarfilm.com, along with a copy of this e-mail, and \$10 USD (we'll pay the tax) and \$6 USD S & H, and we'll send out a copy of the film (alas, VHS).

The same applies for our film Do You Believe in Majic - \$10 USD plus \$6 USD. The film covers the MJ-12 saga, and features Stan, Bruce Maccabee, Nick Redfern, Rob Swiatek, Karl Pflock and others (ditto VHS).

Selected reviews for both films below.

Great - now I feel like a used car salesman!

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
Redstar Films
www.redstarfilm.com

"The material evidence Kimball gathers accumulates enough evidence to shake the foundations of any skeptic, breathing new life into the once-tired UFO conspiracy universe... measured, dignified, serious and entirely unsettling" Ron Foley MacDonald [Halifax Daily News] for Do You Believe in Majic?

"An in-depth, hard-hitting hard hitting study of the Majestic 12 affair... If you want the latest, filmed lowdown on Majestic 12, then Kimball's documentary is the perfect medium" Phenomena

Magazine for Do You Believe in Majic?

"Takes the man and his message seriously... a hoot!" Globe and Mail for Stanton T. Friedman is Real

"Makes a substantial contribution to the UFO discourse while managing to be an entertaining and fast-paced hour-long documentary:

Atlantic Zone for Stanton T. Friedman is Real

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - King

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 06:28:21 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 07:54:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - King

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 08:58:52 -0600
>Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

>>From: Mike Woods <mike.woods.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 15:31:44 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

>>I'd have no problem with an UpDates subscription of \$60. per
>>year which works out to \$5 dollars a month or \$1.25 per week.

>>I get more than 125 messages a week, so this is a place where "A
>>penny for your thoughts" is more than just a cheap ploy to
>>appear sensitive.

>>Although, I'll admit, in some cases, we're still being
>>overcharged!

>Seems to me, and based on more than a few years experience, that
>this might be one of those rare occasions where contributing to
>some kind of subscription mechanism vis vis UpDates would make
>the experience better for all of us, take advantage of current
>technologies to fully feature it, and do creative thinking in
>the service of our interests. I'd support something along those
>lines, for sure. Put the hammer down, yea and verily.

Mike, Alfred,

I think a free-to-lurk, pay-to-post system would work well.

If the archives remained freely available, and the subscription was for the purpose of active participation, we'd still be able to attract new voices (particularly if we promoted the archives), And would be able to offset the cost of the change, and perhaps new features as Alfred mentions.

Lest there be some question about accounting, I'd say it's the equivalent of buying Errol dinner and cocktails once a month, easily and gratefully afforded, and he can do with it what he may.

Besides, I feel a little guilty that I've been listening to C2C AM for free on my local radio stream for a couple of years, and bypass the "Streamlink" subscription service in the process. That the service didn't begin until long after I was listening via the web somewhat mitigates my unease, but this would still "ease my worried mi-ind" a little. <g>

Best Regards,

Kyle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 08:22:30 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:04:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:18:39 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:27:40 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>Of course, the angular size of the sun is about 1/2 degree which
>>is considerably larger than the angular size of the objects
>>Arnold saw. Each one would have reflected only a portion of
>>thesun's light. In a detailed analysis done 5-6 years ago during
>>the previous "tempet in a teapot" over Arnold, I calculated that
>>to appear blindingly bright from a distance of 20 some miles, a
>>solar reflection would have to be from a rather flat surface. A
>>noticeably curved surface would have caused the reflected light to
>>diverge and dissipate too much.

>Even better, a slightly concave surface on top would, when
>tilted just right, focus more sunlight into a smaller point of
>convergence, which could account for the single really bright
>flash on Arnold's plane, and how the flashes reduced in
>intensity later in the sighting as the focal point dchanged. Such
>a shape is also aerodynamically sound, like a wing. A more
>convex shape to the underside would also conversely diffuse any
>reflected light (unlikely illuminated by direct sunlight in the
>movement described by Arnold), making the craft less noticeable
>from below.

>Your flat "mirror" analogy is apt as well, but less likely in
>light of the curved aspect already found in the circumferential
>shape of the objects as described. Curves make sense.

>While Arnold's drawing doesn't specifically imply a concave
>upper surface, it is still indeed plausible as the craft were
>"weaving" as described and capable of reflecting a relatively
>large amount of sunlight to an object 10s of miles away. A
>"saucer" in the truest sense... less a nibble.

In principle you are correct about the concave surface tending
to focus the light. However, if the concave surface has a
curvature radius less than 40 (or so) miles, the light would
focus before it got to the plane. (Focal distance from curved
mirror is 1/2 the radius of curvature). Arnold could never
notice, even close up, a radius of curvature of 40miles. It
would appear flat.

The effect of aconvex surface is to diverge the sunlight and
reduce its intensity./ For this reason I have considered the
possibility that Arnold may have been wrong in his
interpretation that he was seeing sunlight reflected, although
his may well (probably was) correct in his _observation_ that
the flashes were very bright. The observation would also be
consistent with the object acting as momentary sources of light.
I have no doubt that with large enough mirror surfaces the

reflections could be seen against the snow which would not be very bright at a distance of 20 miles. (Reflection from snow diffuses the sunlight.) However, to compare them with a welder's arc might have been an exaggeration. If it was not an exaggeration then we must consider the possibility that the saucers were sources of light as well as being reflective.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 08:22:39 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:05:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Maccabee

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:48 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 11:27:40 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>I actually did an experiment in which I used a mirror at a
>>distance to reflect the sun into my eyes. The afterimage from
>>staring at the reflection was not black, but rather colored and
>>pale.... Looking at a metallic reflection of the sun is like
>>looking at the sun. Whenever I look at the sun (briefly!) it
>>"burns" a hot spot on the retina which remains looking bright
>>for a second or so. Then it fades to a pale afterimage with a
>>pale greenish center and with a reddish halo around. It does
>>not look black. The pale afterimage can last for a minute or
>>more.

>Again being dragged into an argument I told you I don't have
>time (or resources right now) to get into. Just because I dare
>to disagree about the sacred Arnold case. Your sun Bruce is over
>30 arcminutes in diameter and round, whereas Arnold's tiny
>little flashes were at closest approach less than 3 arcminutes
>in length and anywhere from ten to twenty times thinner than
>that in vertical thickness, according to his drawing and
>statements, or around 0.1 to 0.3 arcmins in thickness. This is
>at or below the smallest resolvable image with human acuity.
>They would have been much LESS than HALF that size at first
>appearance and at the end of the sighting. They were moving
>horizontally and thus tending to smear the image in that same
>direction. Now when that afterimage on Arnold's retina was
>projected onto the snowfields of Mt Rainier as he moved his head
>and eyes to try to follow the objects would the afterimage be a
>dark line when seen against white or what? ("Dark line" of
>whatever color if color could even be resolved clearly in a tiny
>image briefly flashed and briefly afterimaged.)>>

As I pointed out above, I did the experiment with a small
reflector - mirror- at a few hundred feet so its angular size
was also much smaller than the sun. It is my experience that
when you "burn" a small spot on the retina and then turn your
eyes asif following some motion the small spot does not smear
out but stays as a small, moving spot. In the meteor calculation
I posted last week I didn't mention the fact that the angular
rate of travel was about 1/2 deg/ sec, which is easy to follow.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:21:29 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:09:30 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 12:26:07 -0600
>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:20:19 -0500
>>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>>>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>><snip>

>>>It was a pure puff piece, except that now network television can
>>>state with a straight face..."been there, done that, nothing to
>>>see here... move along". Case closed.

>>So... does the idea of doing a Ufologists' own documentary seem
>>a little more appealing now?

>What I'm suggesting would not be so much a debate as an enhanced
>(more detailed) discussion of the most compelling cases for each
>researcher. Each could pitch in his own research on a given
>case. If some disagreement arises, the listener is more informed
>and if curious, is more likely to dig into the issue.

And consider, there is no place in the effort for the likes of
skeptibunky pelicanists and conflicted klasskurtxians as they
are the darlings of the mainstream, anyway, and their
regressional spewing can be had, otherwise, everywhere else.

This is forgetting, of course, that they lack the requisite
sack to participate, regardless, in a substantive way because of
their lack of any success in legitimate debate...

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Lowe

From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:31:59 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:15:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Lowe

Hi Errol, List,

Thanks to Larry, David, Terry and Colin for your replies. I'm glad that the NICAP site was not alone in seeing an increase in hits.

Like Larry's site, the NICAP site traffic increased a few days before the show aired. On Monday there were 511 hits compared to 186 the previous day. The traffic then decreased a little for a couple of days but was still above the norm and then came the 1000+ hits on Thursday. On Friday we had about 840 hits but the figures are now dropping off.

I put UFO in Yahoo and the NICAP site doesn't appear on any of the first 10 pages that I checked, but the results for unidentified flying objects has us as the high up the first page which may account for why our site saw such an immediate increase.

Thanks again to all who replied.

Adam

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:40:54 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:21:30 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Clark

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:47:18 -0800
>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

<snip>

David and Listfolk:

>Question: Was anybody on the List interviewed by ABC, such as
>Jerry Clark, Stanton Friedman, or Dick Hall, used as an expert
>consultant? Did the filmmakers express a real interest in
>getting the facts, or were they just in for the sound bites?

I was told that my UFO encyclopedia was a major resource, especially when the ABC News people were educating themselves on the subject and trying to figure out what was there and where to proceed. Through an assistant Jennings asked me for a personal, signed copy of the two volumes.

The show began as Life in the Universe, presumably with a SETI focus. UFOs were to be a part of it, though I suspect a relatively minor one, essentially depicted as silly pop-culture obsession as opposed to the science of SETI. As staff and crew members began to dig into ufology, they were taken aback to learn how much substance was there, and UFOs began to overwhelm the project, which finally became UFO-centered and got a different title.

My dealings with these people suggested they are serious professionals. I wouldn't have dealt with them if they weren't; I have come to abhor UFO presentations on television, which are generally moronic and exploitative, and consequently I don't do them anymore. After long discussion with the producer, I agreed to this one, and I have no regrets.

Overall, despite obvious shortcomings, I thought the show was pretty good, certainly the most pro-UFO primetime documentary by a major broadcast news operation that we are likely to see in our lifetimes. The limitations of time and the documentary format forced certain emphases (and, in the worst moments, distortion and misimpression). People who keep complaining about the neglect of this or that element fail to grasp the reality of the format. This was, after all, about 81 minutes, not eight hours. Moreover, to be watchable, a documentary requires dramatic momentum. If you want the whole story, there are some good books for that, but reading them is going to consume a whole lot more than 81 minutes of your time. Or, for that matter, eight hours of it.

From one point of view - pure good sense - the Roswell and abduction segments were a mistake. These are deeply complex subjects which, if dealt with at all, ought to have been subjects of their own documentaries. My suspicion is that they were there to give Jennings cover from potential criticism of the show's clearly pro-UFO slant. Jennings had to demonstrate that he was hostile toward more outlandish UFO claims in order to make his curiosity about the rest palatable and even credible. I think, of course, that this was unfortunate,

resulting in segments that were, at best, highly simplistic and, at worse, unfair, inaccurate, and grossly misleading. To me the very worst was the depiction of Roswell investigators such as Friedman, Schmitt, and Randle as cynical money-grubbers, which was both false and cheap. Accuse them of being wrong, if you wish; but going beyond that to accuse them of being bad human beings is beyond the pale.

The SETI people were essentially set up. I can't imagine that they are very happy about their portrayal. The documentary makes clear that they know practically nothing about UFOs except that they don't like them - which was the show's larger point about science and government's response generally. Frank Drake appeared to be going out of his way to validate his critics' longstanding contention that his is essentially a mystical, religious quest. He talked like a zealot about how a message from space would change the world, just like some primitive awaiting word from the sky gods. Jill Tarter looked ridiculous when she admitted (boasted, even) that - as an astronomer yet - she failed to recognize what any Joe Doakes has no trouble identifying instantly: the moon partially hidden by clouds. Even more amusingly, this came in the context of smug assertions by her and her colleagues that anecdotal testimony is worthless - except, I guess, if it's anecdotal testimony by a clueless UFO disbeliever. At the end of the show, physicist Michio Kaku gets the last word, rejecting the SETI people's wishful and silly myth that ETs can't be visiting because they can't get here.

I don't blame Stan Friedman and Budd Hopkins for being upset about their treatment on the show. The Roswell and abduction segments are indefensible.

They aren't, however, the end of the story. I don't know what, if any, longterm effects will fall out from the show's airing, but if there are, they are more likely to be positive than negative.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Jennings' Un-Aired Footage

From: Luis R. Gonzalez <lrgm.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 18:14:54 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:24:28 -0500
Subject: Jennings' Un-Aired Footage

Is there any way to secure all the footage that did not make the final cut, for posterity?

Can some people (for instance, Wendy Connors) ask for a copy of all the raw material?

Luis R. Gonzalez Manso

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program -

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 12:27:20 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:26:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program -

>Source: The John E. Mack Institute

>http://johnemackinstitute.org/center/center_news.asp?id=249

>Feb 25, 2005

>Budd Hopkins' Response
>to the ABC Peter Jennings "Seeing is Believing" TV Program
>Courtesy of the Intruders Foundation

>During the past year Jennings' producers interviewed me a number
>of times, and because I sensed what they had in mind, I made, as
>a preemptive strike, a number of careful, highly specific
>observations about the UFO abduction phenomenon. All of these
>crucial points - recorded by ABC on videotape - were designed to
>underline the physical reality of UFO abductions and to
>demonstrate the implausibility of current skeptical
>explanations.

>To its shame, ABC suppressed all of these observations.

Well that answers that question! Budd answered with the
statistics but were they presented? Nope. Why? Because stats
speak for themselves.

This special was the scariest thing I've seen now that I think
of it.

Why? Because it shows just how much in danger we really are in.
Not from some menace from the stars but that old menace the
cowardice from the ID.

<snip>

>Peter Jennings and his staff should be ashamed

Ya gotta have a sense of honor to feel ashamed. Right now
Jennings and his staff are lower than snake spit in quicksand.

And 'spit' wuddn't the word I was a-fixin' to use.

Why, they'd have to climb a ladder in a gully in China to set on
top of a run over worm in a wagon rut just to get up to the
point of low.

Best,

Greg

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 17:29:08 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:28:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Rimmer

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 18:41:42 -0000
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 20:26:04 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>Fine with me, so long as the term also includes those
>>Pelicanists who continually support ridiculous and unsupportable
>>theories such as that the Trindade case was a 'structured craft'
>>witnessed by dozens of people, or that an extraterrestrial
>>spacecraft crashed at Roswell.

>I'd be interested to know if you have any new information on the
>Trindade case. Do you? If so please could you open it up for
>discussion?

No, all I have to say is well archived in two separate
discussions at the List's Archive over the past four years.
Does anybody else have anything new, especially new evidence
which Jerry Clark promised a year or two back, which was going
to leave the 'pelicanists' with egg on their face?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 12:09:37 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:30:42 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 06:33:16 -1000
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

><snip>

>People like Bob Lazar, Robert Dean, Clifford Stone, Dan Sherman,
>etc., reveal much of what is happening but many UFO researchers
>don't want to go there.

<http://www.ufomind.com/area51/people/lazar/ultimate.html>

QF: Could you reveal some of your professors at M.I.T. and
Cal-Tech?

BL: Yeah, if you want. I don't have a list of them here. Dr.
Duxler I think was one of them. And Hohsfield was another.

QF: Hohsfield?

BL: Hohsfield. H-O-H-S-F-I-E-L-D, or something along those
lines.

QF: Would he remember you?

BL: Oh, yeah. Hohsfield I know will.

QF: These are at M.I.T. or Cal-Tech?

BL: Hohsfield was at M.I.T. Duxler was at Cal-Tech.

<http://alum.mit.edu/ne/noteworthy/hockfield-thank-you.html>

H-O-H-S-F-I-E-L-D
H-O-C-K-F-I-E-L-D

N-O-P-E <g>

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:20:25 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:34:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:13:51 -0500
>Subject: Re: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special!?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:57:30 EST
>>Subject: Did You See That Peter Jennings UFO Special?

>They portrayed the Roswell "bit" as an attempt by everyone
>involved to make \$\$\$ and get famous. Including Pflock, I suppose
>(and C.B. Moore).

And Klass and Korff. But we forget. When debunkers get book deals to debunk UFOs, it's not "moneygrubbing" - it's called "setting the record straight." When national pundits making millions debunk it's called "journalism" or "investigative reporting" or "the public's right to know."

>I wonder hw much money Jesse Marcel made from
>making up his basic Roswell story. I wonder how much money
>Jenning made disparaging Marcel... and his son, the doctor, who
>volunteered for work in Iraq.

Jennings makes millions a year punditing. No reason for him not to play it safe. He can't bring himself to play it straight on a lot of stories, such as the lies Bush has been telling about Social Security. That might jeopardize his cozy job. Look at what happened to Dan Rather.

><snip>

>>ABC should be ashamed of itself and should have taken Jennings
>>over the coals for providing that as commercial and newsworthy
>>product. It is literally the worst UFO special and documentary
>>I've seen and I've seen some pretty rotten UFO documentaries!

There are so many rotten ones out there, I wouldn't call it the top stinker. The first hour was pretty good. Then the Empire decided to strike back.

>Awww, don't be too hard on the poor chap, After all this is
>probably the first UFO documentary ever to go to press without
>Klass or Randi or Oberg or Sheaffer.

Yeah, Seth Shostak is no Phil Klass (thank God for that). But there he was making the same dumb demands for physical proof (his alien seat cushion), and not even bothering to look at the available evidence. There is nothing in science that demands something actually physical in a laboratory to establish a phenomenon. (Should we demand an alien ham radio set if SETI claims to have found a genuine signal?)

And UFOs certainly do leave behind physical evidence of their existence in the form of film/video, landing traces, radar contact, trails, various electromagnetic effects, medical effects on people in close encounters, and even an occasional chunk of metal. Even the disparaged eyewitness accounts can be

analyzed to determine such things as flight performance or commonalities through statistical analysis. True science adapts its methodology to fit a phenomenon. It doesn't demand the phenomenon adapt itself to fit some rigid preconceptions of how it must be studied.

>And I thought the
>juxtaposition of the seemingly credible witness testimony
>(including police and military) with the "know-it-all-pointy
>headed gurus of science" made the scientists look foolish. The
>segment with pilots (including the 30,000 hour guy) was good.

Yes, that was the best part of the documentary-the first hour. If they had just kept that up, showing really good cases with the credible witnesses plus covering the history of UFOs, it would have been a good documentary.

>The history lesson was UFOS 101 (beginning college level)

More like "UFOs for Dummies" in my opinion. They just skimmed the surface. But they did mention Twining's memo saying the phenomenon was real and the 1948 Estimate of the Situation concluding the objects were extraterrestrial. That was the first hour, of course, before the Empire struck back.

>but at
>least did no more than mention the Condon whitewash as a reason
>to end Blue Book. And they got Hynek contradicting himself (says
>no scientific proof in the 1960's but founded the Center in the
>1970's). Of course, they portrayed him as a skeptic turned
>believer.... and emphasized "believer" as much as possible. Is
>this a religion? One might get that idea from Jennings's show.

They also left the impression that Hynek was the one and only scientist interested and studying the subject in the entire country.

>Mainstream science and news can't get over the idea that most
>UFO sightings are made by people who have no interest in the
>subject and are thoroughly surprised by what they see happening.
>Instead, they seem to think that all sightings of "lights in the
>sky" etc. are a result of people wanting to see lights in the
>sky or having a great need for something exciting to happen.
>Tell that to the guys at Minot AFB (or numerous other SAC
>bases.... and no one has even mentioned the 1975 flyovers which
>opened a crack in the cover up of SAC base incidents over the
>years).

Easy to explain Bruce, if you are a skeptic. Duty is so damn boring up there that these guys yearn for a little excitement. Imagining stars are alien spaceships provides that for them. Did I neglect to mention drug use being involved?

>Now we find out that Roswell was all a grab for \$\$\$ even though
>we're told that Mogul balloon material (rubber, sticks, wood,
>strings/rope) can't be permanently bent or dented with a hammer
>(characteristics of the material as reported by Jesse Marcel).

They didn't go into the physical properties. They deliberately made it seem like Marcel was the sole person telling this story and painted him as an idiot. Why didn't they mention high ranking officers like Gen. Exon or Gen. Dubose or backed up Marcel's story, plus a myriad of other people (e.g. Barry Goldwater's story of LeMay denying him access to the alien artifacts at Wright-Patterson). Exon was C/O of Wright-Patterson for crying out loud!

>At least Jennings didn't go into the "dummy drop" explanation
>that the bodies were crash dummies dropped 6 years too late and
>in the wrong place.

Maybe they realized that no amount of propaganda spin would sell that one. I remember reporters giggling when the Air Force came out with it in 1997.

>Poor Budd got sandbagged as usual. What about abductees who
>recall everything without hypnosis? What about the abductees who
>are NOT asleep at the time of the incident but, instead, have
>Missing Time. Had Jennings never heard of Betty and Barney? I
>hope the abductees who were willing to appear don't feel too
>disappointed. I expect that others will be willing to come forward

>simply to spite Jennings.

As you know, Budd Hopkins wrote a letter afterwards saying he deliberately addressed all these issues when they were filming. It all ended up on the cutting room floor. What sort of balanced "journalism" is this?

>So, all in all, it was a mixed bag. To the person like myself
>who spotted all the fake UFOs photos combined with good stuff
>(those photo editors have to have something to show!) and the
>statements like "thousands" of people saw the 10 PM Phoenix
>lights (thousands? I am only aware of a few who videotaped them)
>and that there are "hundreds" of UFO conventions each year (gee,
>does each ufologist have his/her own convention),

Mine's next week. When's yours?

>this show
>ranged from ho hum to tragedy. But I think there might have been
>enough positive during the first hour and at the very end when
>Michio Kaku stomped on the "they can't get here from there" guys
>to interest the casual listener and even spur the "casual
>witness" to tell his/her story.

One doesn't even need more speculative faster-than-light travel for visitation to take place. Advanced propulsion methods not too far beyond our present technology can accelerate probes to ~10% light speed. NASA is investigating these right now. Couple that with greatly extended life spans (already thought possible for humans in the not-to-distant future), suspended animation, and/or cybernetic representatives and one could easily meet another one of the dumb skeptical demands-that the travelers live to the end of their journey, even at sublight speeds. Other scenarios are also possible, such as nomadic spacefaring species (no central planet needed), multigenerational travel, robotic nannies raising a new generation from egg and sperm and the end of the journey, etc.

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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Freeman

From: Kelly Freeman <Khfflsciufu.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 13:42:33 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 08:36:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught - Freeman

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 16:28:06 -0600
>Subject: Re: Seeing Is Believing Naught

<snip>

>Really. After his sneering celebration of the suspicious status
>quo and his re-inflation of the patently discredited, his
>glossovers, and his character attacks I would think you'd pick
>up your_own_torch or pitchfork.

Well, in a way, I did. I sent Mr. Jennings and ABC News an e-mail pointing out what I thought were the positives and negatives of the show. I suggested they take another look at Roswell and alien abductions and pointed out they were alot more complex than what they led the viewer to believe. I also recommended they consider doing individual in-depth programs on each one. Of course, whether or not they reply or even read it is another matter. But, for what it's worth...

I recommend that you and others who feel strongly about the injustice that was done in the program do the same, but keep the e-mail/letter or whatever positive and point out the mistakes made. They should be hearing from us.

<snip>

>Seems to me he continued the insidious inculcation of ufological
>dis-creditation and performed exactly as he was told to perform.
>He, in no way, stuck his neck out, IMO.

We will agree to disagree on this one.

<snip>

>Problem is, the opposition lacks the requisite sack to engage in
>that debate because of their lack of success, and I'm reluctant
>to congratulate an institution for minimally doing its job,
>especially when it's not even minimally doing its job.

You don't have to congratulate them, just point_out_to_them what they have done wrong, which is to get the facts straight, report them and make corrections where they have distorted or left them out. They have alot to learn and they won't if we don't point the way. I think you know where I am coming from.

<snip>

>The preceding 50 years of wheel spinning indifference from our
>conflicted mainstream_has_been_very long indeed.

Exactly my point. Just how long would you expect the mainstream to realize the mistakes made over that period of time. Remember, the Robertson Panel set the stage for conditioning the "masses", if you will, to accept the notion that UFOs were nothing more than IFOs, hallucinations or the fantasies of those wanting to believe. As you and others on this list already know, that strategy has worked for over 50 years and now there needs to be

a strategy to reverse that conditioning. How long would you think that would take? One UFO program exploring everything UFO in a positive manner on one night? By one network? Come on. I think not.

<snip>

>Everything I mentioned could have been programmed into a minute,
>so drop one of McHaha's segments or snip a SETI "cultist" who
>all got carte blanche treatment by the way. And maybe you
>haven't seen my paper on a rational justification for conspiracy of
>all types. A mention of a "cosmic conspiracy" would not have
>been inappropriate.

Everything you mentioned could also be explored more in depth, on another network, at another time. A mention of a "cosmic conspiracy" would, IMO, have negative over-tones unless those presenting such a scenario are prepared to prove conclusively that is_in_fact_the_case. No, I have not seen your paper, but I will look at it if you tell me where to find it.

<snip>

>Too little too late and in a manner baldly constructed to
>pretend balance, and besides, Dr. Kaku was speculating on
>'magic' that the viewer can push comfortably off until the next
>millenium - no points here.

Again, we will have to agree to disagree. The important thing is that Michio Kaku had a chance to respond and did it well, IMO. Don't you think the SETI cultists were also speculating? I think the viewers are alot smarter than most will admit.

<snip>

>Hynek was painted as a lone wolf to the uninformed when nothing
>could have been further from the truth. Ask Richard Hall.

Again, you just can't expect everything to be addressed in just two hours. The fact that they even touched upon Hynek's reversal from a skeptical scientist to a "believer" in UFOs is in itself significant, IMO.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 19:12:45 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:18:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma - Rogerson

>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 18:25:15 -0000
>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:27:02 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>From: Martin Shough <mshough.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 17:23:12 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>>From: Peter Rogerson <progerson.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 21:44:42 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Experts Divided On The UFO Dilemma

>>>>I suspect that the TRUFOS are not representative of a unique
>>>>phenomenon but like IFOS are a heterogeneous collection of many
>>>>different things, though not perhaps the same things which
>>>>generate the vast bulk of IFOs.

>>>>I agree with this. It's extremely unlikely that our
>>>>investigative and deductive filters are so refined as to have
>>>>sieved a perfectly pure sample of one class of phenomena. Since
>>>>we have no idea what we are looking for this could only have
>>>>happened by chance. It's inevitable that the residue is a
>>>>complicated mixture of objective and subjective processes about
>>>>which we are fairly ignorant.

>>>>But this is not a satisfactory conclusion. It merely restates
>>>>the question of interest to us (or the spectrum of questions) in
>>>>a richer and more concentrated form. This is as far as
>>>>investigation has brought us! Maybe not far, from an absolutist
>>>>point of view, but science in reality is like all experience an
>>>>endlessly reiterative activity. ("We shall not cease from
>>>>exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to return
>>>>back where we started and know the place for the first time."
>>>>T.S.Eliot - a transatlantic emollient for the culturally
>>>>polarised UFO community!)

>>>>You wish to go further, and I think you are proposing that
>>>>_none_ of those "many different things" is a truly remarkable
>>>>thing. But to do this is actually to propose that this _is_ an
>>>>homogeneous sample, in terms of an underlying uniform
>>>>unremarkability. This may not seem quite as unlikely as that the
>>>>whole residue of TRUFOS is uniformly amazing, but it is somewhat
>>>>unlikely. It masquerades as a "simple" option in the spirit of
>>>>Occam's Razor by importing an unknown amount of explanatory
>>>>complexity to impose an artificial uniformity on nature.

>>>>In my opinion the messier but more realistic assumption is that
>>>>the unknown causes of the sample will exhibit some
>>>>heterogeneity, and that there will be a spectrum of remarkability.

>>That seems fair enough, but I think you need to define

>>"remarkability" in this context.

>I think we should defer, in the first instance, to the body of
>scientific thought and opinion about the nature of the world and
>derive our definition of "remarkability" from that. Call it that
>element of nature responsible for scientific surprise. An array
>of possible scientific interpretations for various types of
>experiential phenomena can then be associated to different
>degrees of scientific surprise. (Note: Not demonstrable
>interpretations, but possible interpretations, else we deny
>science its capacity for surprise.)

>In these terms some interpretations would not be very remarkable
>at all, others would be very remarkable indeed; but they would
>all be inside the realm of scientific naturalism. One of these
>remarkable naturalistic interpretations is ET intelligence. It
>would surprise some scientists out of their underpants, but so
>would some others. It is not an occult notion beyond the pale of
>scientific naturalism. On the contrary the notion that
>"intelligent life" is a spontaneous attribute of chemical and
>informational complexity, and not a unique earthly miracle, was
>birthed by, and has matured in tandem with, the growth of
>science, the only method of "knowledge" which enshrines the
>inevitability of surprise.

>We don't have to specify ahead of time which of these
>interpretations will work where. The only way we can find out is
>to try them (this is Bridgeman's "operational criterion of
>meaning") and in doing so the body of scientific thought
>continually transforms itself, altering the relative
>remarkability of some ideas and introducing some new ones. So
>the complete definition of "remarkability" is an operational
>one, and I think the process of defining it is just the activity
>of science itself.

>Which is where devising testable forms of remarkable hypotheses
>comes in. It may be very difficult and contentious in the case
>of ETH. But doing this devising and testing is the science. We
>can't in conscience just exclude the difficult questions.

I would tend to agree. Technically the discovery of an ET probe
would be remarkable but only a moderate anomaly, equivalent to
say finding a working steam engine in a Roman bath, unexpected
but not surprising.

But the ETH may be rather more anomalous than is conventionally
thought. I suspect we were all brought up in school on a
unidirectional, ladder of life view of evolution with an amoeba
at the bottom and a balding, middle aged, male college professor
at the top. However modern views of evolution reject that in
favour of the image of a bush, with humankind just being one
little twig among many. Humankind is no more than the purpose
of evolution, than are aadvarks or giraffes.

Jerry Clark accused me of arguing that humans were the lords of
the earth, but if anything deserves that accolade its microbes
of one form or another which seem to be able colonise all
imaginable (and many previously unimaginable) habitats and which
form the bulk of the biosphere, all else is window dressing. If
we find lots of microbial life in the rest of the solar system,
this predomination will increase.

Of course visible matter itself seems to be just the surface, so
complex life forms may be just the window dressing of the window
dressing.

Stephen J Gould has suggested that it's this filling up of all
spaces available to simple life forms which drives the engine of
complexity and divergence, and the growth of specialisation. Eg
giraffes necks get longer, primates brains get bigger.

The core issue for the ETH is whether separate evolutionary
histories could generate creatures sufficiently physically and
psychologically similar to humans to engage on the same sort of
projects as us, eg build space ships or radio telescopes. The
only example, earth, is not terribly encouraging in that regard.
Where are the language bearing descendents of the Asian apes and
the new world monkeys:, where are the marsupial hominids etc.
Again studies in human genetic mutations suggests that very
small changes can produce really profound shifts in the nature

of consciousness.

This should not be interpreted as arguing that humans are the _summit_ of evolution, because evolution doesn't have summits only twigs. Language and technology may be just one of a vast number of unique or near unique specialisms in the galaxy, other biospheres will have entities with their own unique adaptations and abilities, most of which we cannot readily imagine.

Of course all this is speculative, but it is grounded in the one biosphere we know, and at least should give pause to think.

That does not mean that there may not be phenomena out there with exotic natures, or that there might not be, or have been, exotic technologies from sources closer to home.

For now the best strategy for ufologists is to try to work in a step by step fashion out from what is known.

I'd also add, that whatever out there is triggering ufo reports, be it ever so prosaic or ever so exotic, there is still a ufo phenomenon of the imagination, through which we articulate our hopes and fears

Peter Rogerson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Chace

From: David Chace <davidwchace.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:47:20 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:19:19 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Chace

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 20:26:03 -0500
>Subject: ABC Jennings Special

>The first segment was weighted positive by the number of
>witnesses. Unfortunately they combined the "8 o'clock hour"
>events over Phoenix (triangle) with the 10 PM videos that
>probably show flares, as described on my web site.

>The astronomer guy clearly didn't know anything about the
>8:30 PM triangle or else simply ignored all that testimony in
>favor of commenting only upon the : "lights in the sky" that
>were videod at 10 PM.

So, the long awaited "UFOs: Seeing Is Believing" has finally aired. I have to say that in my opinion, approaching it with realistic expectations, it was a fairly balanced program. I know, certainly the Roswell researchers such as Friedman and Randle are not going to be happy with the way the show made it look as if the Mogul explanation (coupled with sensationalism by UFO authors) perfectly accounts for that entire episode. But there is no way that a two-hour special can address every piece of testimony or evidence associated with Roswell. They had to reach some conclusion so they could put Roswell behind them and move on to the next topic. They did not do a "hatchet job" on Friedman and Randle in the same sense that NOVA did on Hopkins and Mack back in February 1996 (though they did unfairly dismiss much of the Roswell research). Basically, the viewer is left with, "This is our explanation, but there's more information out there if you are interested." So, I'm okay with the way they handled that.

With regard to the program's treatment of UFO abductions I feel similarly. They made sure to let the audience know that their experts on both sides considered abductees psychologically sound, and they even included a quote from an abductee to indicate that not all of his experiences were bedroom visitations (for which sleep paralysis might be an explanation). Then they went on to suggest that a lot of this could be explained perhaps through sleep paralysis and confabulation under hypnosis. Okay, but they included enough quotes from abductees to let you know that maybe that's not the whole story, and if you're interested you can look into it. That's fair. The viewers who are more comfortable believing it's all sleep paralysis can believe that, and those who are curious can look into the phenomenon for themselves. As with Roswell, the show had to reach some kind of conclusion on abductions so that it could move on quickly to the next topic.

With the Phoenix lights, they *did* talk about the 8:30 event, during which people saw a triangular or chevron-shaped object that blotted out the stars, and they also talked about the 10:00 pm event, which might be explained by people seeing flares and "connecting the dots" in the words of James McGaha. As to combining the two events=85 Yes, a viewer who was not paying close attention might get the impression that it was all one event with a single cause. I feel this might have been done deliberately in an effort to appease skeptics, "Your flares

explanation accounts for the whole thing, so get off our backs about us selling out to the UFO enthusiasts." Meanwhile they are winking to the ETH proponents "We know that the 8:30 event could not have been explained by flares."

As to McGaha not knowing anything about the 8:30 event, one has to remember that his skeptibunker mindset does not allow him to know anything about such an event. Incidentally, the juxtaposition of McGaha's comments with those of some of the witnesses made it quite obvious (to at least a good portion of the viewers) that the arch-skeptics are every bit as disconnected from reality as the wildest New Age believers.

As a resident of Washington State, I was especially happy to see Peter Davenport get his due. He has run the National UFO Reporting Center for a decade now, and it is about time he got some recognition from someone as prominent in the national media as Peter Jennings.

I liked the final segment, in which they talked about the extreme energy requirements and other challenges of interstellar travel. After presenting the skeptical arguments, they then had Michio Kaku come on in and demolish them. Clearly their skeptical scientists had either not heard of technological progress, or were not aware of the vast time scales involved when discussing hypothetical extraterrestrial civilizations. In conclusion, Michio Kaku announced that the UFO phenomenon was worthy of serious study. That was a very positive note on which to end the documentary.

David W. Chace

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -

From: Rob Kritkauskay <robkrit.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 13:11:32 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:21:25 -0500
Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 14:41:59 -0600
>Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>>From: Rob Kritkauskay <robkrit.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2005 11:18:58 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>>>From: Erik Landahl <landahl1.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2005 21:25:19 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>>>>From: Stig Agermose <trippyplanet.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 23:58:27 -0800 (PST)
>>>>Subject: USAF Commissioned Study Of Teleportation

>Also, by the "mobius transformation" term I assume you meant
>moebius?

No Kyle, I did mean Mobius Transformations:

<http://mathforum.org/library/view/7994.html>

Spell checkers loath typos, but sometimes they can also exhibit
an equal disdain for the obscure.

>Steganography of course is the science or art of embedding
>information into larger dissimilar things...like hiding
>terrorist info in mundane vacation photos, a tactic purportedly
>used by Al Qaeda, etc.
>This is all very interesting, but I wonder if the barrier
>between the quantum and the macro applies equally to quantum
>teleportation versus physical "beam me up" style teleportation.>

As for Steganography, I think in this case it has much less to
do with the hiding of messages and much more to do with
achieving the greatest efficiency/quantity of content that can
be encrypted into a limited data stream. However, this is just
speculation formulated from the correspondence I have had with
this individual.

Regards,

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](#)

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

If Aliens Can Visit How Did They Get Here?

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 15:57:51 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:25:36 -0500
Subject: If Aliens Can Visit How Did They Get Here?

Source: Kerala Next - India

<http://www.keralanext.com/news/indexread.asp?id=130627>

02-26-05

If Aliens Can Visit, How Did They Get Here?

Space Travel Defies Human Lifespans, But There May Be Loopholes

There have been countless accounts of alien visitations around the world, but one of the things that prompts skepticism is how they would get here in the first place.

If aliens are from another world, they must have some extraordinary means of travel - nothing like what is available anywhere on Earth. It is hard to underestimate the difficulty of going from star to star.

"The distances are so vast, the energy requirements are so extreme, it would be very, very difficult to travel between the stars," said James McGaha, a retired Air Force pilot.

A law of science, determined by Albert Einstein, says nothing can travel faster than the speed of light - 186,000 miles per second. The fastest object made by man, the Voyager spacecraft is travelling along at 11 miles per second. At that rate, the scientific probe Voyager, launched in 1977, would take 73,000 years to reach the nearest star.

As a result, some scientists think that sort of space travel is a waste of time.

"Scientifically, we have a rule: you want to be alive at the end of your experiment, not dead," said Dr. Neil deGrasse Tyson, director of the Rose Center's Hayden Planetarium at the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

Einstein's Wormhole Loophole

If humans can't travel to the stars, many scientists say extraterrestrial life can't come here either.

However, Michio Kaku, one of the leading theoretical physicists in the world, says many scientists are too quick to dismiss the idea of other civilizations visiting Earth.

Einstein may have said nothing can go faster than the speed of light, but he also left a loophole, said Kaku, a professor at the City University of New York. In Einstein's theory, space and time is a fabric.

Kaku explained: "In school we learned that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. But actually that's not true. You see, if you fold the sheet of paper and punch a hole through it, you begin to realize that a wormhole is the shortest distance between two points."

A civilization that could harness the power of stars might be able to use that shortcut through space and time, and perhaps bridge the vast distances of space to reach Earth, he said.

"The fundamental mistake people make when thinking about extraterrestrial intelligence is to assume that they're just like us except a few hundred years more advanced. I say open your mind, open your consciousness to the possibility that they are a million years ahead," he said.

Kaku believes that only this type of civilization - millions of years more advanced than us and capable of using wormholes as shortcuts - could reach Earth and might be one explanation for UFOs.

"When you look at this handful of [UFO] cases that cannot be easily dismissed, this is worthy of scientific investigation," he said. "Maybe there's nothing there. However, on that off chance that there is something there, that could literally change the course of human history. So I say let this investigation begin."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 22:05:19 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:27:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Subscription Fee To UpDates? - McGonagle

>From: John Scheldroup <jschel.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2005 18:26:01 -0600
>Subject: Subscription Fee To UpDates?

>Dear List,

>Has there ever been talk about an annual subscription fee to
>subscribe at ufoupdates?. I for one, would like to pay a fee so
>that I can post to the list in the future.

<snip>

From a personal perspective, I regard the access to the archives to be the most significant value of the List, rather than the privilege of posting to it. If there were to be a charge, I would rather be charged for archival access than to be charged for receiving daily output, or posting rights.

This would also capture a large proportion of people who do not subscribe to the list, but do access the archives. It would also create potential issues, as it is currently convenient to refer people to posts in the archive which address enquiries made by them, and I sometimes forward specific posts to other interested lists. If the archive were to become a financial asset rather than an open resource, it might prevent or impede circulation of pertinent information.

Other objections with regard to charging for the privilege of receiving daily output or posting are:

1. I would expect any message that I posted to be forwarded, in spite of any formatting errors or perceived violation of relevance etc.

2. I only read in the order of 1 in 20 posts received from the list. The rest are outside my focus of interest.

I would consider an annual charge of \$50 or so for archival access to be reasonable.

Regards,

Joe

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 17:19:12 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:29:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 15:07:37 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:48 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>Again being dragged into an argument I told you I don't have
>>time (or resources right now) to get into. Just because I dare
>>to disagree about the sacred Arnold case. Your sun Bruce is over
>>30 arcminutes in diameter and round, whereas Arnold's tiny
>>little flashes were at closest approach less than 3 arcminutes
>>in length and anywhere from ten to twenty times thinner than
>>that in vertical thickness, according to his drawing and
>>statements, or around 0.1 to 0.3 arcmins in thickness. This is
>>at or below the smallest resolvable image with human acuity.

>I covered all the acuity arguments in my original post.
>Gathering by your many erroneous comments here, either you
>didn't read it or absorb it. You are again arguing outside of
>your fields of expertise and muddling things.

In fact Dave you are choosing to make Arnold's measurements in error by factors of 2x to 4x then calling that an "error" _I_ made in accepting Arnold's measurements of angular size just as _he_ stated them. Arnold used two different methods of angular size measurement, both used when the objects were at closest approach straight ahead of him (after passing Rainier). Both methods were in exact agreement. The "farthest engines" comparison on the DC-4 at 15 miles is something Arnold could estimate with great accuracy as he had seen DC-4's every day for years while flying and that yields (65 ft at 15 miles) an angular size of 2.8 arcmins at maximum, and at least twice smaller at the greater distances. The "cowling tool" method Arnold used for comparison gave him figures which worked out to 100 ft at 23 miles, or again 2.8 arcmins at maximum.

Two different methods that Arnold used in real time while the objects were actually in sight, not from memory later, and both yielded exactly the same values for angular size 2.8 arcmins. And by your own admission the minimum shape recognition limit was about 3.75 arcmins, which was exactly my point, not impossibility of seeing them at all, just impossibility to see any shapes like bats or half-moon with rear convex trailing edge, etc.

You can choose whatever you want to but don't call your _choices_ in _changing_ Arnold's testimony to what you personally prefer in order to make them UFOs by making them 2x to 4x larger than Arnold had measured them, don't call that _error_ on my part. If anything they are errors on your part, not mine. I do not reject any of Arnold's testimony except where it is a physical impossibility (such as seeing highly defined

shapes when the tiny little lines, nearly dots, are way too small and below shape recognition acuity levels) and where Arnold has contradictory testimony I have a legitimate choice I can make and I choose the Arnold testimony that puts the objects behind and beyond Mt Rainier, just like meteors would have to be.

Again I don't have time for this right now and didn't ask for a huge argument or debate, simply made a comment about what I think Arnold saw (meteors not UFOs). And yes I have loads of email especially these last few days since the ABC show which I cannot even sort through, I hit a few to try to clear them from my inbox and then it's too much. I have time deadlines and this is all I got time for, a quick response here and that's it.

That you can't accept my viewpoint (that Arnold saw meteors not UFOs) without making ad hominem comments about my abilities and "absolute errors" etc. is not my problem. I simply shared my viewpoint and said I cannot get into all of the detailed arguments now. I also said we will just have to agree to disagree but you can't seem to be able to accept that, and seem to feel that you are driven to show me up or prove me wrong or try to make a convert of me. I didn't go after you at all, just made a one-sentence comment (now snipped out by you) which has unleashed this torrent of argument.

>The problem is that these two angular measure estimates of
>object size disagree by about a factor of 4.

No they aren't in disagreement, one is Arnold's (and correct) and the other is yours which I refuse to accept. We will just have to agree to disagree.

>his shape resolution limit (estimated at 3.75 minarc based on
>20/15, 0.75 minarc resolution acuity).

Yes for simple shape recognition like a square from a circle, but not for being able to tell if the trailing edge was convex and sharp pointed, wings like bat wings, bulge like a tadpole on top, 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 17:27:45 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:31:10 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Maccabee

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:47:18 -0800
>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:40:09 -0500
>>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

<snip>

>>The "TRUFO" was the object seen "in the 8 o'clock hour" which
>>was large, dark and blocked the stars. Jennings said in his
>>monologue that hundreds of people also saw the lights at 10 p.m.
>>However, to the best of my knowledge there were only a few who
>>saw those, but hundreds did see the "thing" at about 8:30.

>I noticed that they failed to draw a clear line between the
>earlier and later sightings, but lumped them in together as one
>and the same thing. Whether this was deliberate confusion or
>simple ignorance on the part of the writer/director I don't
>know. Judging by how he badly slanted Roswell and abductions, I
>suspect the former.

>Question: Was anybody on the List interviewed by ABC, such as
>Jerry Clark, Stanton Friedman, or Dick Hall, used as an expert
>consultant? Did the filmmakers express a real interest in
>getting the facts, or were they just in for the sound bites?

Mike Fortson, who saw the 8:30 PM triangle told me he
recommended to the ABC team that they contact me or look at my
web site about the Phoenix lights. But they didn't do 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 17:28:50 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:06:00 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs -

>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 13:32:37 -1000
>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>From: Paul Kimball <Kimballwood.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 18:17:10 EST
>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

>>>From: Michael Salla <exopolitics.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 06:33:16 -1000
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Whistleblowers & Special Access Programs

><snip>

>>>Why bother with more sightings cases and analyses?

>>>Because that is where the best evidence is to be found.

<snip>

>Best evidence for what? The existence of UFOs?

Michael:

Exactly. What you and the "disclosure" crowd cannot come to grips with, it seems, is that the case has not yet been made that the UFOs are alien spacecraft, at least not to the point where you or I could walk into a court of law, or a history classroom, or a newspaper editor's office, and state with certainty that this was so beyond a reasonable doubt (perhaps not even to the "balance of probabilities" standard, although I'd be willing to take a crack in front of an unbiased jury in a civil trial).

UFOs exist. That can be proved, by the very fact that there are a fairly large number of "unidentified flying object" sightings out there that remain unexplained. That they are alien spacecraft remains unproved. So the need to gather evidence continues.

<snip>

>If you want evidence of what's happening with waived Special Access Programs dealing with reverse engineering of ETVs, >working with EBEs, you need to work with the whistleblower >testimonies. That's where UFO research needs to go, unless >you are dedicated to reinventing the wheel and doing in new >novel ways what others such as Keyhoe have done before.

I have never said that "whistleblower" testimony is worthless, or that it should be ignored. What I maintain is that the alleged "whistleblowers" need to be vetted with a far more rigorous methodology than you and others have employed.

><snip>

>>People like Bob Lazar, Robert Dean, Clifford Stone, Dan Sherman,
>>etc., reveal much of what is happening but many UFO researchers
>>don't want to go there.

>>Those researchers who do venture into that field are criticized
>>for being credulous and sloppy, and not having the right
>>emphasis on hard evidence when the role of national agencies in
>>manipulating hard evidence is ignored. UFO research needs to
>>move on.

>Those "researchers" are criticized for being credulous and
>sloppy for a very good reason - because they are credulous and
>sloppy. Again with Lazar. What is your response to Stan
>Friedman, who posted a detailed critique of Sideshow Bob here
>just a couple of days ago? Do you have one?

<snip>

>Oh, I see, making your argument by assertion. Researchers are
>credulous and sloppy because you say so, hmm. You make no
>mention of different methodologies being used in analysing
>different sources of evidence as I've mentioned numerous times
>in earlier posts. It seems methodology is not part of your
>lexicon. There is a rigorous alternative to the nuts and bolts
>approach to evidence but you don't want to acknowledge that.
>Argument by assertion is not very compelling. I posted my reply
>to Stan's critique of Lazar which you perhaps didn't read.

Of course I read it. You should have kept reading my post,
below. As for the "rigorous" nature of your methodology, I have
yet to see any evidence of it. What I see instead is a
predisposition to accept what these people are saying as true,
because it fits in with your belief system. That isn't
methodology. Methodology requires checking of facts, searching
for evidence, that will either support or discredit the
"whistleblower" testimony.

However, your statement above is an excellent example of one the
propagandist's favourite tools - if you can't counter a person's
argument, start attacking them personally. Just because I don't
agree that your techniques amount to a "methodology" doesn't
mean that the word "methodology" isn't in my lexicon. Your
hubris is amazing.

>>Oh, yes, I recall it now. If I had \$1 for everytime you hemmed
>>and hawed in your defence of Lazar, or said "perhaps" followed
>>by some ridiculous, unsubstantiated speculation, I'd have a nice
>>pocketful of change.

>>Can you not even acknowledge the possibility (I would say
>>probability, but for the sake of argument I'll go with
>>possibility) that these whistleblowers, who cannot provide the
>>"hard evidence" you so casually dismiss, might actually be
>>lying? Perhaps even working (to enter your world here for a
>>moment) for the government as disinformation agents, sent to
>>distract our attention from the real evidence? Is this any less
>>likely than your theories? If so, why? Your gut feeling?? As
>>Stan might say, "psychic powers"??

<snip>

>That is a possibilty that needs to be part of any investigation
>into a whistleblower.

Hallelujah - finally some common sense.

<snip>

>Yet it does not follow that a person is lying because they don't
>have sufficient 'hard evidence' to back up their claims.

I never said it did, and it's just wrong of you to imply that I
have, as you do above.

<snip>

>There are many ways to determine if one is determining the
>truth aside from hard evidence: coherence, consistency,
>sincerity, integrity, etc.

I grant that coherence and consistency are part of the parcel,

as they can be checked. Sincerity and integrity are not things that can be checked, however - they are subjective judgements. On what do you base your opinion that a person is being sincere? Or that they have integrity?

Here's what I base it on - can they offer some evidence (any evidence!) that what they say is true. Can their credentials be verified? If not, their sincerity and integrity are, to but the best spin possible on it, in dispute.

<snip>

>One can reach a rigorous conclusion that someone is telling the >truth without hard evidence. We do that all time. Do you demand >hard evidence to prove that your wife is telling you the truth >when she says that she spent the afternoon shopping with >friends? To say someone is lying simply because the hard >evidence isn't there is a poor methodology.

This might be the most ridiculous example you've used yet, and it demonstrates the intellectual bankruptcy of your argument. My wife? She earned that trust, over the years, unlike the "whistleblowers" who seem to be granted that trust from the get-go, as soon as they appear, because they are telling a story that backs up things in which you already believe.

And, again, don't put words in my mouth. I never said that a person is lying simply because the hard evidence isn't there to back up their claims. I said that this is an indicator that their testimony is questionable, and should not be accepted at face value. At best, it belongs in Stan's grey basket.

<snip>

>I do believe Stan went overboard when he made that claim >regarding Lazar. That is especially the case when it comes to >credible claims that evidence tampering is going on and efforts >underway to undermine witness credibility.

What are these credible claims you refer to? From whom? Cite some examples, particularly with reference to Lazar. If you have any, I'm willing to listen, but I haven't heard any "evidence" (your word here, not mine) so far.

<snip>

>Why wouldn't it be a logical policy for a Program Manager of a >waived Special Access Program undermine the credibility of a >whistleblower or remove any hard evidence possessed by the >whistleblower?

>If a program is so secret that you don't even want members of Congress >to know its existence, would you just sit back and allow someone >like Bob Lazar to spill the beans if you were the Program >Manager of such a program? If you take a look at the SOM1-01 >Majestic Document, you'll see that Ch 3, section 1.12 refers to >discrediting witnesses and outlines some of the methods of doing >this.

A couple of points here:

1. When you start using MJ-12 documents as evidence to support your position, you're on shaky ground;
2. If you wouldn't allow someone like Lazar to "spill the beans" why would you not just kill him. Apparently the government can do that (or so I hear), with all sorts of untraceable methods (or so I hear). Why not take care of the problem that way? It seems so much simpler;
3. I have stipulated elsewhere that the government is capable of altering the government records of government employees (I'm not convinced that they've done this, but I'll accept it for the sake of argument). What you've failed to demonstrate is how they could do this to a person's civilian records, particularly evidence of his alleged university studies, ie, Lazar. I'll give Lazar a second look on the day he can produce a copy of his degree, or his transcripts, or testimony from ONE person at any of these institutions he supposedly attended that he was there, and that they knew him. Even a photo in the yearbook will do. To suggest that the government would have erased all of his records

at the time he was attending the university is preposterous, because he wasn't in government service at that time (unless the government has precognitive powers we don't know about). So, he must be in the yearbook, or a register of students. Anything.

Where is it?

<snip>

>>Your say that "UFO research needs to move on."

>>That is a siren call that, if followed as you propose, will
>>probably finish ufology as a place for serious research.

>Again, serious research for what? That UFOs are real and exist.
>Do you need more evidence?

I need more evidence that demonstrates they are extraterrestrial in nature, yes.

>>So here's my siren call...

>>I would suggest that UFO research needs to move on, all right -
>>away from you and your whistleblowers (unless they can offer
>>some proof other than their word), and back to serious study of
>>serious evidence.

>Paul, let's be serious here. Lazar offered more than his word.
>He had a W-2 form showing he worked for Naval Intelligence in
>1989, he supplied the name of the checking officer for someone
>doing security checks for prospective Navy employees, he had
>witnesses to the testing of reverse engineered ETVs on three
>occassions while he claimed to be working at S4, he had a Los
>Alamos Monitor Article in 1982 which said he was employed as a
>'physist' at Los Alamos in 1982. To be employed as a physicist
>you would need to have at least a Master's degree. So in
>addition to the completion of a Bachelor's degree in 1976 he
>must have completed a Master's degree to get the job at Los
>Alamos. Stan's assertion that Lazar was a technician and didn't
>have a Master's doesn't make sense given the Los Alamos Monitor
>story. Have a look yourself at the story:

><http://www.serve.com/mahood/lazar/jetcar.htm>

I've checked. Stan's questions still remain unanswered. Lazar has offered nothing to substantiate his claims that stands up under critical scrutiny.

>Also, investigators such as Knapp have provided more evidence
>that Lazar was employed at Los Alamos through the phone book
>entry and other employees verifying this. Yet this is not enough
>to be considered 'serious evidence' for his claims for working
>at S-4. What do you expect? What Lazar claims to have worked for
>is at the very least a waived Special Access Program. Don't you
>think there would be security team in place to ensure that such
>hard evidence dissappears, and that Lazar's credibility is
<undermined?

His credibility is undermined because he can neither substantiate his government claims nor his civilian ones.

>I want UFO research to move forward into the area of classified
>programs on ETVS, EBEs, etc., and this is what many of the
>whistleblowers in Greer's Disclosure Project, and others such as
>Lazar, Robert Dean, Charles Hall, supply. You'd like more
>serioues evidence for the 'serious study' of UFOs as a real
>phenomenon. Sorry to say, but I think you are caught in a time
>warp anomaly of some kind.

One of us is caught in a time warp, all right, but it's you, not me. You want to take people back to 1950, and Frank Scully - the unquestioning acceptance of anyone's word so long as they are saying the things that you want to hear, that back up what you already believe to be the truth.

It's a condition that from hereon in I'll call "Scullyism".

There is a cure, fortunately. I and others have already set out the prescription. I have no doubt as to whether you'll take the medicine; alas, some cases of Scullyism are already too far advanced to treat.

For the rest, no time like the present.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
www.redstarfilm.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 17:39:05 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:09:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicanist - Sparks

>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 09:21:03 -0800
>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:14:15 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 12:04:28 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

>>>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 09:34:49 -0800
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicanist

<snip>

>>>My interpretation is that, whereas Arnold estimated that the
>>>objects were at 9500 ft as they passed Rainier (not at 14,000
>>>ft), they were actually about 2000 ft lower, at least when they
>>>passed Rainier, and maybe also while crossing Rainier's face.

>>>This would place them low enough to "dip into canyons" south of
>>>Rainier and to be at an altitude consistent with the 7000 ft
>>>estimate based on Fed Johnson's sighting.

>>One such possible subpeak would be Pyramid Peak, a well-known
>>landmark on the SW flank of Rainier:

<http://ericibasecamp.net/trips/MRNP/PyramidPk.jpg>

>>Maximum elevation is about 6940 feet. There's a saddle point
>>behind Pyramid Pk. and Rainier at an altitude of about 6600
>>feet.

>>If the objects were on a ground-hugging trajectory and flying in
>>and out of peaks and dipping into canyons, as Arnold described,
>>then the base of Pyramid, roughly 1500-2500 feet wide (depending
>>on how high above the surface the objects were), would have been
>>wide enough to conceal the objects for a sufficient time to see
>>them noticeably disappear.

>>Assume the objects were flying at Arnold's clocked maximum,
>>~1700 mph, or about 2500 ft/sec, and, again, close to the
>>surface. Arnold also said he could clearly see their outlines
>>against the white backdrop of snow on Rainier, except when they
>>seemed to go into profile and appeared as thin black lines that
>>were difficult to see. The point is, when they were passing in
>>front of Rainier, they were visible most of the time.

>>Thus Arnold's objects could have been conceivably concealed for
>>around 0.6-1.0 seconds as they passed behind Pyramid Peak. If
>>they disappeared one after one as they passed this landmark,
>>Arnold would have had good reason to believe they passed briefly

>>behind Pyramid, and could have used this to determine distance.

>>There are several other candidate subpeaks. Pyramid is just one
>>example.

>Thanks for pointing these out, David. Pyramid Peak at 6900 ft
>looks like a good bet to me. There's a topo map of it at:

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=46.8069&lon=-121.8111>

>The terrain actually slopes down to about 6200 ft on the east
>side of the peak, where upper Pyramid Creek lies. And Pyramid
>Peak could appropriately be called a sub-peak of Mt. Rainier,
>being on its S.W. flank.

>One of your lesser probabilities is Copper Mtn. just to the S.W.
>of Pyramid Peak. It's about 6300 ft high and has a little valley
>with steep walls to its immediate N.E. The valley floor is at
>5540 ft, which the UFOs also might have dipped down into. But
>Pyramid Peak seems to best fit the bill.

Geez when will this end? I made a one-sentence personal comment
and now comes this torrent of argument. This requires a lot of
research and presentation covering hundreds of pages and won't
be resolved in an email or two, nor do I have time for this.

Too bad for your theory but Arnold drew in his one and only
drawing of the terrain scene of his sighting, done on the back
of his company's manila envelope about June 25, 1947, that the
objects were (as he captioned it) at 10,000 feet, not your 6,000
ft speculation, and it was on a horizontal line that did not dip
down in front of Mt Rainier but actually sloped up slightly
higher and apparently behind Rainier as shown by the solid line
from the sky converting to a dotted line when over Rainier. The
dotted line also trails out over Rainier, as if it was not
actually of objects seen but their unseen path behind Rainier
had to be inferred by Arnold.

Arnold's drawing of what he later called the "jagged peak"
jutting out from Rainier's summit, is shown on his drawing off
to the right, not in front of Rainier down way way low where
Pyramid Peak is actually located. The "jagged peak" was clearly
Little Tahoma off to the right of Rainier's summit.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Simon Hicks <slh.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 07:52:54 +0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:10:59 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 12:26:07 -0600
>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:20:19 -0500
>>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

>>>From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 01:17:52 -0600
>>>Subject: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

<snip>

>Perhaps a better idea might be to approach say, Coast to Coast
>AM, with the following...

>A series of round-table discussions...

>UFO - Panel

<snip>

Kyle,

I believe George Noory tasked Linda Moulton Howe with putting
something like this together for April(?) on his show last
Friday.

Regards,

Simon

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Another Response To The Peter Jennings UFO Special

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>

Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 18:51:11 -0800 (PST)

Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:14:58 -0500

Subject: Another Response To The Peter Jennings UFO Special

(Another response to the Peter Jennings UFO special. This one is by a friend of John Mack's who prefers to remain anonymous; I am posting on his or her behalf).

John and I used to have chats in his kitchen about where we thought this phenomenon was "at", and what we thought were the next steps the larger cultural conversation needed to take. He and I both agreed that before further discussion about the reality of "contact" could be addressed in the mainstream, the first point that needed to be addressed in public forums is why we westerners have such a hard time even engaging as a possibility the idea that "contact" has already happened.

I had a phone conversation today with one of the people who helped put together the Peter Jennings special, a man similar in age, education, and upbringing as myself. But despite our similarities, we were the perfect embodiment of the polarities that exist in our culture about this subject matter. And yet, the two of us represent people, equally "of sound mind and body", who have the capacity to engage in private a much more sophisticated dialogue than what a mainstream two hour program is willing to discuss in public (for all of it's myriad of reasons).

For me, and for many others in communities that address issues of Evolving Consciousness (not just "UFO/alien" folks), the need to create platforms or media (whatever you want to call it, whatever it looks like) that doesn't represent ungrounded, new agey mumbo jumbo - or it's current polarized counterpart that is the mainstream media - but that DOES represent the cutting edge of mainstream consciousness and the issues it is dealing with, is a pressing one.

We are not just a few hundred people, we who are interested in the physics of a new reality, we who are aware of the fact that we are NOT alone in this universe (even though we may not as yet be able to explain any where close to fully, what has been the exact nature of our contact experiences - though, rest assured, sleep paralysis it ain't).

There are millions of us who are interested in really moving this larger conversation forward.

That there exists SUCH a gap between the mainstream and those who are interested in actively participating in conversations that push forward the evolution of our western consciousness is telling.

And what it suggests, is that the mainstream is afraid, just as those of us who had these "alien encounter" experiences were afraid. It was terrifying to have our realities and beliefs shattered over and over again. And yet, most of us survived our paradigm deconstruction (even if it was in a "sink or swim" kind of fashion) and have managed to recreate meaningful new realities for ourselves in the wake of our experiences.

That the mainstream is unconsciously facing what would certainly

represent the collapse of all it has held dear (including beliefs about God, religion, humans being at the "top of the food chain", and reality being a definable structure as interpreted only by our five senses and empirical science), has everything to do with why the Peter Jennings documentary had to be AS watered down as it was.

Interesting questions to ask here are:

Why CAN'T we have a balls to the wall, full blown documentary "on air" that articulates the phenomenon and it's accompanying confusion, just as it has been authentically presenting itself?

Why can't we have the skeptics present their arguments, and have them fully responded to by equally qualified professionals, scientists, & academics who possess both the letters after their names, and the experience to satisfyingly rebutt and make clearly obvious that the skeptics arguments are weak at best, and in truth, fall FAR short of being able to describe what's actually happening in this phenomenon?

If we could manage to pull off those kinds of investigations, maybe we could begin the careful but courageous dance of beginning to stick our faces into the heart of this phenomenon (instead of into the sand) to begin to honestly explore what seems to be the collapse of reality as we currently understand it.

One of the problems, I think, so far, has been that we in the consciousness related communities have been waiting for the mainstream to bring itself into the larger conversation. We have been expecting the mainstream media to want to investigate the contact phenomenon in spite of its fear of ridicule for being truthful in it's reporting.

Problem is though, no one of sound mind who wants to stay safe and accepted within the cultural framework of what's believable wants to be played the fool.

So time and time and time again, we who have had these experiences are called out to report what has happened to us. And time and time again, we are dismissed, explained away, pathologized or marginalized. We are sacrificed because nobody has the courage to say "hey, maybe the emperor really isn't wearing any clothes".

We have a long way to go, we humans. As one of the experiencers featured on the program said, we really are just babies. That may be one of the most important things we need to remember as we consider why we, as a culture, have thus far lacked the courage to engage these possibilities... we're only babies.

And not so unlike infants, we think the Universe extends only as far as the four walls we can see around us.

Or perhaps, even more tragically, we believe that we don't matter. That we're alone in a vast void of space and time.

But we're wrong.

And eventually, hopefully, before it's "too late", we'll figure that out. We'll make adjustments in our cultural belief system to accommodate a new reality, before our old one comes crashing down around us.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Jim Marrs On UFOs: Seeing Is Believing

From: **Larry W. Bryant** <overtci.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 21:47:44 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:20:47 -0500
Subject: Jim Marrs On UFOs: Seeing Is Believing

From: victorgm.nul (Victor Martinez)
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 13:08:24 -0800
Subject: Investigative author Jim Marrs comments on UFOs:
Seeing is Believing

www.jimmarrs.com/

University of Texas at Austin and best-selling author, Professor Jim Marrs shares his comments and criticisms of the recent ABC News Special UFOs: Seeing Is Believing, by Peter Jennings, aired 2-24-05

Howdy Victor:

For what it's worth, here's my contribution to the critiques of Peter Jennings' ABC special:

The recent ABC Special "UFOs: Seeing is Believing" was an most interesting blend of fact, fiction, information and DISinformation.

It appeared that ABC was trying to play catch-up. Most of the good information was years out of date. The coverage of the Phoenix flyover and the police chase of a UFO in the North were quite good. But why were these "good" cases not covered as news events when they occurred? It was as though someone in charge of ABC said, "This stuff is already in the public domain and anyone interested in this knows about it so we can talk about this." Or to be more blunt, ABC was mimicing the bumper sticker that reads, "Hey wait for me! I'm your leader!"

Yet, there were some astounding moments in the program. After reviewing the 1950s Robertson panel and Project Bluebook, which purported to be the last government word on UFOs, Jennings correctly concluded that it was all hogwash. There was no scientific investigation, only a public relations effort to stop interest in the subject. In other words, hey America, your federal government lied to you in the 1950s and 1960s! But then Jennings turns to Roswell.

He concludes that it was only a secret Mogul balloon that crashed and places all the blame for later publicity on Maj. Jesse Marcel who stirred up a number of publicity seekers. This is an atrocious assault on a gentleman and fine military officer. One need only review Marcel's military records to see that he was quite highly regarded. There was no mention of the more than 400 witnesses to the Roswell event. Not all of these people are flakes or hoaxers. To support the Mogul theory, Jennings trotted out Karl Pflock without mentioning that Karl is CIA and a former deputy assistant secretary of defense. Pflock argues in his book that Mogul was so secret that its recovery at Roswell had to be covered by a story about a flying saucer. Now just think about this one for a moment - a "secret" Mogul balloon crashes and the authorities do not want Soviet agents snooping around New Mexico. So they announce they have recovered a flying saucer?!! Every agent in the world would flock to NM!

He also points out that more than half the Mogul balloons launched were never recovered. Why not? No one bothered to go look for them, he tells us. Some Top-Secret project, eh? If the Mogul balloons were to detect Soviet nuclear testing in the atmosphere as claimed, it has never been adequately explained why they were launched from New Mexico instead of US bases in Turkey or Japan.

The 1997 official Air Force explanation of crash dummies was not even mentioned by Jennings. This is probably due to the fact that the government's own documents clearly show the very first crash dummy test was not until June, 1954.

Both Jennings and their scientific "experts" all came down on the fact that not one piece of physical evidence has been made public to verify the UFO phenomena. Yet there was not a whisper concerning the massive amount of evidence, both documentary and narrative, that this maddening lack of physical evidence can be directly tied to government crash retrieval programs designed to appropriate such evidence and hide it away. If I take a quarter from you and place it in my pocket, then claim that I do not have a quarter, how can you "prove" that I do without emptying my pocket. We cannot empty the government's pocket.

So the Jennings special ended up all about lights in the sky which admittedly is the weakest evidence supporting the reality of UFOs. He brushed aside the abduction phenomenon as a sleep disorder and never mentioned the peer-reviewed work of the late Harvard psychologist Dr. John Mack. And there was no mention whatsoever of crop circles, animal mutilations or the numerous cases involving physical effects on both people and property.

Jennings instead spent an inordinate amount of time of the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI) in which radio signals are beamed into space hoping for a reply. While most UFO researchers support the SETI program, they also question the use of primitive radio signals to contact a technologically-advanced alien civilization. What if I sent a Morse Code message by AM radio signal to your house? Would you even receive it on the new sophisticated digital receivers? Would you be listening for it? And could you understand it if you did receive it? I know I have long forgotten the Morse Code I learned in the Boy Scouts.

For all of this, the upshot of the Jennings special was encouraging. Yes, they debunked Roswell but they admitted that the government lied to us about UFOs in the '50s and '60s, a period many of us still remember. They pooch-pooched alien abductions yet showed sobering personal testimony from some unidentified persons. The personal narratives presented were riveting and compelling and undoubtedly stirred some interest in that portion of the public still in denial about life outside the Earth.

Most importantly, ABC, a major Establishment news outlet, actually addressed the UFO issue without the usual smug and condescending attitudes which marked earlier efforts. The door to serious discussion and study of UFOs may have cracked open a bit. This may be yet another step forward in the 50-year program to condition the American public to the reality of the UFOs.

Professor Jim Marrs author of:

Alien Agenda: Investigating The Extraterrestrial Presence Among Us
Perennial Books, June 2000, ISBN# 0060955368, \$15.00

Rule By Secrecy: The Hidden History That Connects The
Trilateral Commission, The Freemasons And The Great Pyramids
Perennial Books, June 2001, ISBN# 0060931841, \$15.00

www.jimmarrs.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Seeing Is Believing

From: William Bolt <ab5sy.nul>
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 19:29:12 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:27:21 -0500
Subject: Seeing Is Believing

Hi List,

I see that SBCYahoo carried a Peter Jennings news video of a Bud Hopkins interview Titled: What's It Like To Be Abducted By Aliens. A couple of abductees were interviewed as well as the Phd.s from the other camp to discredit their stories and that of Bud Hopkins use of hypnoses during his investigations.....

I also seen that ABC News has an on-line store where you can buy the hatchet job Jenny's did on the Seeing Is Believing program on the 24th Feb. Now don't everyone rush on-line to buy a copy of this remarkable program (?).

But if you must, it comes in DVD and VHS for \$29.95. No I did not buy it.

May You Live Long And Prosper

AB5SY

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program -

From: Dave Morton <Marspyrs.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 00:13:23 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:30:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program -

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers ->
>Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 12:05:41 -0500
>Subject: Budd Hopkins' Response To Jennings' Program

>Source: The John E. Mack Institute

>http://johnemackinstitute.org/center/center_news.asp?id=249

>Feb 25, 2005

>Budd Hopkins' Response
>to the ABC Peter Jennings "Seeing is Believing" TV Program
>Courtesy of the Intruders Foundation

>During the past year Jennings' producers interviewed me a number
>of times, and because I sensed what they had in mind, I made, as
>a preemptive strike, a number of careful, highly specific
>observations about the UFO abduction phenomenon. All of these
>crucial points - recorded by ABC on videotape - were designed to
>underline the physical reality of UFO abductions and to
>demonstrate the implausibility of current skeptical
>explanations.

>To its shame, ABC suppressed all of these observations.

<snip>

>Peter Jennings and his staff should be ashamed.

>Budd Hopkins
>New York

Under the circumstances, Budd Hopkins and David Jacobs should send a bill to the network that produced the show - say, a minimum of \$50/hour? Did the network people donate their time and work for free? What did Hopkins and Jacobs get for their labors? Satisfaction? Pride? Joy? Gratitude? Respect? Nope! None of the above.

Next time - if there is a next time - upfront payment and a written contract should precede their generous efforts. IE, cash in advance, and guarantees that crucial aspects of the data will make it into the program, such as scoop marks, daytime abductions, etc. This concept is known as "No tickee, no washee."

Of course, the networks won't do that, but then Hopkins and Jacobs won't waste so much time and effort - and passion - into collecting and producing documentation which will end up in the trash can - along with their betrayed emotions.

I feel very bad for both of these good men, and despise those who did it to them. If the producers didn't want any good material from them, they shouldn't have requested any!

Can the word "conspiracy" be spelled using the letters "NOVA" and "Special Program on UFOs (Thursday 02/24/05)"?

The whole episode has the following ring to it: The American (and non-American?) public might now be able to handle the idea that life on Mars once existed, and that UFOs might be real, but when it comes to demonstrating the reality of alien abductions, that's too frightening for people to handle. Far too frightening.

But then, how would two different sets of producers of two different programs know that? Or aren't they calling the shots? If not, who is calling the shots for network television? PBS and ABC execs? Of course not...

(Why they ridiculed Roswell, I don't know, except that Roswell involved a saucer which crash-landed here - not merely a craft which paced a DC-6 for a few miles - as exciting as that would be! That makes Roswell much more real and immediate.)

Still, it sounds like they filled part of the pool and stuck their toes in - even if the deep end is still far too shallow to dive into.

Thank goodness this group exists. Without this group to explore and illuminate the truth, I'd probably be madder than a Hatter, still pouring tea for all the un-birthdays, and grinding my teeth at the un-documentaries, with no place to turn for the explanations, insights, and wisdom of the day.

Thank you, all, for the all the wonderful, satisfying, difficult, brilliant work you do! I'm fortunate, and as grateful as a blind man whose sight is restored every evening for a few hours. Don't stop!

Dave Morton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sawers

From: William Sawers <ufsyntax.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 15:36:18 +1000
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:32:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Believes Roswell Was ET? - Sawers

Listers,

After reading all the interesting comments re Radar

Tracking tests and Lightning/Thunderstorms as a possible reason for the crash of this craft I am suprised I havent seen this website mentioned:

http://www.angelfire.com/indie/anna_jones1/roswell-sunspots.html

If Lightning/Thunder and something perhaps as innocuous as a Radar test can be blamed, is it not possible, unprecedented sunspot activity in mid 1947 be worth throwing into the mix? The 'fact' that July 1947 had the highest activity of sunspots ever recorded and the largest one in April of that year lasted for months afterwards with who knows what effects to electricis/ magnetics etc

A quote from the website:

"So, what does that have to do with anything? Areas on the Sun near sunspots often flare up, heating material to millions of degrees in just seconds, causing Coronal Mass Ejections (CME's) which blast billions of tons of ionized gas into space millions of miles per hour. If the gas bundle goes off at the right spot on the sun so it can intercept the Earth it can set off geomagnetic storms that can damage satellites in space and shut down electrical power and power grids."

If this is taken into account then perhaps then, it's not so unreasonable to suggest there could have been more than one crash in '47?

Regards

William

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Tuptown RND05 UFO Base

From: Colin Stevenson <colsweb.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 11:22:42 +0000 (GMT)
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:34:28 -0500
Subject: Tuptown RND05 UFO Base

Tuptown UFO Base declares support of RND05 with revelations of its hitherto unknown existence in Snozzle Valley UK.

You are cordially invited to nose around.

No appointment is necessary.

<http://colsweb.com/tupton.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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

From: Kyle King <kyleking.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 07:40:33 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:39:37 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed -

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 10:21:29 -0600
>Subject: Re: ABC UFO Special Seeing Is Being Underwhelmed

<snip>

>And consider, there is no place in the effort for the likes of
>skeptibunky pelicanists and conflicted klasskurtxians as they
>are the darlings of the mainstream, anyway, and their
>regressional spewing can be had, otherwise, everywhere else.
>This is forgetting, of course, that they lack the requisite
>sack to participate, regardless, in a substantive way because of
>their lack of any success in legitimate debate...

Hi Alfred,

Absolutely right. This must be a "best evidence for UFOs" kind of thing, rather than a point/counterpoint. Callers could raise questions, but therein lies what is missing from documentaries and video presentations. Just avoiding the "usual suspects" in the debunking community would enhance the information exchange immeasurably.

The debunkers and duplicitous dastards already have a platform, as the Jennings special amply demonstrated, and as Fox does on a daily basis.

We would want to appeal to that large percentage that feels that the UFO phenomenon represents something real.

Not fair and certainly not balanced, but an accurate and up to date "Estimate of the Situation" for interested parties.

The idea might attract paying customers for a subscription plan, as well.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:22:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:40:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night - Maccabee

>From: Adam Lowe <subbie.nul>
>T>o: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 11:31:59 -0500
>Subject: Re: Website Traffic Increase Last Night

>Thanks to Larry, David, Terry and Colin for your replies. I'm
>glad that the NICAP site was not alone in seeing an increase in
>hits.

I, too, had an increase of about 50% over the daily average.
There was also an increase during the beginning of the week with
Monday being a peak, then dropping down on Wednesday and peaking
again on Friday.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: ABC Jennings Special - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 09:16:59 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:44:42 -0500
Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special - Lehmborg

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 17:27:45 -0500
>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 11:47:18 -0800
>>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 16:40:09 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: ABC Jennings Special

><snip>

>>>The "TRUFO" was the object seen "in the 8 o'clock hour" which
>>>was large, dark and blocked the stars. Jennings said in his
>>>monologue that hundreds of people also saw the lights at 10 p.m.
>>>However, to the best of my knowledge there were only a few who
>>>saw those, but hundreds did see the "thing" at about 8:30.

>>I noticed that they failed to draw a clear line between the
>>earlier and later sightings, but lumped them in together as one
>>and the same thing. Whether this was deliberate confusion or
>>simple ignorance on the part of the writer/director I don't
>>know. Judging by how he badly slanted Roswell and abductions, I
>>suspect the former.

>>Question: Was anybody on the List interviewed by ABC, such as
>>Jerry Clark, Stanton Friedman, or Dick Hall, used as an expert
>>consultant? Did the filmmakers express a real interest in
>>getting the facts, or were they just in for the sound bites?

>Mike Fortson, who saw the 8:30 PM triangle told me he
>recommended to the ABC team that they contact me or look at my
>web site about the Phoenix lights. But they didn't do it.

Dissembling soundbites, unsupported proclamation, and
broad-brushed fallacy did nothing to help convince the
justifiably baffled fence-sitter to, even tentatively, step down
on the side of a demanding look at the most compelling events
and occurrences of any time! The rose colored observations of
those expressing an ambivalence or even an appreciation for the
quality of this tedious whitewash does nothing to excuse the
off-target, inaccurate, and patently fatuous appraisals of
Hopkins, Friedman, and Davenport by a hijacked and corrupted
mainstream. The preceding, alone, is reason enough for a
serious and ongoing excoriation of Jennings, ABC, and corporate
media in general. Beyond excoriation to abandonment... beyond
abandonment to banishment... beyond banishment to class action
punishment.....

The hyperbole circuit breaker remains ice cold.

I suspect Jennings knew just where he was going with this before
the first frame of video was shot. The mainstream media is
obviously professionally bankrupt, without journalistic ethics

and integrity, and Edward Roscoe Murrow moans as he rolls in his agitated grave.

alienview.nul -:|:-
www.AlienView.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Jennings' Un-Aired Footage - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:23:04 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:46:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Jennings' Un-Aired Footage - Kaeser

>From: Luis R. Gonzalez <lrgm.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 18:14:54 +0100
>Subject: Jennings' Un-Aired Footage

>Is there any way to secure all the footage that did not make
>the final cut, for posterity?

>Can some people (for instance, Wendy Connors) ask for a copy of
>all the raw material?

One could ask, but it would highly unlikely for producers to
release un-used footage, for a variety of reasons.

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 > [2005](#) > [Feb](#) > [Feb 28](#)

Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' -

From: Joachim Koch <lists.nul>
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 15:58:42 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 10:42:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy' -

>From: Wendelle Stevens <s18195a.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 23:20:15 EST
>Subject: Re: Another Surgeon's View Of 'Alien Autopsy'

>Dear Joachim:

>There seems to be a lot of unnecessary confusion about that
>Santilli autopsy film, and there is no reason for it, if one was
>to look at the realities.

<snip>

>To put Michael Hesseman down for his role in this is a disgrace,
>as he is the only one I know of who really went there and did
>the spadework. I was with him. I know this was strictly real,
>and there is no doubt about it in my mind.

Dear Wendelle,

Thank you very much for this information.

I am not in the position to put Mr. Hessemann (his name and correct spelling is: Michael Hessemann) down in any way for the real work he has done. It is only that no one here - at least the ones I knew - could stand his presence physically anymore because of his egocentric behaviour to be the greatest, the best, the most informed one with the best connections to everyone because everyone was - in his eyes - his friend. But if he was with you and you all could research, find and prove some solid evidence - fine!

Regarding the film: please - and all the others are invited to do it - have a look at the website of:

Joe Longo, SOC
President, International Combat Camera Association

http://www.soc.org/opcam/a_autopsy/alienautopsy.html

Another item: M. Hessemann - who always nearly went hysteric here when someone dared to question the 'reality' of the AA footage - distributed (and earned ..?) a video with the footage 'to be the uncut material as it came from the reels'.

We showed this 'Hessemann video' to a German film specialist and he was surprised how many (!) cuts (visibly to the trained eye) there were in the footage.

So the suggestion is not too far away that the whole thing was never produced on film but only on video and what we saw was the original production on video and the allegation that there should exist 'cans of film' is only another part of the scam.

As far as I know - Kodak has never received a part of the 'film' from a reel they would like to choose neither from Mr. Santilli (still smiling, Ray?..) nor from his alledged German/Austrian friend. Alone this name 'Spielberg' is too ridiculous.

Do you really think that there wouldn't have been any attempt/assault by Intelligence Services to get hold of the 'cans' if they were 'real'? But nothing. Neither Santilli nor his friend have ever reported to have been contacted or threatened by any of those 'Black Men'.

Nothing at all. The greatest mystery revealed on film - and no attempt to prevent the official announced showing in London? Well...

And so much more...

All the best,

Joachim

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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