

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2006](#) > May

UFO UpDates Mailing List May 2006

May 1:

[Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Smith](#) - James Smith [47]
[Air Cases \[was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up\]](#) - Don Ledger [47]
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -](#) - Rick Nielsen [7]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [22]
[Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [8]
[Re: British House Of Commons On Nick Pope -](#) - John Rimmer [5]
[Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [34]
[UFO UpDate: Carbondale UFO Crash Chronicles Entry No.8](#) - Matt Graeber [154]
[Roswell Museum Presents Both Sides Of UFO Story](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [57]
[Foiling The Space Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [83]
[Missing E-Mails](#) - Larry Hatch [17]
[Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [13]
[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [38]
[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [7]
[Re: Foiling The Space Aliens - Rome](#) - Irene Rome [7]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [12]
[Secrecy News -- 05/01/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [134]
[Re: Air Cases - Harney](#) - John Harney [31]
[Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference Tues May 9th](#) - Victor Viggiani [119]
[Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [23]

May 2:

[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [12]
[Re: Air Cases - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [7]
[Re: The Best Short UFO Report? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [28]
[Re: Air Cases - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [64]
[Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [153]
[UFO & Alien Encounter In Bloomington Indiana](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [549]
[UFOs Interdimensional Travel & One Giant Rock](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [83]
[Furlotte On SDI 04-29-06](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [40]
[Re: Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [16]
[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [12]
[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [2]

May 3:

[Art School Rationalism? \[was: UFOs Are Back\]](#) - Cathy Reason [8]
[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [23]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [48]
[Pelicanism \[was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up\]](#) - Jerome Clark [13]
[Re: Pelicanism \[was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel\]](#) - Bruce Maccabee [31]
[Re: UFOs Interdimensional Travel & One Giant Rock](#) - Kathy Kasten [13]
[Re: Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference Tues May](#) - Kathy Kasten [10]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [14]
[Okno ELINT Complex In Tajikistan](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [43]
[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [3]
[Hudson Valley UFO Meeting Tonight @ 7:30](#) - Vinny Polise [15]
[Re: Air Cases - Matteson](#) - Gary Matteson [14]
[Michigan Researcher Links Bigfoot & UFOs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [47]
[Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [74]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [10]
[Re: Hudson Valley UFO Meeting Tonight @ 7:30](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [18]
[Re: Air Cases - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [16]
[Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?](#) - Steven Kaeser [11]
[Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?](#) - Ed Gehrman [4]
[Friedman Reviews Clancy](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [236]
[Re: Secrecy News -- 05/03/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [120]
[Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [39]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [23]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [6]
[Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Smith](#) - James Smith [86]

May 4:

[Re: Pelicanism - White](#) - Eleanor White [6]
[Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - White](#) - Eleanor White [10]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - James Smith [46]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [7]
[Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?](#) - Craig Beasley [20]
[Re: Art School Rationalism? - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [3]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [12]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [18]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [8]
[PRG Update - May 4, 2006](#) - Stephen G. Bassett [77]
[The 'Dark' Cosmos](#) - Terry W. Colvin [51]
[USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [74]
[US Seeks Laser Weapon To Down Enemy Satellites](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [25]
[Something In Sky Over Terrace BC](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [45]
[New Lie Detection Tech Worries Ethicist](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [107]

May 5:

[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [25]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - Steven Kaeser [36]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - Craig Beasley [8]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [55]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - Don Ledger [13]
[Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?](#) - Don Ledger [8]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [23]

[A Twist On Fermi](#) - Ray Dickenson [23]
[Re: The 'Dark' Cosmos - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [11]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - Bruce Maccabee [22]
[Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [9]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Frager](#) - Richard Frager [2]
[Links To FBI Files](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [39]
[Sci-Fi Man](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [249]
[Aliens Have Landed](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [87]
[Tourist Shoots 'UFO' In Penang](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [21]
[Follow The Nitrogen To Extraterrestrial Life](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [61]
[The House The Venusians Built](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [178]
[Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [6]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - James Smith [28]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - James Smith [27]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - James Smith [16]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [20]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - James Smith [8]
[Re: Aliens Have Landed - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [7]

May 6:

[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Morton](#) - Dave Morton [34]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - Jeanne Sloane [7]
[Who Is Behind It All?](#) - Greg Boone [31]
[Re: Aliens Have Landed - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [11]
[Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [6]
[Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [2]
[Hacker Fears 'UFO Cover-Up'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [131]
[Re: UFOs Are Back - Pope](#) - Nick Pope [40]
[Important Breaking News](#) - Gary Anthony [25]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [18]

May 7:

[ET Just A Puff Of Plasma](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [94]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White](#) - Eleanor White [4]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [14]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [5]
[UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [71]
[Extracts From 'Hearing On Life In The Universe'](#) - Sergey Shpakovsky [332]
[Obvious Spin](#) - Ray Dickenson [31]
[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [3]
[Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project](#) - Joe McGonagle [8]
[The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?](#) - Eleanor White [14]
[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [15]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [10]
[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [26]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [10]
[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [18]
[Re: Extracts From 'Hearing On Life In The](#) - Rick Nielsen [23]
[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [57]
[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [45]
[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [21]

[UFO Shoot-Downs](#) - Nick Balaskas [82]

[Project Condign](#) - Nick Pope [19]

[Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Waskiewicz](#) - Jean Waskiewicz [4]

[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Bassett](#) - Steve Bassett [14]

[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [26]

May 8:

[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [18]

[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [17]

[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [9]

[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [14]

[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - Matthew James Didier [164]

[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [14]

[Re: UFO Shoot-Downs - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [18]

[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [6]

[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [4]

[MSNBC.Com Article & UFO Poll](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [18]

[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [6]

[BBC News On MOD's UFO Report](#) - Rob Simone [10]

[UFO Conference In Altrincham UK](#) - Stuart Miller [127]

[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [12]

[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [15]

May 9:

[UFO DATA](#) - Philip Mantle [12]

[Mariana's UFO Film One Of The Best Produced](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [76]

[Re: UFO Shoot-Downs - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [21]

[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [29]

[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [8]

[Review Of Night Journeys In Ufology: 1974-1977](#) - Robert Barrow [279]

[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [52]

[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [17]

[Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Jacobs](#) - Robert Jacobs [11]

[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [48]

[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - James Smith [90]

[UFOs The 'Truth' Is In Here](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [13]

[Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [24]

[Secrecy News -- 05/08/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [157]

[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [27]

[Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [4]

[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research](#) - James Smith [63]

[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White](#) - Eleanor White [5]

[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [48]

[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [1]

[Two UFO Surprises](#) - Bruce Maccabee [63]

[Re: ET Just a Puff of Plasma - Kimball](#) - Paul Kimball [45]

[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [28]

[Humanity's Place In The Cosmic Garden](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [256]

[Classified MoD Report Reveals The Secrets Behind](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [62]

May 10:

[Maccabee West Coast MUFON UFO Lectures](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]
[First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO](#) - Robert Morningstar [50]
[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [8]
[UK Court Approves McKinnon Extadition](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [32]
[UK MoD BS](#) - Stephen Bassett [15]
[Secrecy News -- 05/10/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [156]

May 11:

[UFOs Do Exist Insists Watcher](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [28]
[More Greer Guff](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [158]
[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Watson](#) - Nigel Watson [9]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [10]
[Re: Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens -](#) - Viktor Golubik [29]
[Re: First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [12]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [37]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [8]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [5]
[Project Condign - MOD Announcement](#) - Nick Pope [9]

May 12:

[Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [6]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Bassett](#) - Stephen Bassett [32]
[Re: First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [34]
[Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [66]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White](#) - Eleanor White [41]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [14]
[Re: UK Court Approves McKinnon Extadition - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [7]
[Re: Clarke & Rutkowski On CBC Radio 1 - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [24]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Hale](#) - Roy Hale [18]
[Nick Redfern's E-mail?](#) - Bill Chalker [8]

May 13:

[Skeptics Confounded](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [213]
[40th Anniversary Of eaver County UFO Sighting](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [41]
[Filmmaker Kimball Invited To UFO Conference](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [21]
[Movies Serve As Previews For Area's Own UFO](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [30]
[UFO Cannot Believe It!](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [52]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [5]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [36]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [17]
[Re: Project Condign - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [132]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White](#) - Eleanor White [6]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -](#) - Matthew James Didier [172]

May 14:

[Unusual Encounters](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [77]
[Man Says Photo Shows UFOs Over Santa Isabel](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [75]
[Yaldhurst NZ UFO](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [29]

[Pictures From Retro UFO Conference In Landers](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [6]
[Hypothesis to Explain Atmospheric Methane Findings](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [50]
[Light Travels Backwards?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [103]
[Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Deardorff](#) - Jim Deardorff [10]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [33]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [10]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [27]
[Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [19]
[Valuable UK UFO Project](#) - Isaac Koi [1293]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -](#) - James Smith [47]
[Re: Project Condign - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [8]
[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [13]
[Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [21]
[Re: UK MoD BS - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [10]
[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [13]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [29]

May 15:

[Re: Pictures From Retro UFO Conference - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [5]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [5]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [18]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Bassett](#) - Stephen Bassett [33]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -](#) - Eleanor White [10]
[UFO Abduction Seminar June 3 2006 NYC](#) - The Intruders Foundation [68]
[Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [12]
[Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [36]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [4]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Harrison](#) - Diane Harrison [38]
[The Condign Report Release & Media Coverage](#) - Nick Pope [12]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [9]
[Where Are The Aliens?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [34]
[I Live In A Triangle](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [75]
[Aykroyd Unplugged On UFOs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [69]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [13]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [11]
[Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -](#) - James Smith [6]
[Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [23]
[UFOs Exist It's Official!](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [51]
[Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Jacobs](#) - Bob Jacobs [9]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [6]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Anderson](#) - Paul Anderson [21]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [22]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Anthony](#) - Gary Anthony [171]
[British Skies UFO-Free For Last 30 Years](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [39]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [26]
[Science Fantastic](#) - Stanton Friedman [20]
[Are humans 'Fit' For True Space Travel?](#) - Ray Dickenson [29]

May 16:

[Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [11]
[What Got You Hooked On UFOs?](#) - Greg Boone [23]

[Specific Cases In Condign Report?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [21]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Chalker](#) - Bill Chalker [15]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [38]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [9]
[Re: Science Fantastic - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [8]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [6]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [38]
[Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [6]
[Re: Are humans 'Fit' For True Space Travel?](#) - - Steven Kaeser [28]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [42]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [12]
[Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [22]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [20]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [43]
[Re: Science Fantastic - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [8]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [6]

May 17:

[White Sands Looks Deep Into Outer Space](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [57]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [30]
[UK MoD Condign Updated](#) - Don Ledger [12]
[Re: Secrecy News -- 05/16/06 - Aftergood](#) - Steven Aftergood [122]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [55]
[New Reports Posted To NUFORC Website](#) - Peter B. Davenport [41]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Faccenda](#) - Joe Faccenda [22]
[Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [12]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger](#) - Eleanor White [12]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [10]
[Re: Science Fantastic - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [11]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [12]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - White](#) - Eleanor White [10]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [15]
[My Heroes](#) - John Velez [26]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [14]
[Looking For Aliens On The Moon](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [98]
[Unsung Heroes](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [21]
[Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Macabbee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [103]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [12]

May 18:

[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [99]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Rome](#) - Irene Rome [34]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Terri](#) - Terri Kelly [31]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [33]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [43]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [5]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Schramm](#) - Kathleen Schramm [5]
[Re: UK MoD Condign Updated - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [6]
[Re: New Reports Posted To NUFORC Website - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [32]
[Re: UK MoD BS - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [69]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [36]

[Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [54]
[Close Encounters Of The Strange Kind](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [123]
[UFO Report Reveals Lancs Sightings](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [37]
[UFO Seen In South-East Queensland](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [18]

May 19:

[UFO Festival Looks Into The World Of Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [84]
[Secrecy News -- 05/18/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [133]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [15]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -](#) - Nick Balaskas [33]
[Re: Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure - White](#) - Eleanor White [5]
[UFO Researcher In Cairo](#) - Ahmed Ziady [14]
[UFOs 9/11 And Why The Uphill Battle](#) - Greg Boone [8]
[Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Faccenda](#) - Joe Faccenda [24]
[Charles Fort Books On-Line](#) - Terry W. Colvin [5]
[\[fantasticreality\] Re: Flight 77's Crash?](#) - Terry W. Colvin [45]
[PRG Update 05-19-06](#) - Stephen Bassett [106]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [12]
[Questions For Skeptics](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [106]

May 20:

[Secrecy News -- 05/19/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [115]
[Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White](#) - Eleanor White [5]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - White](#) - Eleanor White [15]
[UK MOD/UAP Scientific Filter?](#) - Viktor Golubik [190]
[Our All-Time Favourite Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [60]
[Light Up The Sky ET](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [24]
[Gulf Breeze Six Case Revisited](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [269]
[The Roswell Case: Meeting Jesse Marcel, Jr.](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [50]
[Condign And Meteors](#) - Martin Shough [106]
[Re: Charles Fort Books On-Line - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [4]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [8]
[Re: \[fantasticreality\] Re: Flight 77's Crash?](#) - Viktor Golubik [18]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [20]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi](#) - Isaac Koi [30]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [5]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [8]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [12]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]
[Unplugged On UFOs Trailer](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [3]

May 21:

[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [12]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [17]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [9]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [20]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -](#) - Paul Anderson [25]
['UFO' Crashes Off KwaZulu-Natal Coast](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [36]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [17]

May 22:

[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [6]
[YouTube.Com UFO Videos](#) - Greg Boone [13]
[Aliens: Worlds of Possibilities](#) - Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo [39]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [34]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [27]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [24]
[No Sign Of 'Crashed UFO' Off South African Coast](#) - Greg Boone [10]
[If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So](#) - Rick Nielsen [77]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -](#) - Paul Anderson [16]
[Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -](#) - Paul Anderson [14]
[New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Tim Shell [38]
[No Sign Of ZA 'UFO'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [46]
[Husband Has Secret That's Out of This World](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [39]
[Search For Crashed ZA 'UFO' On Hold](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [46]
[Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [120]

May 23:

[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [22]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [17]
[Secrecy News -- 05/22/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [149]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [27]
[Re: No Sign Of ZA 'UFO' - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [22]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Christopher Allan [10]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [7]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - White](#) - Eleanor White [13]
[UK National Archives Global Search](#) - Nick Pope [11]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Ole Henningsen [9]

May 24:

[Space Aliens From Luxemburg A Horror Story](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [152]
[E.T Hunters Swarm To The Northwest](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [109]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [5]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [15]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Don Ledger [9]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn](#) - Tom Horn [6]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [15]
[UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore](#) - Jerome Clark [50]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [36]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Viktor Golubik [58]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Richard Hall [18]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [16]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Bruce Maccabee [10]
[TRUFOs \[was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So\]](#) - Bruce Maccabee [60]
[UFO Abductions And John Mack](#) - Richard Hall [21]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [5]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [9]
[Celestial Secrets Reveals Fatima Cover-Up](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [78]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So -](#) - Carol Buckallew [8]
[George Fawcett's New Book](#) - George Fawcett [22]

[The National 2006 UFO Conference Sydney Oz](#) - Diane Harrison [29]
[Shurinoy Slams Mantle & Stonehill Book](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [3]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [9]
[Re: Secrecy News -- 05/24/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [109]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [98]
[Re: UFO Abductions And John Mack - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [8]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [95]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Tim Shell [57]
[Re: TRUFOs - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [26]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [5]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson](#) - Nigel Watson [8]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [6]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn](#) - Tom Horn [18]
[Re: UFO Abductions And John Mack - Bueche](#) - Will Bueche [20]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [10]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [4]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [52]

May 25:

[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Isaac Koi [57]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [44]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [18]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [8]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [8]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [59]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [4]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - David Rudiak [25]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Robert Gates [22]
[Re: TRUFOs - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [3]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [18]
[Magonia Supplement No. 61](#) - John Harney [14]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [6]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos [7]
[Re: TRUFOs - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [16]
[UFOs Fact Or Fiction?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [88]
[Theories On Recent Cattle Mutilations Sort Of Alien](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [83]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [12]
[Re: TRUFOs - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [4]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Stanton Friedman [10]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [9]
[Re: TRUFOs - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [5]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [50]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Christopher Allan [6]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [14]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Viktor Golubik [14]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson](#) - Nigel Watson [9]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Smith](#) - James Smith [41]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Viktor Golubik [53]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Don Ledger [23]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Don Ledger [12]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn](#) - Tom Horn [5]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [14]

[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - David Rudiak [109]
['Alien Message' Sparks Tsunami Panic](#) - Mike Jamieson [39]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Viktor Golubik [28]
[Stephen Lovekin Is Not Brigadier General](#) - Michael Gates [44]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [12]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Viktor Golubik [5]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Bob Shell [18]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [24]
[Re: \[fantasticreality\] Re: Flight 77's Crash?](#) - - Viktor Golubik [20]
[P-47: UFOPOP Opens New Gallery](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [26]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore](#) - - Ray Dickenson [10]
[Analysis Of Ellen Crystal's UFO Photos?](#) - Greg Boone [11]

May 26:

[Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [61]
[If It Quacks Like An Alien...](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [97]
[SA UFO 'Probably A Small Meteorite Or Something'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [42]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [11]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [27]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [6]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [18]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Tim Shell [10]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [11]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [11]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Don Ledger [6]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [76]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Ann Druffel [44]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [8]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson](#) - Nigel Watson [17]
[Re: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [8]

May 27:

[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [13]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Viktor Golubik [24]
[Re: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [13]
[Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [17]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Isaac Koi [67]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [15]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik Diverge247@aol.com [13]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [26]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [20]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Don Ledger [4]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Martin Shough [104]
[Secrecy News -- 05/26/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [119]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn](#) - Tom Horn [13]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [12]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - David Rudiak [18]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - David Rudiak [48]
[Secrecy News -- 05/26/06 \(Extra!\)](#) - Steven Aftergood [72]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Nick Balaskas [53]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Bruce Maccabee [6]

[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment](#) - Franck Boitte [36]
[Welsh UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [88]
['Little Green Men Syndrome'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [287]
[SA UFO A 'Waterspout'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [32]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [76]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [10]
[Spherical UFO Follows Pennsylvania Driver](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [33]

May 28:

[Strange Object Over Dutch Village](#) - Rick Speelman [20]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [22]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Viktor Golubik [56]
[Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [36]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [50]
[Re: Welsh UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained](#) - Don Ledger [57]
[Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [15]
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment](#) - Eleanor White [7]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [8]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [92]
[Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [36]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Ann Druffel [20]
[Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome's - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [18]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore](#) - Ray Dickenson [16]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Bob Shell [39]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [17]
[Sudbury Man Keeps An Eye On The Sky](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [96]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [22]

May 29:

[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [44]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [20]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [40]
[Direct Link To John Mack Piece On IF Website](#) - Richard Hall [15]
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment](#) - Richard Hall [18]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [15]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Nick Balaskas [34]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [29]
[The Missing Science Of Ball Lightning](#) - Gary C. Matteson [42]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Nick Balaskas [15]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Viktor Golubik [26]
[Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [20]
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment](#) - Franck Boitte [32]
[Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [56]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [14]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Bob Shell [6]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Bob Shell [15]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [72]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [17]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Richard Hall [21]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Don Ledger [37]

May 30:

[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [108]
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment](#) - Rick Nielsen [5]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [80]
[Re: Direct Link To John Mack Piece On IF Website](#) - Kathy Kasten [14]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [36]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [50]
[Is The Truth Out There In Northern Saskatchewan](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [39]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - David Rudiak [83]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [30]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Viktor Golubik [26]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Viktor Golubik [7]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Nick Balaskas [37]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - David Rudiak [79]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Nick Balaskas [23]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore](#) - Ray Dickenson [11]
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment](#) - Richard Hall [14]
[The Park Hypothesis](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [97]
[UFO Photo 'Proof'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [36]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [8]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Richard Hall [23]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Bob Shell [6]

May 31:

[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [20]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [29]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [8]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [16]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [9]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - David Rudiak [129]
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson](#) - Nigel Watson [45]
[Supreme Court Stomps Whistleblowers](#) - Greg Boone [19]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Joe Faccenda [8]
[Re: The Park Hypothesis - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [7]
[Re: UFO Photo 'Proof' - Bueche](#) - Will Bueche [7]
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment](#) - Rick Nielsen [52]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [28]
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [25]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Don Ledger [9]
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Viktor Golubik [4]

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Smith

From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 13:44:28 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:11:06 -0400
Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Smith

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 21:27:29 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 15:00:23 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2006 20:12:22 +0100 (BST)
>>>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>>>Unfortunately, their next door neighbours think they're mad.
>>>OK, hardly the end of the world but the endless debates with
>>>ill informed smart asses and smirkers would vanish overnight
>>>the moment someone in "authority" confirms what we already
>>>know.

>>I have sympathy with folk being afraid of being called mad.
>>But, I am concerned that folk would be such wimps to worry
>>about what their neighbors say. If neighbors know who you are
>>and trust you then they should not call you mad. If they
>>don't trust you or know you, you shouldn't care what they
>>say. If one is so concerned about the "clique" and fitting in
>>rather than holding one's own beliefs, then perhaps they
>>should keep their heads down and mouths shut.

>In an earlier post, I accused you of contradictions, which you
>denied. You need to make your mind up. You have sympathy with
>folks who are worried about being seen to be off their trolleys
>and yet it would appear you don't.

It boils down to regardless what other people think about you,
you should have strong enough self-confidence to shrug off their
statements. If not, then one should keep mum rather than suffer
the hurtful words of others. So I sympathize with their fear,
but you see there is a solution. So, no contradiction.

>>And this expectation that "authority" is definitive is sad but
>>not surprising. Yes, whatever the suits say is true! White is
>>black! Ignorance is knowledge! War is peace! Communists in
>>Russia, China, Korea, Vietnam and elsewhere were "authorities"
>>and made many pronouncements based on little factual basis (or
>>were twisted in some way), however, they met political and
>>policy ends. Democracies have different policies but operate
>>similarly.

>So the suits in your government are a bunch of liars yet you
>come down hard on the concept of whistleblowers who tend to
>highlight the lies your government tells.

I am saying government officials have their own agenda in
pronouncements and we do not know what it is.

So any statements they make may be a lie.

Since we do not know for sure which statements are lies or non-lies, we must assume they are all lies unless we have proof otherwise. But where can we get proof? Do we trust data from the government or do we try to obtain our own data independently? I say the latter.

Whistleblowers are also not to be assumed as pure truth-tellers either. Who knows what their agenda is? Who knows whether they have been intentionally misled?

Blatant acceptance of either government or whistleblowers group is not prudent. Independent proof is needed.

Part of the contradictory issue here is that while I do not trust the pronouncements of government, I assume they are doing things like "defending the country". Probably naive of me but I would hope this is still a fundamental role of a government. As such, I am somewhat disturbed when people decide on their own to release classified information (or which may be classified if it had gone through the right channels). One would hope that the whole rationale of classified information is to help in the security and defense of the country. I naively think that a large percentage of such documents truly pertain to maintaining the country's security.

You seem to want to know everything that is going on in secret in the government, perhaps because you do not trust them. My belief is that many secrets (not all) are for the security and defense and thus it makes no sense for the public to know unless one wants to reduce security and defense (or doesn't care). Statements by the government may be made that are false in order to not reveal secrets and thus maintain security and defense.

>>>>But if you get the government involved, proof isn't even
>>>>needed. They can make up stuff right and left. They can pick
>>>>and choose whatever scientists they want or just make
>>>>"facts". They are policy makers, not truth sayers. Do not
>>>>trust the government to ever tell the truth.

>Boo!! I hope you didn't jump too much but they could be standing
>right behind you just now. As a demonstration in confused
>paranoia James, this is a masterclass. It's backwards, forwards,
>all over the place.

Trust must be earned. If you can independently verify government data, then it's okay.

All this may seem like paranoia, but it's really just the application of logic. The whole point of discussing this is that there is a group of UFOlogists who think that if they get cooperation and answers from the government, then all is well. Such an approach seems to have many flaws that cannot be resolved without independent verification using instrumented field research. Are you going to be satisfied if the government makes the official pronouncement that UFOs can all be explained and are not alien?

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

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Air Cases [was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up]

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 15:10:13 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:11:41 -0400
Subject: Air Cases [was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up]

>>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 00:18:33 +0100
>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 15:17:49 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 14:29:22 +0100
>>>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>>>>You worry about the possibility of the introduction of the term
>>>>>pelicanism but see no danger in the use of the words used by
>>>>>Harney in his simple-minded ramblings such as: modern myth, >
>>>>>self-styled "Serious Ufologists", self-deluded buffoons [I

>>>>>assume that means myself as well] and the sentence "The general
>>>>>idea is to dispel the lies, delusions and paranoid fantasies, by
>>>>>such methods as pointing out that reports of apparent "true
>>>>>UFOs" never stand up to critical examination."

>>>>>>This last sentence is a big lie, and what's more, Harney knows
>>>>>>it [note he said he was "attempting" to write an article]
>>>>>>because he can't make his accusations stick himself-other than
>>>>>>in his crawl. He uses this approach over and over in hopes [like
>>>>>>the Nazis of yore] that if you tell a big enough lie often
>>>>>>enough, people will begin to believe it. In his closed off
>>>>>>little, self aggrandized, "Magonia" world perhaps that is true,
>>>>>>but he and the other magonian sheep are bleating into the wind
>>>>>>when it comes to the world at large. The best he can hope
>>>>>>for is that he intimidates enough witnesses into keeping to themselves
>>>>>>their extraordinary experiences because they don't want to be
>>>>>>branded as crazies and lunatics. These are/is the same methods
>>>>>>used by the SS, Stalin, organized crime and many governments to
>>>>>>keep people from testifying to the truth. Harney doesn't like
>>>>>>the truth. I've never actually seen him disprove anything, but
>>>>>>just make repeated claims that there is no proof.

>>>>>>>Many of his ilk are guilty of that omission as is yourself when
>>>>>>>it comes down to it.

>>>>>>>>If this is not true, CDA, then start with this one. It's right
>>>>>>>>in your territory.

>>>>>>>>>"Commercial Air Transport Airmis Reports (January-April 1995)
>>>>>>>>>Manchester Airmis With Wedge Shaped UFO"

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Airmis report No. 2/95
>>>>>>>>>>Date/Time: 061848 Jan; Night
>>>>>>>>>>Position: N5318 W0200 (8NM SE Manchester Apt)
>>>>>>>>>>Airspace: TMA Class: A
>>>>>>>>>>Reporting Aircraft Reporting Aircraft
>>>>>>>>>>Type: B737 Untraced
>>>>>>>>>>Operator: CAT
>>>>>>>>>>Alt/FL: 4000ft =83 (Descending) (QNH 1027 mb)

>>Weather: VMC CLAC
>>Visibility: 10Km+

>>You can Google it up on your own. First disprove this to my
>>satisfaction, the pilots' and the CAA, not your own - because
>>you have no way of knowing if your solution is accurate or un-
>>educated nonsense. Bear in mind the UK's CAA [Civil Aviation
>>Authority] investigation could not determine what it was,
>>however commended the pilots for making the report and
>>encouraged other to do so [which they are loath to do because of
>>those like Harney and yourself] when similar circumstances
>>arose. If you do come up with a reasonable solution I'll post
>>it to my contact in the CAA myself.

>>It's time for you guys to put up or shut up and stop using wordy
>>debate to prove or disprove an incident. Basically I'm tired of
>>reading pages long rhetoric [as mine above though not case
>>related-my apologies to the list] that does nothing to prove or
>>disprove a case. Harney, at least, does us the favour of burying
>>his skewed comments in the Magonia supplement where only a few
>>dozen people have to read it.

>The comments on my post to my Magonia blog have confirmed what
I wrote as being basically true. This is because of the strong
emotional reaction to the suggestion that there is nothing to
the UFO myth apart from popular belief and personal subjective
experience.

>The example you give is yet another case of a UFO report not
standing up to critical examination. This one about the sighting
from an airliner near Manchester Airport in January 1995 is well
known to British ufologists and has been discussed on this List.
See, for example

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2001/apr/m17-023.shtml>

>in which Jenny Randles concludes that the probable explanation
is that the object was a meteor. Of course, the incident was
rightly reported as an Airmiss, as the pilot had no way of
knowing how far away it was as he didn't know what it was.
However, on investigation, it seems that the meteor explanation
was generally accepted. Of course, such explanations are not
certain, in the scientific sense, as modern science is based on
probability rather than certainty. However, some UFO
explanations are rather more probable than others.

>John Harney

Well that's the response I would have expected. Mine was an
"emotional reaction" while your blog was "reasonable and well
thought out".

My response was one of disbelief, as is the case with your
attempt to slough-off the case I suggested.

The Manchester case stood up to critical analyses by the CAA. It
doesn't really matter what Jenny says. She's no expert in this
area. She really should stay out of air cases. I'm sure the CAA
would have taken a meteor into account and dismissed it as
quickly as I did. That was her explanation for the
Chiles-Whitted case as well.

A meteor doesn't even come close to the description of the
object, and the objects behavior as seen by the pilots while
approaching Manchester, frankly is a simple-minded explanation
for the event. The very idea that a meteor of this size would
have been traveling horizontally at that altitude, that slowly
[apparent closing speed of 1,200 mph] and having lasted long
enough to make it to that altitude without making a sizable hole
in the ground shows little understanding of meteors.

Once more you use debating tactics and insults as reasoning
rather than fact.

I've seen the case debated before on this List. When it comes to
air cases, most investigators and skeptics are on soft ground,
including Jenny.

Solve it to mine and the CAA's satisfaction but don't come back
with that pseudo science drivel.

John, I have no idea why you are on this list but it has nothing to do with the investigation of the phenomenon. You pretend to be above it all when really you are just wasting time while stroking your own ego for, but what purpose I can't imagine.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 13:57:11 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:12:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: John Velez <johnvelez.aic.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 16:43:55 -0400
>Subject: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:46:55 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 16:39:36 -0700 (PDT)
>>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

<snip>

>>>>In my experience some small percentage of abductees find
>>>>"spiritual enlightenemnt", while a large majoritty are scared to
>>>>death and have their entire world view badly shaken.

>>>Could it be that those without prior "spiritual" experience,
>>>however they choose to define it, are more prone to think of
>>>abductions as spiritual?

<snip>

>>I suspect that people who were spiritually inclined in the first
>>place would be more likely to find something positive in an
>>abduction experience, and people who were inclined to buy into
>>the scientific, secular worldview (like me) would be more likely
>>to be scared by it.

<snip>

>At that point in her 'testimony' I asked her what she thought it
>was. She responded, "At the time, I thought it was Jesus!" She
>believed she had had a religious experience/encounter. I asked
>her, well what do you think it was 'now', all these years later?
>She responded, "I just don't know."

<snip>

"I just don't know" is a phrase I understand. Is there a more or
even most credible review extant one can share their experiences
with to help in understanding them?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:30:20 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:12:58 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 00:38:47 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 09:10:03 +0100
>>Subject: UFOs Are Back

>>In response to recent 'ufology is dead' articles in the media,
>>my agent asked me to write something for the publishing
>>industry, setting the record straight.

>>Here's the article:

>>Source: The Andrew Lowney Literary Agency - London, UK

>>http://www.andrewlownie.co.uk/articles/2006/april_07UFO.shtml

>><snip>

>A general comment. There seem to be two arguments being forth in
>various editorials.

>One argument being put forth is that 'ufology is dead' in the
>sense that there are fewer books on this subject being published
>by publishers now than in former boom times. That could well be
>>true, but unless you are an author trying to get published it
>doesn't seem like much of a concern. Publishing houses work in
>cycles, as Nick says, or perhaps everything that could be said
>about our current understanding of these encounters has been
>said - and until some authors realize a new level of insight,
>there won't be much interest from publishers.

>Of more relevance to those interested in the study of alien
>encounters is the other argument being put forth -- that
>'ufology is dead' because there are fewer ufo sightings or alien
>encounters being reported in recent years.

I don't think that the numbers of books being published, or even
the number of sighting being reported is relevant to the 'death
of ufology'. As you say, such figures will show variations in
accordance with the fashions and obsessions of the day. The real
indicator of ufology's terminal decline is the total lack of new
ideas in the subject, and the total inability to form any
rational, testable, scientific hypothesis after sixty years of
reporting, investigating and theorising.

Ufology is dead in the same way that psychical research is dead,
as after almost a century and a half of research the latter has
produced absolutely nothing that might be said to expand the
range of human understanding.

I was at the Fortean Times UnConvention in London today, where a
speaker noted what appeared to be a small resurgence of interest
in the Bermuda Triangle, with new books published or in
preparation. However, I think we will all agree that the Bermuda
Triangle in very much a dead topic, and although there may be

some posthumous publications they are unlikely to add anything to a subject which has been long buried.

Incidentally, The Pelican asks me to point out that he is immune to Avian Flu. I know some people will be sorry about that.

--
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:12:37 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:14:03 -0400
Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Rimmer

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 05:05:33 EDT
>Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa

>I have spent many moons pouring through old newspapers although
>no where as much as Jan Aldrich.

>I've found some awesome items like UFO reports and crop circles
>going back to the early 1800s. There are still more papers and
>almanacs to go through.

I have read numerous claims that the crop circle phenomenon can
be traced back to before the last century, but on examination
the effects described bear no resemblance to the crop circles
produced from the 1980s to date.

Can you give any more details of these descriptions, or sources
where they can be found - particularly for those of us in the
UK who may not have immediate access to US newspapers.

--
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: British House Of Commons On Nick Pope -

From: **John Rimmer** <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:07:41 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:15:26 -0400
Subject: Re: British House Of Commons On Nick Pope -

>From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 19:13:45 +0100
>Subject: Re: British House Of Commons On Nick Pope

>>Mr. Touhig: From 1991 to 1994 Mr. Pope worked as a civil
>>servant within Secretariat (air staff). He undertook a wide
>>range of secretariat tasks relating to central policy, political
>>and parliamentary aspects of non-operational RAF activity. Part
>>of his duties related to the investigation of unidentified
>>aerial phenomena reported to the Department to see if they had
>>any defence significance.

>There are two interesting things here, mainly for those who have
>consistently sought to downplay my role at the MOD.

>Firstly, the phrase "part of his duties". In other words, not
>something I pursued as a personal interest, as has been alleged,
>but core business.

>Secondly and perhaps most importantly, the word "investigation".
>In other words, not "collating the files" or any other nonsense
>that implies only a clerical role.

Yes, but this is rather different from "Head of the British
Government's UFO Project", isn't it?

Does the present occupant of your former post describe his/her
position in such terms?

--
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:52:18 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:26:53 -0400
Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Aubeck

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 15:46:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 10:40:09 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 21:32:08 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa

>>>My immediate reaction to reading this account when
>>>first posted was to wonder why the craft/wreckage
>>>was described in such meager detail. Wasn't the
>>>alleged unusual nature of what was found
>>>supposedly the core of the story after all? But I
>>>realized that was probably all Jerry had found.

<snip>

Hi List,

This account is not so mysterious if we read it in its original context.

The first thing I did when I read the article Jerry posted was to search the Iowa press of that month and the previous and following months in case similar reports were made. I quickly found this to be the case.

There is a very strong likelihood that the story either came from a real event, or confusion over a real event.

Iowa City Press-citizen, May 13th 1920: GOVERNMENT AEROPLANE SWEPT INTO TREE BY FIERCE WINDS, KILLS SUPT. MC CANDLESS. Also "Another airplane disaster was reported here today, as having occurred before the tragic event above chronicled." In this case the engine stopped at 1000 feet and the plane fell.

Iowa City Press-citizen, June 11th 1920: MAIL AIRSHIP HURT ON EARTH. This article reports that two government airplanes had recently been damaged in the area. Nobody was killed, but the craft landed badly.

Iowa City Press-citizen, July 17th 1920: SHIP SMASHES, PILOT UNHARMED.

Reading through these articles - and others from the same year - I get the impression that the engine would have been removed for inspection quite soon after the crash. Anyone stumbling on the wreck would have found a plane, no pilot and no engine, and would have reported it.

Don't take my word for it, of course, I invite anyone to check

the press of that period themselves.

If anyone would like to participate in the kind of serious newspaper-based research Jerry and I are busy with, do send me a message at caubeck at gmail dot com and I will send you information about our international research project.

Best wishes,

Chris

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

UFO UpDate: Carbondale UFO Crash Chronicles Entry No.8

From: **Matt Graeber** <Matthewgraeber.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 22:02:48 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 08:34:23 -0400
Subject: UFO UpDate: Carbondale UFO Crash Chronicles Entry No.8

[Non-subscriber post]

Entry No. 8

The Carbondale UFO Crash Chronicles

On the revealing light of fact and objectivity.

Since November of 1974, there have been many "unanswered questions" lingering in the minds of some people concerning the feasibility a battery-powered railroad lantern remaining lit while submerged in a frigid pond.

The questions spring to mind because such a lantern was identified as the hoax object which caused quite a UFO fiasco 32 years ago - and because three recent enthusiasts are attempting to revive the hoax incident as a genuine UFO crash cover up. (Ahh, the ever-growing suspicions of the UFO conspiracy throng!)

Some folks proclaim "The lantern would probably go out immediately!" While others feel that it would have had to have been encased in a water-proof container (or wrapping) of some kind to remain aglow.

Beyond these questions and assumptions, there are the various estimates on how long the lantern might have been luminous and visible in the water of the murky coal breaker's silt pond. A pond believed to be the location of an ill-fated two-seater flying saucer.

Well, recent tests by independent researcher, Mr. Rick Fisher of Paranormal, Pa have confirmed that a six-volt heavy duty battery will power the type of lantern that was recovered from the pond's floor for a whopping period of 84 hours. The entire 1974 UFO incident at Carbondale only lasted 44 hours, (From the time the boy's first tossed the lantern into the pond, until the time that a volunteer scuba diver recovered it), and the light beneath the water was only visible for an estimated 6-8 hours, although the rumor-mongers have managed to extended the estimated time span considerably).

Of course, they've also managed (Via 'unverified' witness accounts), to extend the entire incident to a full week or so.

Some claim that the light moved about in the water. That probably was an 'optical illusion' caused by the lantern being nudged by the police who were attempting to snag the lamp in a fish net. Others say, "What about the cops shooting at the moving light?" This question arose shortly after a rookie cop (Joseph Jacobina), over-reacted to the illusion of the light rushing towards the boat he was in during the fish net nudging of the lamp. (i.e., the object didn't move, the lantern's extended light beam shifted position upon the water's surface and the young policeman reportedly fired several shots at it).

As one of the primary investigators of the 1974 incident, I've often wondered how 'new or partially-used' the 6-volt heavy duty battery in the '74 incident's lantern may have actually been? I've pondered the 7-8 ft. depth of the water, its minor

discoloration and its temperature. All factors to be considered but, nothing of greater significance than Mr.Fisher's on-going lantern experiments.

The folks at BUFO, (Burlington UFO and Paranormal Radio) which is headed by Mary Sutherland (a very vocal and aggressive online self-promoter), desire to "Turn" the Carbondale hoax into a saucer crash convention and enthusiast Mecca which Mary Sutherland intends to sponsor.

Mrs.Sutherland has posted numerous falsehoods concerning Mr.Fisher and I " working together" to cover up the truth about the incident in her many ridiculous (Agenda-driven) attempts to resurrect the long-dead case.

In fact, Mrs. Sutherland has even taken to drawing crude cartoons depicting Mr.Fisher and I as "Mat Lock and Fish Head", "The Shad Detectives", (Whatever that is supposed to mean?) Within Mary's strange cartoon, Mr.Fisher is seen delivering a flying saucer to me - and I'm telling him that we will inform everyone the saucer was a lantern. She even goes so far as to assert that with the saucer "We (Fisher and I),"can rule the world!"

Sounds like serious and reliable BUFO researching to me, how about you?

Apparently, Mary suspects that Fisher went back in time to Carbondale (through a space and time portal), before flying the saucer to me. As you may know, Mary and her investigators wholeheartedly believe in the existence of a number of "Portals or Star Gates" in Lackawanna County. I mention this because all three BUFOonians seem to have completely missed the obvious point that I never heard of Mary, BUFO or Mr.Fisher until 29-30 years after the incident's investigation was officially closed by the late Dr.J.Allen Hynek.

(Besides, I've never been a time-traveling conspirator, and seriously doubt that Mr.Fisher has ever inadvertently fallen through a space and time portal).

When I happened upon BUFO's nonsensical yarns about the incident on the internet in April of 2004, I attempted to offer BUFO's investigators some first-hand eyewitness information and assistance with their investigation. As a result, I was confronted with unwarranted suspicion and prolonged deceitful behavior. But, that's another very long, sad and boring BUFO story.

Mrs.Sutherland and her defective detectives should take a lesson from Mr.Fisher and start doing a wee little bit of serious/objective researching - while spending less time attempting to draw bad cartoons with ludicrous captions - and/or chasing imaginary windmills and portals throughout Lackawanna County..

As far as I know, Rick Fisher's interest in the Carbondale incident is chiefly involved with his researches while writing a book about the case. He will attempt to explain 'why' some folks think a UFO crashed into the pond, while others believe an errant Soviet Missile fell into it. Naturally, he will also discuss why some people feel that the incident was a silly hoax perpetrated by three local teens who tossed a lantern into the pond on a nothing else to do Saturday night in Carbondale.

(That's the ONLY reason why he's ever been in contact with me).

For the record: Mr.Fisher and I have never met, nor are we UFOlogically, or philosophically aligned in anyway. I haven't a two-seater (sport model) flying saucer in my garage, and I do not desire to rule anything or anybody. Unlike Mary Sutherland, I also have nothing to sell or promote on what Jim Moseley (of Saucer Smear) affectionately calls "The dreaded net!"

Unfortunately, Mrs.Sutherland and her pair of woefully inept field investigators (Ron Hannivig and Frank Scassellati), have managed to persuade others (Whom are equally ill-informed on the matter), to join their convoluted cause and support their position on the so-called crash. I realize that some of this behavior is directly linked to misplaced loyalties and friendships forged in a commonly-shared interest in UFOs.

Therefore, I shall refrain from pointing out the contributing UFOology of Mr. Jerry Pippin, Major George A. Filer and others who have obviously been bamboozled and completely mesmerized by the Carbondale 'crash myth' as it is presently espoused by the BUFOonians.

I ask, what has happened to the investigative tool known as common sense? What has happened to critical thought and evaluation? Are these basics of objective inquiry considered to be a UFOological blasphemy of sorts? And if that is the case, doesn't that make UFOlogy a matter of 'faith', not a quasi-scientific endeavor?

Those who may care to see how full-blown internet UFOology operates might visit

<http://www.burlingtonnews.net/carbondalepage3.html>

tell'em Mat Lock sent you. While visiting, be certain to check out Mary's "Virtual Investigation" of the Carbondale affair. Make up your own mind on what really happened that fateful November night back in 1974. PONDER the slanted and distorted information Mary presents therein- But, keep in mind that you are reading a UFOological tour de facre=E2=80=A6NOT a 'reality-based' show and tell production!

If Mary's plans for her Carbondale UFO crash enterprises do not pan out, I suggest that Mary might try sponsoring an annual "Sasquatch-Anna" hunts near Carbondale (Mary suspects that the mythical creature is there) or, Mary might try hawking pond-side tickets to catch a glimpse of "Carbi" the legendary silt pond monster. (Carbi's thought to be a 32 year old radioactive mutant toad - just kidding- actually, the largest creature in the pond is a pregnant muskrat.

Of course, there's always the opportunity to sponsor exciting portal-rides through time and space! Who knows, perhaps in time, TV commercials will feature happy family faces and sports celebrities proclaiming, "We're going to Carbondale!" instead of Disney World.

"Keep on watch'n the skies!" and, !ofub fo ssenhsiloofu eht etamitse-rednu reveN

Matt Graeber

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Roswell Museum Presents Both Sides Of UFO Story

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 09:09:16 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 09:09:16 -0400
Subject: Roswell Museum Presents Both Sides Of UFO Story

Source: Midland Reporter-Telegram - Midland, Texas, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/gnxhz>

05/01/2006

Roswell Museum Presents Both Sides Of UFO Story
Tumbleweed Smith
MRT Correspondent

We've passed through Roswell, N.M., dozens of times, always in a hurry to get somewhere else. The other day on a trip to Ruidoso we had a little more time and stopped in at Roswell's UFO Museum and Research Center and visited with director Julie Shuster.

She says the museum opened in 1992 to present both sides of the story about an extra-terrestrial craft that crashed north of Roswell in 1947 and the efforts by the military to cover up the story. "We're also here to present information on other UFO phenomena, since Roswell has become a household word in the UFO world."

The museum keeps expanding. It's now in its third location and a new building is being planned north of the present site. The museum averages 187,000 visitors a year from all over the world.

"We have affidavits and signatures of people who were directly involved with the UFO crash and documentation of the incident obtained by various researchers. We also have details about the military's side of the story."

The story was dormant until the late 1970s when a researcher ran across the story and started following up on it.

Mac Brazel, who ranched 75 miles north of Roswell, heard a loud noise about 11:50 p.m. on July 4, 1947. The next day he found some debris he couldn't identify, so he took it to town and gave it to the sheriff.

The sheriff didn't know what it was, thought it might be military, so he called Maj. Jeff Marcel, the base intelligence officer at Roswell Army Air Field. Marcel went to the site and had military trucks haul off the debris. Lt. Walter Haut, the public information officer, issued a press release on July 7 saying the military had a flying saucer, which was flown to higher headquarters in Fort Worth. From Fort Worth, the military issued another press release saying it was a weather balloon. Military personnel and civilians involved were told not to talk about the incident.

There is speculation that bodies were aboard the craft. Local undertaker Glenn Dennis was contacted by the military about the number of child-size caskets he had in stock and when could he get more.

Dennis went into the base hospital but was escorted out of there

with threats to his life. A nurse later drew a picture of what she saw on the examining table: a big-eyed alien.

Both a movie and a television series have been made about the Roswell incident. The city of Roswell has gone all out to keep the UFO motif alive. There are businesses with alien themes and city streetlights have alien eyes on them. The McDonald's in Roswell is shaped like a UFO. A big UFO festival, held annually around July 4, draws huge crowds and leading UFO researchers. This year the four-day festival starts on June 30 and will include an alien invasion and costume contest.

Julie believes the story is true. Her father was the PIO, Walter Haut. "My father doesn't lie," she says.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Foiling The Space Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 09:18:17 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 09:18:17 -0400
Subject: Foiling The Space Aliens

Source: The Los Angeles Times - California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/hcqpq>

May 1, 2006

Foiling The Space Aliens

In the search for the perfect tin hat, a few things are learned about community and mind control.

By Bettie Rinehart
Latimes.com staff writer

For two weeks I've been thinking about aluminum foil. The problem is that my thoughts should have been focused on tin foil because that, you see, is what purportedly provides the best shield against alien mind control. At least that's what I've read on the Internet.

This is not simply a matter of research. This weekend, I'll be chronicling in writing and on video the Retro UFO Space Convention at the Integratron in the Mojave Desert. I'll be chatting with the abducted, drinking in the wisdom of guest experts on extra-terrestrials and listening to some UFO performance poetry.

But it was the "Tinfoil Hat Contest" that hit me like a gigaton of space balls. Although I didn't even know what the prize was, I wanted to win.

Foil hats got a pop culture bump in the 2002 thriller, "Signs," when, in perhaps the film's funniest scene, Joaquin Phoenix donned aluminum headgear to keep his thoughts protected from unseen aliens. But in my Web sleuthing I found that the coterie of the aluminated is of two minds. Anecdotally speaking, some feel that tin foil provides a shield to thought invasion by both aliens and, dare I say, the CIA. Others contend that the thin metallic sheets are actually more of an "antenna" for other-worldly communication.

I've chosen the style of my hat with an intensity bordering on obsession. I knew I wouldn't be caught dead wandering the desert like some still-wrapped Hershey Kiss or like the styles I'd seen on the Web, including the "Kutcher" (an annoying trucker cap), or the Fez (nice enough with its sassy tassel, but too easy).

For me, would it be Katherine Hepburn in "The Alien Queen?" Uma Thurman in "Even Martian Ladies Get the Blues?" No, I'd go more exotic—a Chinese sunhat with a huge, garish aluminum foil and pink construction paper rose. Maybe some trim, too. A little Chinoiserie meets Audrey Hepburn in "My Fair Alien."

I headed to the Rite-aid and Office Depot for foil, tape, colored paper and paste. Four hours later, voila!

My hat turned out to be a pretty glamorous little something for the stylish, paranoid gardening enthusiast. Any misguided extraterrestrial looking to probe my thoughts would be in for a big surprise. They'd have to dig through that monster garnish on the top of my head. Good luck, space invader. Good luck.

They say that the desert doesn't care if you live or die. The desert doesn't care about fashion, either. It's really, really hot. And within a half hour of my arrival, I'm sweaty and smell bad. I've left my hat in the car, stressed about the resilience of Elmer's glue and foil.

The hard sun glints off a mere handful of silvered pates. There isn't much competition. Or maybe, like myself, folks are just waiting for the crucial moment. The competition is scheduled to take place after a very down-to-Earth lunch of burgers and hot dogs, beans, slaw and apple pie.

After I've completed a few select interviews with members of the UFO community-learning along the way about the tall, thin Arcturian tribe of aliens, the dovetailing of heavenly angels and extraterrestrials and universal astrology-I run to the car, grab my precious hat and arrive at the judging table in a cloud of dust, just in time.

After all the hopes I'd rested atop my foil hat, the judging turned out to be a very informal affair-winners determined by claps, hoots and hollers. Not first, not second, but third place was mine. The prize: a sound bath at the Integratron. A \$40 value!

Afterwards, Frank Bollinger, co-creator of the "Brain Tuner," which he claims "stops anxiety and trans-cranial electro-stimulation," asks me, "Is that just a hat, or does it have another purpose?"

It no longer mattered to me that I felt like I'd put more brainpower into my hat than the other winners, who'd constructed theirs' in a matter of minutes before the contest. Maybe, in my striving toward alien sartorial greatness, I had been foiled by my own design. I remembered the words of extraterrestrial expert Dr. Louis Turi, author of "Moon Power Starguide 2006": "You have to mean business with the super-conscience of time and space. Be prepared."

With that piece of real-world advice in and on my head, next year I'll be all business.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Missing E-Mails

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 05:43:19 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 14:29:29 -0400
Subject: Missing E-Mails

Dear Errol and all others on the List:

I took a 2+ day vacation to Nevada to test certain stochastic (random) theories regarding dice tables.

In the interim, I expected emails of all kinds, including messages from this list, plus unwanted spam etc to simply pile up.

I came home Sunday 30 APR 06 fully expecting something like 150 emails. Instead I found nothing. Zero. Zip. Nada.

If anyone wrote to me between 1430 hrs Friday 28 April and Sunday 30 April 06 at say 5:00 pm, would you kindly email me again?

I have gotten no response from my \$10 dial-up ISP nor any excuses.

Any solid clues highly appreciated, please leave speculation to me.

Very 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 13:50:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 14:30:32 -0400
Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Dickenson

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 13:44:28 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

<snip>

>Part of the contradictory issue here is that while I do not
>trust the pronouncements of government, I assume they are doing
>things like "defending the country". Probably naive of me but I
>would hope this is still a fundamental role of a government.

<snip>

Wouldn't want to shock you or anyone else James, but suspect
that most 'authority' has no regard for any country, even their
own.

Because they know 'countries' don't really exist. Oh yes, bits
of land exist - that's geography. And people exist - they're
called humans and live everywhere.

But 'authority' has no special regard for land, or for people.
Quite the opposite.

Cheers
Ray D

PS maybe check < fake causes > in Google, criticism welcome

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 08:40:10 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 14:33:50 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Clark

>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 00:18:33 +0100
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 15:17:49 -0300
>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

<snip>

>The comments on my post to my Magonia blog have confirmed what
>I wrote as being basically true. This is because of the strong
>emotional reaction to the suggestion that there is nothing to
>the UFO myth apart from popular belief and personal subjective
>experience.

John Harney flies true to pelicanist form, as the above remarks nicely document. Pelicanism is about nothing if not self-congratulation, which is why it always cracks up non-flock members. If nobody else will congratulate you on how wise and rational you are, then do it yourself, and often. That's why people sprout wings and feathers and become pelicanists.

It's easy, folks. Just identify your beliefs as rational and cool (in both senses, one presumes, of the latter adjective), all dissenting ones as buffoonish and emotional, of the sort, say, that one would expect of rude colonials. This of course serves the purpose of allowing one to sail above all the messy and inconvenient details cluttering an immensely complex controversy where the answers, if they were as simple as pelicanist theology holds, would have been found long ago, leaving UFO proponents (or even those still open-minded and curious) the functional equivalent of flat-earthers. (Watch, by the way, for Harney to try to argue precisely that, and to demonstrate yet another instance in which unhinged rhetorical excess seeks to pass for serious argument in pelicanist discourse.)

Misuse words in a way that makes you sound important. For example, "UFO myth." In nonpolemical usage, UFOs are a "myth" - as, for example, Jung pointed out decades ago - even if the actual phenomenon arises from significantly anomalous causes. Throw around "folklore" and "sociology" as if they actually explained everything, when in fact folklore and sociology surround any subject, which fact says nothing about whether the core subject has empirical validity.

Harney's discourse has all of the intellectual sophistication one would associate with a barstool philosopher. Precisely, one might add, what one would expect to emerge from the Sceptics Club at the Pelican Pub. One imagines that Harney, who now has a blog where - the dream of all pelicanists - he has first and last word every time, rushes from that establishment to his computer to preserve, for what passes for eternity in cyberspace, the wisdom that has just passed through pubspace.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 10:36:31 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 14:36:03 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Sandow

<snip>

I can't speculate about John, but for many skeptics - and above all for the various branches of the organized skeptics' movement - I'd guess that the motivation is simple, and also very deep. It's terror. Fear that we and our science can't control the universe we live in.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: Foiling The Space Aliens - Rome

From: Irene Rome <ikrom1.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 07:38:51 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 14:37:57 -0400
Subject: Re: Foiling The Space Aliens - Rome

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>

>Source: The Los Angeles Times - California, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/hcqpq>

>

>May 1, 2006

>Foiling The Space Aliens

>In the search for the perfect tin hat, a few things are learned
>about community and mind control.

>By Bettie Rinehart
>Latimes.com staff writer

To think that someone would waste good writing creativity and
good column space on this unworthy, time-wasting subject.
Another detraction from the search for the truth.

You think I should lighten up? Nah. I'm tired of these unfunny
witticisms that do nothing for ufology except drag it down into
the ludicrous.

Irene

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 16:16:49 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 17:25:41 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Miller

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:30:20 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

<snip>

>Ufology is dead in the same way that psychical research is
>dead, as after almost a century and a half of research the
>latter has produced absolutely nothing that might be said to
>expand the range of human understanding.

So, Ufology is dead, ghost hunting is dead, and you spend your weekend at a conference about pink dog faeces and frogs with testicles the size of the moon.

I'm telling you, you really can't make this drivel up.

BTW - I thought conferences were where shiester researchers and other purveyors of lies went in order to sell more books and line their pockets, or is that just UFO conferences? What did you buy there John? Oh well, I'll just have to organise my own UFO conference then. Hang on a mo... Back in a day or two with one.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/01/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 14:45:24 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 17:26:13 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/01/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 53
May 1, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITY RISES SHARPLY
** DISCO INFERNO: DSS WON'T PROCESS SECURITY CLEARANCES
** WOULD-BE NSA WHISTLEBLOWER CAN'T GET CONGRESS' ATTENTION
** EVEN MORE CRS REPORTS

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITY RISES SHARPLY

Electronic surveillance and physical searches conducted under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) reached a new record high in 2005, according to the latest annual report to Congress on FISA.

"During calendar year 2005, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) approved 2,072 applications for authority to conduct electronic surveillance and physical search," the new annual report stated.

"The FISC made substantive modifications to the Government's proposed orders in 61 of those applications. The FISC did not deny, in whole or in part, any application filed by the Government during calendar year 2005."

In 2004, by comparison, there were 1,754 such authorizations.

By definition, these data do not reflect the controversial warrantless surveillance activities that the Bush Administration has conducted outside of the legal framework of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, in what is arguably a criminal violation of the law.

The new annual report to Congress for the first time included data on applications made by the Government for access to business records for foreign intelligence purposes; and on the use of National Security Letters to obtain information concerning United States persons.

See the FISA Annual Report for Calendar Year 2005, dated April 28, 2006, here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/doj/fisa/2005rept.html>

DISCO INFERNO: DSS WON'T PROCESS SECURITY CLEARANCES

In the security policy equivalent of shutting down the government, the Defense Security Service announced Friday that it would no longer process applications from industry for new

security clearances or reinvestigations of existing clearances.

"Owing to the overwhelming volume of requests for industry personnel security investigations and funding constraints, the Defense Security Service has discontinued accepting industry requests for new personnel security clearances and periodic reinvestigations effective immediately and until further notice," DSS said in an "urgent notice" sent to cleared contractor organizations on April 28.

"The Defense Industrial Security Clearance Office [DISCO] will reject any requests that are submitted." See:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/04/dss042806.html>

There are an estimated 800,000 defense industry personnel that hold security clearances, and a steadily growing demand for more.

Three thousand new applications for security clearances have already been put on hold, the Washington Post reported on April 29.

WOULD-BE NSA WHISTLEBLOWER CAN'T GET CONGRESS' ATTENTION

There is no excuse for unauthorized disclosures of classified information, it is argued, because whistleblowers who have legitimate complaints about classified government misconduct can use official channels to convey those concerns on a classified basis.

But as a practical matter, those channels are often blocked or ineffectual.

That is what former National Security Agency employee Russell D. Tice discovered when he attempted to initiate contact with the Senate and House Intelligence Committees to report what he believed to be "probable illegal conduct" by the NSA.

Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Pat Roberts (R-KS) did not respond to Mr. Tice's approach at all.

House Intelligence Committee staffers met with Mr. Tice but concluded that neither they nor any member of the Committee had the requisite security clearances to receive his complaint.

See several letters to Congress sent by Mr. Tice last week, summarizing his conundrum, here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2006/04/tice042506.pdf>

In an astonishing letter sent last January, the NSA itself advised Mr. Tice that the congressional intelligence committees were not cleared to receive his information, which involve Department of Defense Special Access Programs, and that he should not convey any classified information to them without prior coordination.

While affirming "unequivocally" that Mr. Tice has "every right to petition Congress" as "guaranteed to you by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution," the NSA proceeded to warn Mr. Tice not to contact the committees without first providing a statement of his complaint to the Department of Defense Inspector General or the NSA Inspector General.

Thereafter, the NSA said, he should follow the instruction of the Secretary of Defense "on how to contact the intelligence committees in accordance with appropriate security practices." See:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2006/04/nsa010906.pdf>

EVEN MORE CRS REPORTS

Some notable recent reports of the Congressional Research Service that have not been readily available to the public include the following:

"China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and

Missiles: Policy Issues," updated April 6, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/nuke/RL31555.pdf>

"Protection of Classified Information by Congress: Practices and Proposals," updated April 5, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/secrecy/RS20748.pdf>

"Navy Ship Propulsion Technologies: Options for Reducing Oil Use -- Background for Congress," April 12, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/weapons/RL33360.pdf>

"FY2006 Supplemental Appropriations: Iraq and Other International Activities; Additional Katrina Hurricane Relief," updated April 14, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/natsec/RL33298.pdf>

"Immigration Enforcement Within the United States," April 6, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL33351.pdf>

"Patent Reform: Issues in the Biomedical and Software Industries," April 7, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL33367.pdf>

"Oil Shale: History, Incentives, and Policy," April 13, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL33359.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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: Air Cases - Harney

From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 20:00:48 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 17:26:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Air Cases - Harney

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 15:10:13 -0300
>Subject: Air Cases - Harney

>The Manchester case stood up to critical analyses by the CAA. It
>doesn't really matter what Jenny says. She's no expert in this
>area. She really should stay out of air cases. I'm sure the CAA
>would have taken a meteor into account and dismissed it as
>quickly as I did. That was her explanation for the
>Chiles-Whitted case as well.

The CAA report does not mention meteors. They were obviously not interested in astronomical phenomena. They considered the possibility of military activity and also made other suggestions, "such as large model aircraft or commercially operated remotely controlled craft". They concluded that these explanations "could not be regarded as a realistic possibility".

It should be noted that the duration of the sighting was estimated to be about two seconds, hardly enough time to get a detailed and accurate impression of the incident.

>A meteor doesn't even come close to the description of the
>object, and the objects behavior as seen by the pilots while
>approaching Manchester, frankly is a simple-minded explanation
>for the event. The very idea that a meteor of this size would
>have been traveling horizontally at that altitude, that slowly
>[apparent closing speed of 1,200 mph] and having lasted long
>enough to make it to that altitude without making a sizable hole
>in the ground shows little understanding of meteors.

>Once more you use debating tactics and insults as reasoning
>rather than fact.

I don't know where the "1,200 mph" comes from as the object is described in the report as travelling at "high speed". As the pilot and first officer did not know what the object was, so had no way of estimating how far away it was, they could not know what its true speed was.

>I've seen the case debated before on this List. When it comes to
>air cases, most investigators and skeptics are on soft ground,
>including Jenny.

>Solve it to mine and the CAA's satisfaction but don't come back
>with that pseudo science drivel.

Science writer Ian Ridpath also thought the meteor explanation the most likely, and he refers to accounts of pilots giving inaccurate descriptions of known events (satellite re-entries) at:

<http://www.zip.com.au/~psmith/pilot-ufos.html>

and

<http://www.ufonet.nl/nieuws/tornado/index2.html>

which should give some idea of the difficulties involved in making such astronomical observations from aircraft. Again, one should remember that the pilots in the Manchester Airport case had only two seconds to attempt to make sense of what they unexpectedly saw.

>John, I have no idea why you are on this List but it has
>nothing to do with the investigation of the phenomenon. You
>pretend to be above it all when really you are just wasting
>time while stroking your own ego for, but what purpose I can't
>imagine.

Not at all; I just don't like to see people getting away with their anti-scientific speculations, and irrational rejection of sensible explanations for UFO reports.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference Tues May 9th

From: Victor Viggiani <zland.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 12:21:58 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 17:26:38 -0400
Subject: Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference Tues May 9th

List

An invitation to everyone in the Toronto area is extended to attend. Information below.

Press Release

A Toronto Press Conference on UFO Disclosure Sponsored by

Exopolitics Toronto with Dr. Steven M. Greer and the Hon. Paul Hellyer

Toronto Ontario May 1, 2006 Exopolitics Toronto and the Canadian Disclosure Initiative present an exclusive Press Conference on UFO Witness Testimony. A press screening of authentic military, corporate and government witness testimony will present compelling evidence attesting to the reality of an extraterrestrial presence and the 58 year old military/government cover-up of this issue. This historic press event will feature Dr. Steven M. Greer Director of the Disclosure Project and the Hon. Paul Hellyer former Minister of National Defense in Canada.

Exopolitics Toronto will screen a professionally produced Witness Testimony digital video film created by the Disclosure Project under the direction of Dr. Steven Greer on the theatre screen at the prestigious De La Salle Oaklands College in Toronto Ontario on Tuesday May 9th at 7:00 pm.

The goal of this press conference is to present witness testimony by Brigadier Generals, Naval Photographic experts, military officers, ICBM Launch Commanders, an FAA Crash Site Senior Administrator, NORAD air traffic controllers, pilots, and that confirms authentic, first-hand encounters with intelligently controlled unidentified aerial craft of non-Earth origin.

Statements and remarks by Dr. Greer and the Hon. Paul Hellyer about the testimony s policy and geo-political implications will follow the film s screening. An open question period for the press will follow remarks by Dr. Greer and Mr. Hellyer.

For the first time in Canada, this provocative and unambiguous witness testimony provides all journalists an opportunity to study irrefutable, documented and shockingly compelling witness testimony about the presence of unidentified aerial phenomenon of non-Earth origin and the associated 58 year cover-up by military and government officials.

In fact, each witness has stated they are willing to testify, under oath, before Congress or Parliament as to the truth of their testimony; a bold personal and legal precedent set by these courageous military, government and corporate officials.

Understandably mainstream media has always been reluctant to approach this issue; dismissing it because of inconclusive evidence or skepticism. This is no longer the case.

Press now will have the right to unreservedly examine superior

quality information assembled by researchers and experts in this field; information only accessible in the past to officials with the highest levels of security clearance.

This category of evidential material has been withheld from the press for over 58 years. Exopolitics Toronto's disclosure press conference rectifies this situation; an event no journalist will want to overlook due to the gravity of the witness disclosures.

Abundant evidence and witness testimony also exists that establishes the existence of related covert projects that have developed advanced energy and propulsion technologies that could replace the need for oil, gas, coal and nuclear power.

These rogue, so-called "black" projects have hidden these energy breakthroughs from the public, to the detriment of national security, the environment and the economy, so that elite special interests can maintain the current status quo.

Press will also be able to view copies of original government documents and national security memoranda that confirm a coordinated involvement with and a high level of interest in global UFO activity by military and national security agencies.

Also on the agenda will be a special announcement concerning the documentary Dan Aykroyd Unplugged on UFOs. This documentary by Canadian David Sereda will be released in late May.

Press Conference Details

Date: Tuesday May 9th 7:00 pm
Location: De La Salle Oaklands College
131 Farnham Ave. Toronto Ontario

Auditorium Entrance at south end of the building

Free Parking available. Doors open at 6:30 pm.

MAP - For directions to De La Salle Oaklands visit: [Google Map](#)

The entrance to De La Salle is located on the south side of Farnham Avenue three streets south of St. Clair east of Avenue Rd. and west of Yonge St.

Public Transit Access

De La Salle Oaklands is also accessible by walking north to Farnham Ave on Yonge St. from the Summerhill subway stop or by taking the Avenue Rd. bus which stops in front of the college.

Admission Criteria

Press - valid press credentials.

General Public - \$5.00

Television Camera Crews should arrive at 6:30 pm to position equipment

Radio and television journalists and print media seating section Press only.

Agenda

-Introduction and Remarks Victor Viggiani Director of Media Relations Exopolitics Toronto and Michael Bird Director Exopolitics Toronto

-Exclusive Witness Disclosure Testimony Presentation Digital Video

-Question Period - Dr. Steven Greer and the Hon. Paul Hellyer Press will have an opportunity to question both featured guests concerning witness testimony and the policy questions surrounding an Extraterrestrial presence.

-Discussion of film documentary Dan Aykroyd Unplugged on UFOs

This Press Event is an initiative supported by the Canadian Disclosure Initiative - a coalition of three NGO agencies:

Exopolitics Toronto

Michael J. Bird Director and Victor Viggiani B.A. M.Ed. Director
of Media Relations

<http://www.exopoliticstoronto.com>

Exopolitics Toronto

The Disclosure Project

Washington, D.C.: Dr. Steven M. Greer,

<http://www.disclosureproject.org> [The Disclosure Project]

ICIS -Institute for Cooperation in Space

Vancouver, Canada: Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd

<http://www.peaceinspace.net> [ICIS]

Contact Information:

Michael Bird Director - Exopolitics Toronto

Victor Viggiani Director - Media Relations Exopolitics Toronto

Tel: 905 278 1238

E-mail: zland.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 1](#)

Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 12:42:13 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 01 May 2006 15:55:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa - Ledger

>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:52:18 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 15:46:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Strange 1920 Crash In Iowa

<snip>

>This account is not so mysterious if we read it in its original
>context.

>The first thing I did when I read the article Jerry posted was
>to search the Iowa press of that month and the previous and
>following months in case similar reports were made. I quickly
>found this to be the case.

>There is a very strong likelihood that the story either came
>from a real event, or confusion over a real event.

>Iowa City Press-citizen, May 13th 1920: GOVERNMENT AEROPLANE
>SWEPT INTO TREE BY FIERCE WINDS, KILLS SUPT. MC CANDLESS. Also
>"Another airplane disaster was reported here today, as having
>occurred before the tragic event above chronicled." In this case
>the engine stopped at 1000 feet and the plane fell.

>Iowa City Press-citizen, June 11th 1920: MAIL AIRSHIP HURT ON
>EARTH. This article reports that two government airplanes had
>recently been damaged in the area. Nobody was killed, but the
>craft landed badly.

>Iowa City Press-citizen, July 17th 1920: SHIP SMASHES, PILOT
>UNHARMED.

>Reading through these articles - and others from the same year
>I get the impression that the engine would have been removed
>for inspection quite soon after the crash. Anyone stumbling on
>the wreck would have found a plane, no pilot and no engine, and
>would have reported it.

>Don't take my word for it, of course, I invite anyone to check
>the press of that period themselves.

>If anyone would like to participate in the kind of serious
>newspaper-based research Jerry and I are busy with, do send me a
>message at caubeck at gmail dot com and I will send you
>information about our international research project.

I shouldn't think that the press of the day were as confused as
all that. The examples above are widely spaced, timewise, and in
two cases report the pilot was unhurt where in Jerry's short
report the pilot was missing. There were no formal
investigations of air crashes in the twenties or even the
thirties. The science of it never really became a formal,
scientific, engineering practice until the crash of the BOAC
Comet in the early 1950s.

Engine stoppages at cruise rpm were common back in the early years, usually due to clogged or broken fuel lines, over-heating or conversely carb icing and metallurgical failure of parts. That's not to say that the engine would not have been torn down to rebuild it to save money. If the engine was still running when it hit the ground then it would have had serious internal damage to the crankshaft, cam, con-rods, push rods prop hub. The prop would have been made of wood which might have reduced internal engine damage - but it still would have had to be torn down before using it again.

There just isn't enough detail to work with, though there are a few prosaic scenarios which could have been the reason for the lack of engine and pilot. I described one in one of my posts.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Olson

From: **Jeff Olson** <jlolson.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 14:59:29 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:00:32 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Olson

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 08:40:10 -0500
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 00:18:33 +0100
>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 15:17:49 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>John Harney flies true to pelicanist form, as the above remarks
>nicely document. Pelicanism is about nothing if not
>self-congratulation, which is why it always cracks up non-flock
>members. If nobody else will congratulate you on how wise and
>rational you are, then do it yourself, and often. That's why
>people sprout wings and feathers and become pelicanists.

Jerry Clark:

I'd never heard the word "pelicanist" before, and naively
assumed, being something of a bird-lover, that it was a term of
approbation. Now I see that it's basically a synonym for
"idiot," though with certain ornithological nuances. :)

Anyway, thanks for being on this List, Jerry. It's nice to see
highly intelligent individuals who can easily stand up to - in
my judgment - the irrational ilk whose knowing,
self-congratulatory smirk appears before actual neuron-firing at
the first mention of "UFO".

Best,

Jeff O.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Olson

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Re: Air Cases - Lehmberg

From: **Alfred Lehmberg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 17:20:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:02:47 -0400
Subject: Re: Air Cases - Lehmberg

>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 20:00:48 +0100
>Subject: Re: Air Cases

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 15:10:13 -0300
>>Subject: Air Cases

>>John, I have no idea why you are on this List but it has
>>nothing to do with the investigation of the phenomenon. You
>>pretend to be above it all when really you are just wasting
>>time while stroking your own ego for, but what purpose I can't
>>imagine.

>Not at all; I just don't like to see people getting away with
>their anti-scientific speculations, and irrational rejection of
>sensible explanations for UFO reports.

Nonsense Mr. Harney. Proud Science should not pretend to be the
final arbiter of that which it reflexively and summarily
discounts, that which it criticizes in a _facile_ manner, and
in the final analysis, that which it refuses to even _look_ at.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Re: The Best Short UFO Report? - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 23:04:19 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:06:42 -0400
Subject: Re: The Best Short UFO Report? - Maccabee

>From: Joe Faccenda <Uforth.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 18:35:07 EDT
>Subject: The Best Short UFO Report?

>While many of the more documented UFO cases have been the
>subject of books, TV presentations, etc.

>I suspect it is sometimes a brief report, perhaps only a few
>paragraphs that can capture the imagination, and in many ways
>may be the basis of an accumulated UFO learning curve.

>With this thought can I ask the List what short seminal
>report has lingered in their consciousness, and perhaps why?

Short report:

A sighting I believe in because I was a witness.

Whatever it was, it was strange.

It appeared in the skyglow caused by city lights illuminating the humid air within a few thousand feet of the ground.

I saw a white 'dot' appear within the glowing haze. In my 8 power binoculars it resolved into a ring of eight white lights. As I watched it the angular elevation increased for about a minute.

Apparently it moved upward or in my direction at some altitude, I couldn't tell which. My Big Ear, long-distance microphone, detected no noise from the object. A crude triangulation plus the fact that no solid-body was visible against the glowing atmosphere suggests that the lights were on the other side of the illuminated atmosphere, perhaps thousands of feet away, in which case ring was probably more than 5 ft and maybe more than 10 ft in diameter.

After the sighting I did not call the nice men in white coats with butterfly nets to come and take me away (ho ho) because there were 30 other people and it was photographed and videotaped.

Oh, one more thing: this was Sept. 16, 1991, in Gulf Breeze, FL, during a period of time when rings of light were sighted several times over a several month time period.

It was either a hoax or 'the real thing'.

Some hoax... flying a many foot diameter ring of lights over the city.

Hoax not impossible... but quite a stretch.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Re: Air Cases - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 01:14:02 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:17:21 -0400
Subject: Re: Air Cases - Ledger

>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 20:00:48 +0100
>Subject: Re: Air Cases

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 15:10:13 -0300
>>Subject: Air Cases - Harney

<snip>

>>I've seen the case debated before on this List. When it
>>comes to air cases, most investigators and skeptics are on
>>soft ground, including Jenny.

>>Solve it to mine and the CAA's satisfaction but don't come
>>back with that pseudo science drivel.

>Science writer Ian Ridpath also thought the meteor explanation
>the most likely, and he refers to accounts of pilots giving
>inaccurate descriptions of known events (satellite re-entries)
>at:

><http://www.zip.com.au/~psmith/pilot-ufos.html>

>and

><http://www.ufonet.nl/nieuws/tornado/index2.html>

>which should give some idea of the difficulties involved in
>making such astronomical observations from aircraft. Again,
>one should remember that the pilots in the Manchester Airport
>case had only two seconds to attempt to make sense of what
>they unexpectedly saw.

>>John, I have no idea why you are on this List but it has
>>nothing to do with the investigation of the phenomenon. You
>>pretend to be above it all when really you are just wasting
>>time while stroking your own ego for, but what purpose I
>>can't imagine.

>Not at all; I just don't like to see people getting away with
>their anti-scientific speculations, and irrational rejection
>of sensible explanations for UFO reports.

>John Harney

Yes, I've emailed with Ian. I guess the CAA thought a meteor
explanation was as silly as I did.

You boys seem to be in a tizzy over there about this one. Pilot
mis-perception and horizontal meteors. If you knew anything
about flying you would understand the 1,200 mile mark. Its right
at the edge of what a pilot could see at that closing speed and
perceive it - for two seconds.

Since the 737 was approaching Manchester and being controlled he
was probably pulled back to about 250 mph or less. He was being

controlled after all; you just don't blaze in and land, but you wouldn't know that because you are educated by your own science and your understanding of flying from all of the TV shows you've watched and the excellent research done by the movie makers. Anyway, that leaves the object doing at least 950 mph.

As for your science, and Ian's, the pilot and the first office had poor perception. They always seem to have poor perception abilities when it comes to their UFO sightings. They have to have in order for your explanations to work out. Ever land a plane John? It's all about perception. Pilots are damn good at perception. They can set a 75 or 400 ton aircraft on the runway when their cockpit is 2 to five stories above it and their main landing gear is 50 to 100 feet behind them.

Re. the Tornado incident. I've read over that case and find it very interesting and I see nothing wrong with this being solved. Good work was done.

There are some questions I have which perhaps one of you can answer. Was the satellite information re heading direction in geographic or magnetic. The Tornados were flying in magnetic. Also I don't have an aeronautical chart here for the Netherlands. What is the angle of variation for Laarbruch?

The pilot also reported absence of color in the object's lights while the burning up space junk was reported as displaying different hues and colors.

John, can you explain this sentence?

Pilots are trained airspace observers. How could they get the impression that they were observing an unidentified aircraft?

These two silly sentences are buried in the middle of the report and frankly, they take away from the report's objectivity. What the heck do they mean?

It was an unidentified aircraft. Actually it's not even that - it was falling junk and was no more an aircraft than a falling grand piano. Was it reported to ATC anywhere. Was it squawking a transponder code. Could they make out the tail registration? It was the Tornado pilot's job to ask about what he was seeing.

There is a vast difference between pilots reporting a near head on [Airmiss]with an object that was a threat to their aircraft and passengers and that of an object or some anomaly seen at a distance that can't be readily explained away. The space junk was reported by as many as two hundred observers and 4 or 5 of them were airline crews. So what? How the heck are they supposed to know what it was? They are concerned about what's in their airspace if it's unidentified and they check with whatever control they are working under to find out so they can determine if it's a danger to their airplane and hence the passengers. That should be self evident.

The upshot? Trying to explain away the Manchester pilots concerns and report of this object has no relationship to the Tornado sighting.

I've been told that there would be little interest in this case by the UK people [which apparently is not the case] and by us Americans.[I corrected that one] If so I'd be happy to argue this off-line.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:23:38 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:23:38 -0400
Subject: Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens

Source: Seed Magazine - Montreal, Quebec, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/f57a5>

May 1, 2006

Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens

A radical explanation for a conundrum about extra-terrestrial life, and what it means for the future of humanity

by Geoffrey Miller

The story goes like this: Sometime in the 1940s, Enrico Fermi was talking about the possibility of extra-terrestrial intelligence with some other physicists. They were impressed that life had evolved quickly and progressively on Earth. They figured our galaxy holds about 100 billion stars, and that an intelligent, exponentially-reproducing species could colonize the galaxy in just a few million years. They reasoned that extra-terrestrial intelligence should be common by now. Fermi listened patiently, then asked, simply, "So, where is everybody?" That is, if extra-terrestrial intelligence is common, why haven't we met any bright aliens yet? This conundrum became known as Fermi's Paradox.

Since then, the paradox has become ever more baffling. Paleontology has shown that organic life evolved quickly after the Earth's surface cooled and became life-hospitable. Given simple life forms, evolution shows progressive trends toward larger bodies, brains and social complexity. Evolutionary psychology has revealed several credible paths from simpler social minds to human-level creative intelligence. So evolving intelligence seems likely, given a propitious habitat⁹⁷and astronomers think such habitats are common. Moreover, at least 150 extrasolar planets have been identified in the last few years, suggesting that life-hospitable planets orbit most stars. Yet 40 years of intensive searching for extra-terrestrial intelligence have yielded nothing: no radio signals, no credible spacecraft sightings, no close encounters of any kind.

It looks, then, as if we can answer Fermi in two ways. Perhaps our current science over-estimates the likelihood of extra-terrestrial intelligence evolving. Or, perhaps evolved technical intelligence has some deep tendency to be self-limiting, even self-extminating. After Hiroshima, some suggested that any aliens bright enough to make colonizing space ships would be bright enough to make thermonuclear bombs, and would use them on each other sooner or later. Maybe extra-terrestrial intelligence always blows itself up. Indeed, Fermi's Paradox became, for a while, a cautionary tale about Cold War geopolitics.

I suggest a different, even darker solution to the Paradox. Basically, I think the aliens don't blow themselves up; they just get addicted to computer games. They forget to send radio signals or colonize space because they're too busy with runaway

consumerism and virtual-reality narcissism. They don't need Sentinels to enslave them in a Matrix; they do it to themselves, just as we are doing today. Once they turn inwards to chase their shiny pennies of pleasure, they lose the cosmic plot. They become like a self-stimulating rat, pressing a bar to deliver electricity to its brain's ventral tegmental area, which stimulates its nucleus accumbens to release dopamine, which feels=85ever so good.

The fundamental problem is that an evolved mind must pay attention to indirect cues of biological fitness, rather than tracking fitness itself. This was a key insight of evolutionary psychology in the early 1990s; although evolution favors brains that tend to maximize fitness (as measured by numbers of great-grandkids), no brain has capacity enough to do so under every possible circumstance. Evolution simply could never have anticipated the novel environments, such as modern society, that our social primate would come to inhabit. That would be a computationally intractable problem, even for the new IBM Blue Gene/L supercomputer that runs 280 trillion operations per second. Even long-term weather prediction is easy when compared to fitness prediction. As a result, brains must evolve short-cuts: fitness-promoting tricks, cons, recipes and heuristics that work, on average, under ancestrally normal conditions.

The result is that we don't seek reproductive success directly; we seek tasty foods that have tended to promote survival, and luscious mates who have tended to produce bright, healthy babies. The modern result? Fast food and pornography. Technology is fairly good at controlling external reality to promote real biological fitness, but it's even better at delivering fake fitness=97subjective cues of survival and reproduction without the real-world effects. Having real friends is so much more effort than watching Friends. Actually colonizing the galaxy would be so much harder than pretending to have done it when filming Star Wars or Serenity. The business of humanity has become entertainment, and entertainment is the business of feeding fake fitness cues to our brains.

Fitness-faking technology tends to evolve much faster than our psychological resistance to it. With the invention of the printing press, people read more and have fewer kids. (Only a few curmudgeons lament this.) With the invention of Xbox 360, people would rather play a high-resolution virtual ape in Peter Jackson's King Kong than be a perfect-resolution real human. Teens today must find their way through a carnival of addictively fitness-faking entertainment products: iPods, DVDs, TiVo, Sirius Satellite Radio, Motorola cellphones, the Spice channel, EverQuest, instant messaging, MDMA, BC bud. The traditional staples of physical, mental and social development=97athletics, homework, dating=97are neglected. The few young people with the self-control to pursue the meritocratic path often get distracted at the last minute. Take, for example, the MIT graduates who apply to do computer game design for Electronics Arts, rather than rocket science for NASA.

Around 1900, most inventions concerned physical reality: cars, airplanes, Zeppelins, electric lights, vacuum cleaners, air conditioners, bras, zippers. In 2005, most inventions concern virtual entertainment=97the top 10 patent-recipients were IBM, Canon, Hewlett-Packard, Matsushita, Samsung, Micron Technology, Intel, Hitachi, Toshiba and Fujitsu=97not Boeing, Toyota or Victoria's Secret. We have already shifted from a reality economy to a virtual economy, from physics to psychology as the value-driver and resource-allocator. We are already disappearing up our own brainstems. Our neurons over-stimulate each other, promiscuously, as our sperm and eggs decay, unused. Freud's pleasure principle triumphs over the reality principle. Today we narrow-cast human-interest stories to each other, rather than broadcasting messages of universal peace and progress to other star systems.

Maybe the bright aliens did the same. I suspect that a certain period of fitness-faking narcissism is inevitable after any intelligent life evolves. This is the Great Temptation for any technological species=97to shape their subjective reality to provide the cues of survival and reproductive success without the substance. Most bright alien species probably go extinct gradually, allocating more time and resources to their pleasures, and less to their children. They eventually die out when the game behind all games=97the Game of Life=97says "Game Over;

you are out of lives and you forgot to reproduce."

Heritable variation in personality might allow some lineages to resist the Great Temptation and last longer. Some individuals and families may start with an "irrational" Luddite abhorrence of entertainment technology, and they may evolve ever more self-control, conscientiousness and pragmatism. They will evolve a horror of virtual entertainment, psychoactive drugs and contraception. They will stress the values of hard work, delayed gratification, child-rearing and environmental stewardship. They will combine the family values of the religious right with the sustainability values of the Greenpeace left. Their concerns about the Game of Life will baffle the political pollsters who only understand the rhetoric of status and power, individual and society, rights and duties, good and evil, us and them.

This, too, may be happening already. Christian and Muslim fundamentalists and anti-consumerism activists already understand exactly what the Great Temptation is, and how to avoid it. They insulate themselves from our creative-class dreamworlds and our EverQuest economics. They wait patiently for our fitness-faking narcissism to go extinct. Those practical-minded breeders will inherit the Earth as like-minded aliens may have inherited a few other planets. When they finally achieve contact, it will not be a meeting of novel-readers and game-players. It will be a meeting of dead-serious super-parents who congratulate each other on surviving not just the Bomb, but the Xbox.

Geoffrey Miller is an assistant professor in the department of psychology at University of New Mexico and author of *The Mating Mind: How Sexual Choice Shaped the Evolution of Human Nature*.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

UFO & Alien Encounter In Bloomington Indiana

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:28:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:28:18 -0400
Subject: UFO & Alien Encounter In Bloomington Indiana

Source: American Chronicle, Beverly Hills, California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/f4vk4>

May 2, 2006

A UFO/Alien Encounter In Bloomington Indiana
by
Brian Vike
Special Report

As Ufologists we hear many stories of unusual encounters and sightings of exotic crafts flying through our day and night skies. Every once in a while we come across a case that truly defies explanation. This is one of those cases I am writing about now. I was contacted recently and was sent a couple of photos of something unusual. At least for now it remains unexplained. At first the conversation started over the object itself but what I didn't realize was, that there was a lot more to come.

This story comes from a man by the name of John Tosti who resides in the southern part of Bloomington, Indiana on acreage in a rural setting and who has lived in the area for many years. Back in his younger days he was an avid hunter and enjoyed being in the outdoors. John would leave his home roughly around 4:00 to 5:00 a.m., before the sun had risen so he could get to the back of his property in hopes of spotting game. One day as he made ready to head out, John walked onto his front porch and quickly noticed three bright spherical shaped lights which appeared to be floating above the top of the trees.

One of the lights travelled to the west. This first light wasn't moving erratically and was flying along rather slowly. The color of the light was blue. The light at arms length was approximately the size of a quarter and the other two lights the size of a dime. These two were green and red and were moving erratically around the blue light in a figure eight pattern. They were slightly smaller than the blue light. The objects were low enough in altitude that they cast their light onto the trees. An estimate of the distance away from the witness would have placed the lights at around 100 yards away from him. John said he watched them move along slowly for approximately three to four minutes before they disappeared. He stood watching and was totally baffled at the strange sight. John explained he had never observed anything like this before. He said that he has seen all types of different aircraft and helicopters and knows what they sound and look like. These lights made no sound whatsoever.

He eventually made his way back home. He woke up his fianc=E9e to tell her what he had just witnessed. Still half asleep John's fianc=E9e listened with a puzzled look on her face as she didn't understand what he'd seen. He went into more detail about the sighting and took her outside in the cool early morning. He pointed in the direction where he saw the lights. They both

stood outside discussing it for a few minutes and eventually she went back inside and back to bed. John sat down on the couch to reflect on what he just had witnessed.

Later that day John talked with a couple of co-workers at the construction site about different things. He made arrangements with his close friend Jim to go out hunting the next day.

John woke up early the next morning ready for the days hunt. His friend Jim pulled up at approximately 4:00 - 4:30 a.m. Both men sat outside pulling on their gear and getting things prepared for the hike to the back of the property. Once again John looked skywards and was surprised to see the same lights were back in the same area performing the same maneuvers. Jim sat there observing, not saying much at all, then finally he turned to John and asked, "what the heck is that ?"

John told his friend that he had no idea what these objects were. He explained he had witnessed the very same thing a day earlier. They both sat watching and looking at each other from time to time and finally shrugged their shoulders and carried on with what they had planned for the morning. Both turned on their flashlights and headed off towards the back end of the property.

Both men were approximately mid-way through the property when they came to a small creek which runs along the side of a hill. John was the first to notice an orange/red glowing ball in the distance in a forested area in the gully. Knowing there was nothing back there to cause this light source he thought it might have been the setting moon, as this was the first thought that came to his mind. The men continued walking, went up the hill and towards the bright colored ball of light which now they saw was sitting in the gully. From their position on the hill all of a sudden they saw the ball of light blink out. Now the two hunters stood baffled, amazed, and nervous at what they both had just seen.

As they looked toward the area where they saw the ball of light there appeared two single lights. John's first thoughts were that a couple of hunters were wearing a strap-on light band around their heads, or miners with the light on their hard hats. But two figures were down in the gully where the orange light was. They were coming in the direction of John and Jim. Thinking they may be hunters and not wanting to be mistaken for a wild animal and being shot at, John told his friend Jim to get behind one of the larger trees which was close to them. Both men laid down on the ground staying silent and keeping out of sight from the figures that were approaching their location. John would peek around the tree to see if the figures were still heading in their direction as they were able to hear the dry leaves crackling and small branches snapping which indicated the two unknowns were getting closer by the second. John guessed the figures may have been 30 yards away at this point. He turned and whispered to Jim telling him again to be very quiet as these unknowns were getting very close and were heading straight for the two men. Just as John finished speaking to his friend he peered around the tree once more and the two figures were standing right over top of them.

The approximately six foot tall figures came around the tree and shone their lights down on the two men. John thought, "who are these men, what are they doing on private property and what do they want?" He was frightened! John was blinded for a moment from the light. The next thing he knew, it was daytime. John said when he became aware of his surroundings he was approximately fifty feet away from where they were hiding. Both of their guns were gone. They were nowhere to be seen. Jim was approximately 50 yards away from John, across the creek in a briar patch, waving to him.

John had a sharp pain in his nasal passage and a bloody nose with blood trickling from his left nostril. He told me it felt as if it was a dream because the two men had just been walking through the area in the darkness only to witness a bright glowing object and the two figures, then all of a sudden it is daylight. He was really confused about what had taken place.

The fellows dazed, and confused, started looking around for their guns. John noticed an unusual pile of leaves and went to investigate. Under the leaves were the men's guns. He said they had been covered over by something, or someone. The fellows

gathered up their gear and headed back home. When they got to the barn on John's property they removed the items they had taken out with them. Jim spoke up and said, "I don't know what happened to you and I, but I don't want to discuss this ever again." John told Jim, "don't worry about me talking about it as I would not even know what to tell someone." John said "I don't know what took place!"

John told me that he definitely had a missing time event; how much time the two men lost, no one could determine due to them still feeling confused and not looking at their watches. Like John said, he never had given much thought about UFOs, Aliens, Abductions or anything of that nature.

(At the end of the article there is a link for photos and a video clips) On the back of John's neck there is a large red scar. He believed something was inserted into the back of his neck after his five hours of missing time. Both John and his wife couldn't figure out why the baby monitor would go crazy when it was passed over the scar on his neck. Also the batteries would go dead. Still, they can't find an answer to this.

Back home, John tried to explain to his fianc=E9e what he and his friend Jim had experienced. Of course, John found it hard to tell his story as he was still at a loss as to what had happened to himself and his friend. After John told her what he was able to remember, she was just as confused.

Later that evening John went to bed and after falling asleep he began to have a series of nightmares about himself and Jim being back in the area where the encounter had taken place, plus what they went through. As the nights passed, John continued to have the same nightmare about their experience.

Because these nightmares kept playing out night after night John decided to seek out some help. As he told me, he did not know who to turn to. He did not want to speak to his family members about what happened as he thought they certainly would not believe him and most likely wouldn't understand what he was talking about. He waited, or put the whole issue off, for six years. Eventually as the years passed, it was time to seek out professional help from a qualified medical person.

He needed some answers!

John continued talking to his fianc=E9e about what took place. Over the course of a year or more after the initial sighting, and encounter, more sightings took place.

At this point in the conversation with John, he was asked how his relationship with Jim was to date. John told me that the two of them had pretty much drifted apart. He also went on to say there were other friends who had been with him on other occasions and they also had witnessed some of the lights/objects John was seeing. These friends also started staying away from him. John's fianc=E9e couldn't take it anymore and left due to the high strangeness which was continuing to play out around their home. The couple had a baby boy and John's fianc=E9e felt it wasn't a good idea to bring the young child up in this type of environment. John told me it was devastating for him to lose the people who were the closest to him. The sad fact in this part of the story is that John's fianc=E9e did not want to have any contact with him after she left. John was not to have any contact with "his" child. Legal proceedings were started by his fianc=E9e to keep John away from his child, which I find extremely sad. She thought that John was going crazy.

John gave examples of the things he was observing around him. As he told me, he was seeing these lights/objects around his property on a continuing basis. He witnessed these unknowns pretty much over the same area on the acreage and he began to chase after the objects down the country roads. John felt as if these objects were leading him to certain spots on the property, maybe setting him up for something yet to come. Even throughout it all he still thought how beautiful the balls of lights were and how they moved so gracefully through the sky. He was chasing after them because he was hoping to find an answer to all of this phenomena. Sometimes there was just one light, sometimes there were two. John said as he chased these lights he would be brought to an old farm where the unknowns would sit stationary and eventually just disappear. It seems that John would be

constantly chasing these lights night after night to only see them vanish before his eyes. (Note: the old farm mentioned above is actually owned by the government).

Of course at this point in John's life he was living on his own. He met a wonderful lady some months down the road after his break up with his fiancée. Early in their relationship John figured he would share some of the things he had witnessed with his new lady. John cared for his new found love. He wanted her to see these things so she didn't think he was making up these stories. It worked out well as she told John that she also had seen something in the past but wasn't sure what it was. So she had an interest in all of this.

The couple took a drive out on one of the country roads so John would be able to let her see for herself the sights he'd been observing for months. The two of them made their way down to the old farm and sat there. John started to point out what appeared to look like shooting stars, except these lights/objects would come all the way down through the sky and stop over top of the tree line and move diagonally either to the right or the left. The lady sat there with her mouth wide open as she watched. She didn't know what to say as she was in shock to actually see this unfolding in front of her. John at this point is feeling much better about the whole situation because he had been talking a little about this, and now the new love in his life didn't consider him to be crazy !!

They both watched the lights dance around the sky for approximately an hour. Suddenly the interior lights of their car started to flicker off and on. She mentioned to John that this had never happened to her car before. Finally they decided to head back home and talk about the event they had both witnessed. Discussing the nights events, she decided it would be good if they got a video camera so this could all be documented. She told John that no one would believe us, we need proof in the form of footage or still pictures. He certainly agreed that it was a good idea to get a camera, if for nothing else than to capture these objects and then show the footage to their other family members. It was very important for them to believe John.

Susan bought a video camera on December 23, and that night John ended up chasing a ball of light down the same country road to the farm where the lights have been so visible on a constant basis. He started filming two balls of light which were low over the trees. After approximately fifteen minutes of filming them, he thought he had enough footage to take back home to share with his family.

He arrived at his house. Shut the vehicle off and walked inside. Susan appeared to be upset about something. She turned to him and asked "where have you been for about five hours". John was shocked to hear this as he knew he had only been filming for a short period of time. The couple ended up in an argument over the length of time he'd been gone as Susan was only concerned for her husband's well-being. She finally told him to look at the clock. The time was 4:30 a.m.! John had left at 11:00 p.m. and thought he was only gone for approximately fifteen minutes. After he looked at the clock he realized why his wife was so upset with him. "I just don't understand where the time has gone" he said.

Eventually things calmed down and he asked his wife to look at the video tape of what he had captured. Both of them settled in to watch the video footage so he could prove to Susan that he was only gone for the 15 minutes and not out doing something else.

While viewing the tape he excused himself as he had to use the washroom. As he was about to enter the bathroom his wife, Susan, yelled out, "what is that?" John turned around to find out what she was referring to. What she observed on the film was a red "thing" which appeared on the upper portion of the TV screen. He walked back and sat down beside her and they rolled the tape back a little so they could replay it and watch for the red "thing" that she had noticed. John describes this thing as being wand or rod-like in shape. It went through his hand which was in view of the camera. Inside the red rod there appeared to be a white tube which extended down through and out the end of the red rod. Once the white tube reached the end of the red rod the entire apparatus moved rapidly back through John's hand. At that

very moment John recalled some type of cloth rubbing together and his arm started to go numb. He immediately got up from the couch and started pacing the floor coming to the realization that something had happened to him when he was out taking footage of the lights at the old farm house earlier that evening.

John was finding it very hard to have a good night's sleep because of what had been going on. The couple just had a baby girl and John was certainly worried about the unknown lights around the home and wondering for the safety of his new born child and his wife. Plus the lights were starting to show up in the daylight hours which was really getting them all stressed out.

One example he gave was when his mother-in-law was in one of the rooms above the main floor of the home and saw a ball of fire drop out of the sky and shoot lightening bolts at the home. Another was of a shimmering blue/white light which constantly showed up in the families backyard. John, not knowing what might happen, would stay up all night until the sun rose the next morning. He finally went to see his family physician to ask for something that might help him get a good night's sleep.

The mother-in-law who saw the ball of fire shoot the lightening bolts towards the home was a skeptic. She did not believe in UFOs, or beings from elsewhere. Matter of fact, she had been holding a cup of coffee when the bolts hit the side of the house and becoming very frightened, she spilt the hot coffee all over her chest. The lady was so scared that she dropped to the ground and crawled underneath a table and stayed there until her daughter and son-in-law came home. She had no idea what happened and no rational explanation for it.

John and his wife were at another house on the property and had witnessed an extremely bright flash and first thought electrical lines might have fallen onto the residence as they could hear the sound of an electrical rush of current or discharge. As they entered the house the flash of light and the sound kept repeating itself over and over as the couple walked through each room looking for John's mother-in-law. Finally they found her hiding underneath the table. Later she told her them that the flash and sound seemed to be moving around the outside of the home following John and Susan in and out of each room. The couple could clearly see the flashing and hear the sound of high voltage going through the roof as they made their way through the different rooms.

Some of the pictures taken around John's home over a period of time. There are three pages of photos to view at this link here:
<http://www.hbccufo.org/modules.php?name=3DNews&file=3Darticle&sid=3D2018>

As mentioned above John sought help so he might get a good nights sleep. With all the visitations happening on a daily basis, he wasn't sure if his family was going to be next, or taken, or harmed in some way. It became so bad that he had his family sleep/hide in the closet at night and he guarded the door. John was worn out. He had lost an excellent job working in construction, etc. He needed professional help at this time. He talked to a lady (she was a director of Mental Health at one of the local hospitals) in hopes he might get a little medication to help him sleep through the night, thinking this may work or at least help him to some degree. The lady suggested that John and her go talk to a doctor to see what could be done for him, in the way of some medication. The lady asked what was going on, and John thought that just maybe if he told her she might have a better understanding and know what exactly should be done for him. She walked with John over to the hospital, (there are two buildings on the property). At one of the buildings they evaluate potential patients and at the other building patient care is handled).

When the lady and John entered one of the buildings, they immediately got into the elevator and the lady mentioned to John we are just going up to see the doctor, plus you can tell him what has been taking place at your home. When John and the lady arrived at the fifth floor, the elevator doors opened. As he stepped out he noticed two men dressed in white hospital clothing approaching him. He was wondering what was going on as the two men were looking directly at him which made him feel

very nervous. He then turned to ask the lady what was going on when he saw her back step into the elevator as he watched the elevator doors close. Feeling frightened at this point John looked over to where one would push buttons for the elevator which would take you to different floors in the hospital, but he noticed that the elevator was operated by keys only. In other words John was stuck, scared, with nowhere to go.

The two men took hold of John and said that they were going to take him to have his vitals checked, etc.. While this is being done John said to the men that he was just here to see the doctor. One of the men who greeted John told him that the doctor was not going to be back to the hospital until tomorrow morning and informed him that he would have to spend the night at the hospital.

Of course straight away John starts to question what is going on. From the sounds of it the lady may have called ahead to the hospital to have John committed for an evaluation, and the two men did confirm this to John. Being cooperative John asked could he please make a telephone call to his wife as she was going to be worried sick about him because she had no clue that he would be kept overnight. The hospital staff allowed John to call home and talk to his wife. When Susan found out where her husband was she was totally upset and surprised. He explained that there was no way the hospital staff was going to let him out. He was basically stuck there, at least until the next day. They had no idea what would come after his meeting with the doctor.

John settled in for the night waiting until morning when the doctor arrived to evaluate him. Susan also arrived at the hospital with some of the video footage that they had taken of the strange occurrences from around their home and explained to the lady who got John into this pickle that he wasn't delusional or crazy and everything he had told her was true. She pleaded with the lady to allow her to show the doctor what was on the videos.

The lady walked Susan over to the hospital and they waited in a room to see the doctor. John, the lady and Susan would be discussing the case. Before he was to meet with everyone he was given a shot which made him lightheaded. He guessed it was a sedative of some kind. When he was escorted into the meeting room there were three doctors waiting. A TV and VCR were hooked up so everyone would be able to view the tapes Susan had brought with her. One of the tapes was placed into the VCR and everyone watched for approximately 5 minutes. The video machine was then turned off and the doctors consulted and looked at John and said, Mr. Tosti, we are sorry but there is nothing we can do for you. So they signed his release papers and John and Susan left the hospital.

Susan, John's wife recounted what took place after the trip to the mental hospital.

I am Johns wife, Susan. I'd like to talk a bit about what happened after his trip to the mental hospital. We found out what would happen if we sought help. John thought the best way to stop what was happening to us would be to throw all of the evidence away. Needless to say I didn't agree and we were having a rather heated argument. In the midst of our quarreling a blinding light shot through the window we were sitting next to. It was just like a bolt of lightning and it sounded like 40,000 volts of electricity on the ceiling. However, there was a blizzard occurring at the time so that definitely wasn't it.

We both jumped up and ran into the kitchen to get away from it. As soon as we got to the kitchen it happened again. But this time it came through the kitchen window we were closest to. So we ran to the very back room of our house where there was an outside door. We were going to exit the house. When we went to open the door it came in through the window in the door at us. Each time this happened the sound of electricity was deafening. We thought a power-line had dropped on our house so we called the power company to help us get out of our house. The snow wasn't that deep yet and they made it. To our surprise they said there wasn't a thing wrong.

However we did notice that the snow that had fallen so far had holes melted in it as if there had been sparks falling all around our house. That night we were terrorized and it continued

every night for about five days. We would first lose our electricity. This always adds an extra element of terror. Then you realize you are not alone. Bright blue strobe lights or bright white lights from outside would light up our house and sometimes we would see others in the house with us. One time they were in my bedroom with me and one grabbed my leg and tried to pull me off the bed. I didn't appreciate it too much. My husband also saw a few others but he can tell you about them. I was very scared and I didn't know how we were going to go on. After the blizzard was over and the state of emergency in our county was lifted things got better. But they were still there above our house every night for the longest time and I never knew when they were going to start terrorizing us again. It was not a good time and I feel for anyone that has experienced this.

John has pulled together some eight to ten hours of footage of these strange lights, etc. Also there is the medical form on which it states that John was in the hospital at the time he mentioned. Also since all the strangeness has been taking place there, John's family have observed many helicopters flying close and over the top of his home when they never showed up before. He has footage and stills of the fly by. Because things were so frightening and not sure what the government might or might not do, John and his family talked to reporters who came to visit their home and related their story to them. The idea was if the information gets into the public eye then government officials would leave them alone if this should ever be a problem. John has filmed military jets flying low over the roads. After he played back the video tape of the aircraft he could clearly see a wobbling object of some kind which was flying directly below one of the jet aircraft. Later that day he went over to a friend's home and saw something with a shape flying over top of his friends house above the tree line. He told me the camera was set at a high shutter speed. Also military helicopters were buzzing the families home on many occasions.

One of John's most memorable videos captured an object that was a moon sized craft that was vertical in the sky and approximately 200 to 300 feet off the ground. John could easily see a number of separate lights on the bottom of the craft. As the object started to lean towards John's direction or location he was able to see a dome towards the back part of the craft as the rim of the object became more visible. The dome portion of it was a blue/white color. As the object started to pitch down in front of John he turned on the vehicle's headlights to brighten up the area. What he wanted to accomplish was to provide some trees, the long grass etc.. which would show up on the video and give some perspective to show just how low the object was, and to give a good idea of what it looked like and how it maneuvered. As soon as the lights from John's vehicle were turned on, the craft flattened out and dropped down towards the ground with the dome and other features clearly visible. All of a sudden the bottom of the craft starts flashing until eventually the whole craft starts to flash. As he watches, the object starts to move to his left, which would have been towards the south. Still visible by sight and camera, the object came to a complete stop and hovers. From there it starts to change it's form/shape and moves back to John's right and behind a tree. From there it releases two smaller objects which are red and the other green. These two colored objects were round in shape.

As John watched the large object move again to his left/south he lost sight of the two smaller ones. Keep in mind that he had still been filming and caught the object changing it's form. As it reached a point to his left the large craft started to flash. As John zooms in on the large object the two smaller objects reappeared. One of the smaller objects went to the top of the craft while the other object positioned itself at the bottom. He could clearly see there were three separate objects and that none of them were attached to one another. This piece of footage was shot on January 19, 1996. John estimates the craft to be approximately 500 yards away from his location. He also estimates (roughly) the object may have been some 35 feet in diameter.

After all this being caught on film it was a relief for John to be able to show his whole family that he was not crazy and was certainly seeing all that he was talking about.

The unusual events that have taken place at the Tosti home are still continuing to this day but it comes in patterns over a

period of time, then the sightings subside to some degree. When the lights or sightings flare up John notices there are regular military over flights of the area.

Note from John Tosti about the newspaper article

I thought we would send some more evidence pertaining to our sightings and visitations. The article attached is from our local newspaper in Bloomington called "The Herald Times". This occurred when we were having many encounters. We obviously weren't the only ones that saw strange occurrences. There is a man who claims he witnessed a plane crash in the woods. This man first saw landing lights of an airplane. Shortly thereafter he saw a fireball and heard an explosion. Two other people also heard the explosion. This site is only 3-4 miles from our house with nothing in between but a lake and woodland. Department of Natural Resources Officer Steve McClain concluded that someone could have exploded a home-made bomb or gasoline but yet "nothing out of the ordinary was found". There wasn't any scorched earth or trees nor was there a strong odor of gas. Seems to me that would have been very noticeable. Even if what Officer McClain concluded was true(which I strongly doubt), it doesn't explain the landing lights the man saw in the air and the fireball with a huge explosion. Corp. Rick Wright said "The man saw something. We just don't know what he saw."

An Update On Events taking place around the area where the Tosti family lives right now.

The below email was from a close friend of John's: (October 2004).

I don't know if John told you about the last couple days, two nights ago John noticed lights up in the sky, the dogs were going nuts over here.

John and I live about 1 1/2 miles apart now, so when he or I see something outside we can both usually see it from our places unless their low to the ground.

But yesterday, there was 3 F-16's flying over town, 1 up front and 2 behind, way below the required 10,000 feet level. They were about 1500 feet off the ground, as I headed back home I lost sight of them. When I got there, my neighbor said he heard them, then saw them flying around in circles like they were "looking or chasing" something, then about 10 minutes later Alice heard a helicopter. I looked outside and saw it was a Black Hawk with a gun port on the side. I called (name removed) out to see it as well.

That is when I went to John's to work on sending you the photos, and on the drive to Johns, 5 military vehicles came rushing down the road in the opposite direction... 1 Humvee with a red light on the dash, 3 troop carriers with the tarps pulled over them, and another Humvee following. Johns wife saw a helicopter hover over their house as well.

Interesting things going on around here as of late.

Other pictures and video footage of interest that John, Mark and other folks have taken around Bloomington Indiana, or close to John's location.

Newspaper article, photos and video footage can be viewed at my site:

<http://www.hbccufo.org/modules.php?name=3DNews&file=3Darticle&sid=3D2037>

Brian Vike, Director of HBCC UFO Research.

Phone: 250 845 2189

<http://www.hbccufo.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

UFOs Interdimensional Travel & One Giant Rock

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:34:42 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:34:42 -0400
Subject: UFOs Interdimensional Travel & One Giant Rock

Source: The River Falls Journal - River Falls, Wisconsin, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/mcs66>

Monday, May 01, 2006

[Several Clickable Images]

Signs Of Life - UFOs, Interdimensional Travel And One Giant Rock
By Chelsea J. Carter

They say there is a magical rock in California's Mojave Desert.

Just ask the folks who live near the seven-story, freestanding boulder known as Giant Rock. Ask, and they might tell you about those who believe it attracts flying saucers.

They may even tell you about the late George Van Tassel, the man who for a short time lived under the rock and said he was told by a visitor from Venus to build a dome that would capture the area's energy and rejuvenate the human body.

asap went in search of answers and found something - the first ever Retro UFO Convention, honoring the man, the rock and the UFOs some swear they attracted.

The small, one-day convention offered believers - some in space costumes - a chance to buy crystals, listen to various UFO specialists and walk around the famed "Integratron" machine at \$25 a pop. (It cost another \$15 to go inside and take a "sound bath.")

The Man And The Rock

Time has not been kind to Giant Rock, which is about three miles off-road in the desert from Landers. The weather has caused it to split. It has been burned by bonfires. It has been defaced by graffiti and scratch-itti.

But it's powers, believers say, are still intact.

Long ago, American Indians gathered at the base of the boulder to welcome the coming seasons, and shamans were said to gather strength for their tribes through the power of the rock, according to local historians.

But it is the rock's supposed special electromagnetic forces, a vortex, that today draw hundreds of UFOs enthusiasts and, supposedly, otherworldly beings. (They don't like to be called aliens, asap was told by some convention attendees.)

They first started coming to the area in the 1950s, according to Van Tassel, who was "channeled" at the convention by Lloyd Noel. (Noel told audiences Van Tassel was speaking through interdimensional travel.)

Van Tassel moved to Landers in 1947, and leased the land that included the rock. He and his family opened a small airport and cafe.

In 1953, Van Tassel began to hold meetings under the rock in rooms carved out earlier by a prospector. It was there he first began to commune with the visitors, he wrote.

In August 1953, he said, a saucer landed from the planet Venus, woke Van Tassel up and invited him onto the ship. There the beings told him to build the "Integratron," a "machine, a high-voltage electrostatic generator that would supply a broad range of frequencies to recharge the cell structure."

Word of Van Tassel's meetings with visitors spread, and people flocked to Giant Rock to glimpse a view of the beings. Van Tassel began to hold UFO Conventions at the rock. In 1959, more than 11,000 people attended one of his UFO conventions.

The Integratron

Van Tassel began, under what he described as the guidance of the visitors, construction of the Integratron in 1954. He spent 18 years building the structure that sits about three miles from Giant Rock.

Van Tassel said the site of the Integratron was worked out according to a complex set of theories involving the earth's magnetic field, and the Integratron's relationship to the Great Pyramid in Egypt and Giant Rock.

The Integratron was capable of collecting up to 50,000 volts of static electricity from the air, Van Tassel wrote. The 16-sided dome was built of wood and concrete and held together by glue and wooden pegs.

Inside, visitors can have a "sound bath," in which a series of quartz bowls keyed to different notes are sounded to rejuvenate the body.

In Van Tassel's writings, he said the beings did not want him to write down the schematics for the building, and that he had to learn about how to construct it in his various channelings. Van Tassel died in 1976, and the Integratron was never finished.

It has since fallen into disrepair, and convention organizer Barbara Harris said proceeds were going to the upkeep of the building.

<http://www.retroufo.com/>

<http://www.integratron.com/>

ASAP reporter Chelsea J. Carter interviewed Lloyd Noel after his channeling. He said he was just an actor.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Furlotte On SDI 04-29-06

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 10:21:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 11:00:35 -0400
Subject: Furlotte On SDI 04-29-06

A very legitimately 'gonzo' Hunter S. Thompson killed himself recently. I suspect his suicide was in part provoked by something alluded to in the terse note he left behind. He wrote of a coming "Big Dark", then he pulled the trigger. Dave Furlotte further forecast the pending arrival of the "darkness" Thompson prophesized on SDI last Saturday night. Listen here:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/podcasts/sdi390pcast.mp3>

at 06' 16" in...

The "big dark" approaches, if it has not already slithered in, in the form of a dry-drunk, double deserting corporate dupe by the name of George. Classically unintelligent if not pathologically eroded by drugs and alcohol, George insentiently fronts for the near unopposed insults of religious fundamentalism, intellectual stagnation, and constitutional implosion, and shills for this egregious assault gleefully, giddily and even gaily.

The current United States Congress George has illegitimately co-opted with criminal sociopaths of equal ardor if greater intelligence is essentially making the search for truth and the demands for leadership accountability criminal acts, themselves, punishable by arrest, fines, and hard jail time. He endeavors to make the truth, itself, against the law of the land. He fully intends to cancel due process and eviscerate the rule of law. Be afraid.

He embraces a police state as bad as anything we have seen in recorded history, promotes the worst kind of immature faux-patriotism to justify his crimes, and does it all draped in the mantel of a God he does not believe in and a due process to which he won't even pay lip service. Darkness looms...

The country we love is threatened by clear and present danger. It is the illegitimate government corrupting it that is undeserving of that love. Now is not the time to be remotely silent, folks. Protest must be loud, energetic, unceasing, and immediate.

Thanks for the heads up, Dave. We weren't hearing that news down here. I don't wonder why.

As for George? Impeach now and try for war crimes.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Re: Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 13:39:39 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 11:05:01 -0400
Subject: Re: Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens - Dickenson

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 12:23 PM
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens

<http://tinyurl.com/f57a5>

>May 1, 2006

>Why We Haven't Met Any Aliens
>by Geoffrey Miller

<snip>

>They insulate themselves from our creative-class
>dreamworlds and our EverQuest economics. They wait patiently for
>our fitness-faking narcissism to go extinct. Those practical-
>minded breeders will inherit the Earth as like-minded aliens may
>have inherited a few other planets. When they finally achieve
>contact, it will not be a meeting of novel-readers and game-
>players. It will be a meeting of dead-serious super-parents who
>congratulate each other on surviving not just the Bomb, but the
>Xbox.

That rings a bell, 'Diplomatic Act' by Peter Jurasik & William H
Keith, Jr ISBN 0-671-57823-5 Baen Publishing NY 1999 had
something like that as a theme (only they wrote it light-
hearted):-

That the risks of mis-understandings setting off inter-species
conflict are too great to allow even story-telling;

That any multi-species alliance of truly advanced beings must've
given up casual fiction and self-deception - so losing
proselytizers, advertisers, probably police, judges and
law-courts, and, of course, politicians.

Speculation - (maybe) why we're not allowed to know about that
"alliance of advanced beings"?

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 09:02:39 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 11:11:12 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Kaeser

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 14:59:29 -0700
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>Jerry Clark:

>I'd never heard the word "pelicanist" before, and naively
>assumed, being something of a bird-lover, that it was a term of
>approbation. Now I see that it's basically a synonym for
>"idiot", though with certain ornithological nuances. :)

>Anyway, thanks for being on this List, Jerry. It's nice to see
>highly intelligent individuals who can easily stand up to - in
>my judgment - the irrational ilk whose knowing, self-
>congratulatory smirk appears before actual neuron-firing at the
>first mention of "UFO".

Jerry,

I think this is a call for a good UFO genre dictionary. It would
make sense to help clarify these for those new to the field.

Jeff,

The term "pelicanist" evolved from a theory expressed by a few
that the infamous Kenneth Arnold sighting in June, 1947 had been
caused by high flying pelicans and that he was simply fooled by
the light reflecting off of them.

This was argued for a number of months and "pelicanist" evolved
as a descriptive term.

Steve

[See: <http://tinyurl.com/fr831> --ebk]

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 2](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 09:35:35 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 11:13:51 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Sandow

>From John Harney <magonia.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 00:18:33 +0100
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>The comments on my post to my Magonia blog have confirmed
>what I wrote as being basically true. This is because of
>the strong emotional reaction to the suggestion that there
>is nothing to the UFO myth apart from popular belief and
>personal subjective experience.

This isn't a strong emotional reaction?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Art School Rationalism? [was: UFOs Are Back]

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 16:24:38 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:18:58 -0400
Subject: Art School Rationalism? [was: UFOs Are Back]

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:30:20 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

I've responded to this post already, but there's another issue here that I thought might merit a thread of its own:

>The real
>indicator of ufology's terminal decline is the total lack of new
>ideas in the subject, and the total inability to form any
>rational, testable, scientific hypothesis after sixty years of
>reporting, investigating and theorising.

I'm just wondering, John, why you cite "rational" and "testable" as separate criteria for a scientific hypothesis? A scientific hypothesis is, after all, exactly one which is testable. Surely you aren't suggesting that science should be subject to non-empirical influences?

Cathy

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 16:26:33 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:21:04 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Reason

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: UFO Updates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 12:10:54 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

[Quoting John Harney]:

>I am attempting to write an article for the next issue of
>Magonia Supplement on the general theme that the whole UFOs and
>ufology business is nothing more than a modern myth, which is
>best studied by folklorists, psychologists and sociologists,
>rather than astronomers, physicists (nuclear or otherwise!), and
>self-styled "Serious Ufologists", most of whom are self-deluded
>buffoons.

<snip>

I think these remarks present some rather dubious assumptions,
the first being whether it's actually possible even in principle
for something to be "nothing more" than a myth. No myth in
history that I'm aware of has ever existed in total isolation
from the rest of reality.

Secondly, there is the assumption that psychologists and
sociologists are the people best equipped to study myth.
Psychologists and sociologists in general do not study myth,
have no tradition of doing so, and more importantly have no
methods or techniques for doing so. Indeed psychology in
particular has debarred itself from the study of the purely
subjective for most of its history. Folklorists of course do
study myth, but don't do so scientifically - that is, they don't
construct and test hypotheses. Folklore is a purely descriptive
discipline which cannot elucidate causal mechanisms.

Lastly of course, psychologists and sociologists do study
Ufology, and have done for some time. They have shown themselves
no more capable of resolving the fundamental questions of
Ufology than astronomers, physicists, or "serious" Ufologists,
and I see no indication they're about to do so.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 16:23:59 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:23:17 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Reason

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:30:20 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

<snip>

>Ufology is dead in the same way that psychical research is dead,
>as after almost a century and a half of research the latter has
>produced absolutely nothing that might be said to expand the
>range of human understanding.

All well and good, but as we've discussed here before, exactly the same can be said of most (if not all) of the social sciences, psychology included. Psychology has been in business for about a century and a half - about as long as psychic research, and with about as much to show for it. Think of any controversy which has existed within psychology at any time during the last hundred years, and you can be pretty sure that controversy remains to this today.

On the whole, though, psychologists don't regard their discipline as being dead or in terminal decline. When this issue comes up in psychology (as it does fairly frequently) the usual response is that psychology is a very new discipline, and it isn't fair to judge it by the standards of disciplines which have been around for hundreds of years. In Ufology, the excuse usually appears to be the lack of interest from "mainstream" science. I find both these excuses rather unconvincing, as presumably do you. So what then is the reason?

In psychology, I'm pretty sure that part of the reason is an over-reliance on ridiculously simplistic mechanical models, the product of a wholly misguided attempt to ape the physical sciences. But billiard balls are predictable - people aren't.

It could be though that there's a deeper problem here. Maybe this is becoming a problem with science generally. Take the supposedly "hardcore" subject of theoretical physics, for example; there's our old favorite, superstring theory - the best part of thirty years' detailed theoretical work and still not a single testable prediction to show for it.

It could be that we have come to the limit of the very small set of scientific problems for which simple mechanical solutions are applicable, and are moving into the real territory of the universe - complex problems involving many thousands or millions of interacting variables, compared to which any practicable data set is inevitable going to be incredibly sparse. Two hundred subjects sounds like a lot if you think in terms of models containing three variables plus noise - but it seems like next to nothing in terms of models involving several million variables plus all their nth order interactions.

So it could be that psychology and Ufology are both pioneers in this new reality of inherently sparse observation. Is there a solution? Maybe not - after all, why should we assume that everything that goes on in the universe is going to be detectable from the minute goldfish bowl, in which we happen to

be trapped in our insignificant corner of the cosmos? Or maybe there is a solution, using techniques of inference which are currently unimaginable.

I for one certainly don't know. Any ideas?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Pelicanism [was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up]

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 11:36:39 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:29:40 -0400
Subject: Pelicanism [was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up]

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 09:02:39 -0400
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 14:59:29 -0700
>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

Jeff and Steve,

>>I'd never heard the word "pelicanist" before, and naively
>>assumed, being something of a bird-lover, that it was a term of
>>approbation. Now I see that it's basically a synonym for
>>"idiot", though with certain ornithological nuances. :)

>I think this is a call for a good UFO genre dictionary. It
>would make sense to help clarify these for those new to the
>field.

>The term "pelicanist" evolved from a theory expressed by a few
>that the infamous Kenneth Arnold sighting in June 1947 had been
>caused by high flying pelicans and that he was simply fooled by
>the light reflecting off of them.

Specifically, the theory - if that's the word for it - was
concocted by Scottish debunker James Easton. In the discussion
that followed, physicists and other scientific sophisticates
demonstrated that the explanation could not be true for a
variety of reasons, not the least of which is that it makes
claims that the laws of physics cannot sustain.

>This was argued for a number of months and "pelicanist" evolved
>as a descriptive term.

"Pelicanism" did not "evolve." I made it up. It is a way to
characterize absurd explanations for UFO cases. Not just any
explanation, mind you, just one that happens to be as fantastic
as - or maybe even more fantastic than - the sighting it
purports to explain.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Pelicanism [was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel]

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 12:52:10 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:34:01 -0400
Subject: Re: Pelicanism [was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel]

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 14:59:29 -0700
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 08:40:10 -0500
>>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>>John Harney flies true to pelicanist form, as the above remarks
>>nicely document. Pelicanism is about nothing if not
>>self-congratulation, which is why it always cracks up non-flock
>>members. If nobody else will congratulate you on how wise and
>>rational you are, then do it yourself, and often. That's why
>>people sprout wings and feathers and become pelicanists.

>Jerry Clark:

>I'd never heard the word "pelicanist" before, and naively
>assumed, being something of a bird-lover, that it was a term of
>approbation. Now I see that it's basically a synonym for
>"idiot," though with certain ornithological nuances. :)

The term "pelicanist" arose during the discussions of the Kenneth Arnold case back in the late 90's and early 2000's. The most recent proposed explanation was "pelicans."

One person was adamant that pelicans was a satisfactory and believable explanation. Said person was asked to "draw a map" to prove that pelicans traveling along at top speed of about 50 mph at an altitude of about 9500 ft could explain what Arnold described. Said person never did that, but stuck to the pelican explanation and publicized it widely.

IMHO and in the opinion of many others on this List and elsewhere, "pelicans" was a non-starter from the beginning. It appeared that said person was advancing an explanation simply to have an explanation available even if it made no sense when analyzed in detail.

Hence the term "pelicanist": one who proposes or advocates, with great assurance (and perhaps a little ego inflation) a theory for a UFO sighting that cannot stand up under analysis. This is not synonymous with 'idiot', although it does not preclude some form of 'idiocy' with respect to UFO explanations.

It appears that the pelican 'explanation' has now joined the collection of defunct Arnold explanations which are (were) in approximate reverse order ending with explanations proposed in the late 40's:

pelicans
geese
meteors
spots on the windshield
orographic clouds
wave clouds
mirages

notes in the eye

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: UFOs Interdimensional Travel & One Giant Rock

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 12:23:39 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:38:24 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Interdimensional Travel & One Giant Rock

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-Updates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 02 May 2006 07:28:18 -0400
>Subject: UFO UpDate: UFO & Alien Encounter In Bloomington Indiana

>Signs Of Life - UFOs, Interdimensional Travel And
>One Giant Rock
>By Chelsea J. Carter

<snip>

>In Van Tassel's writings, he said the beings did not want him to
>write down the schematics for the building, and that he had to
>learn about how to construct it in his various channelings. Van
>Tassel died in 1976, and the Integratron was never finished.

<snip>

Is Doris still alive?

A friend of mine and I made a visit to Doris, and the Integratron. He had lived with Doris and Van Tassel; knew how the Integratron worked and put me through the paces. It did not involve being surrounded by sound. It meant being very quiet and focusing energy.

We'll see how much longer I live after the Integratron exposure.

I still have copies of The Integratron newsletter - shades of my misspent young checking out the fringe crazies. They are always the most fun to be around.

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference Tues May

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 12:42:23 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:43:12 -0400
Subject: Re: Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference Tues May

>From: Victor Viggiani <zland.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 12:21:58 -0400
>Subject: Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference Tues May 9th

<snip>

>Toronto Ontario May 1, 2006 Exopolitics Toronto and the Canadian
>Disclosure Initiative present an exclusive Press Conference on
>UFO Witness Testimony. A press screening of authentic military,
>corporate and government witness testimony will present
>compelling evidence attesting to the reality of an
>extraterrestrial presence and the 58 year old
>military/government cover-up of this issue. This historic press
>event will feature Dr. Steven M. Greer Director of the
>Disclosure Project and the Hon. Paul Hellyer former Minister of
>National Defense in Canada.

One can only hope that the Hon. Paul Hellyer former-Minister of
National Defense in Canada takes his secrecy oath seriously and
this is just another dog and pony show for the public.

In other words, even the Canadian government wants in on the
'cover-up story'. What a hoot!

Frankly, I think a very private conversation with the Hon. Paul
Hellyer might be more enlightening than "a historic press
event."

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 19:35:21 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 05:46:03 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 16:16:49 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:30:20 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

><snip>

>>Ufology is dead in the same way that psychical research is
>>dead, as after almost a century and a half of research the
>>latter has produced absolutely nothing that might be said to
>>expand the range of human understanding.

>So, Ufology is dead, ghost hunting is dead, and you spend your
>weekend at a conference about pink dog faeces and frogs with
>testicles the size of the moon.

>I'm telling you, you really can't make this drivel up.

>BTW - I thought conferences were where shiester researchers and
>other purveyors of lies went in order to sell more books and
>line their pockets, or is that just UFO conferences? What did
>you buy there John?

The tickets were freebies, bought nothing at the conference
(stood a couple of rounds in the pub afterwards) and had a
bloody good time with a group of people - sceptics and non-
sceptics - with many contrasting views, who are capable of
conducting a genuine discussion without descending into school
yard name-calling. The basic difference between most Fortean
and many ufologists.

I don't recall any talks on dog faeces or frogs testes; but
those I did hear were all most interesting and well argued, even
if I didn't agree with them.

Try to get along for next year's UnCon, Stuart, you might even
enjoy it, you obviously need something to enjoy, stuck up there
in Altrincham.

--
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Okno ELINT Complex In Tajikistan

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:18:34 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:18:34 -0400
Subject: Okno ELINT Complex In Tajikistan

Source: Ferghana Information Agency - Moscow, Russia

<http://tinyurl.com/g5hjh>

17.04.2006

Central Asia News

Okno ELINT Complex In Tajikistan Is Becoming Russian

Ferghana.Ru
Staff correspondent

The Duma will discuss the Russian-Tajik accord on transfer of the military object to Russian jurisdiction in the near future. The government of Russia voted to forward the accord for ratification by the Duma the other day. The matter concerns Nurek, an ELINT center of the airspace control known in the Russian Defense Ministry as Okno or Window.

Located in the Sanglok mountains 2,200 meters above the sea level, the complex in question is one of the most efficient means of the airspace control system of the Russian Space Forces. The skies above it are clear almost all year round.

Okno Commander Colonel Sergei Chistyakov says that the complex automatically detects objects in the altitudes ranging between 2,000 and 40,000 kilometers, collects all available information on them, calculates their orbits and trajectories, and flashes the information to command centers. The complex may even be used to keep track of the targets in the altitudes of between 120 and 2,000 kilometers.

Airspace is monitored at night when objects in space reflect sunlight and the reflection provides the complex with the necessary information. Okno is fully automatic. It may operate without human supervision, keeping track of the known and newly detected objects. Since the complex operates in the passive mode, it does not use too much of electric power. (In fact, it needs as much as a house of 150 apartments uses.)

The US Department of Defense has three similar objects. They use lasers and therefore require more by way of electric power. In any case, Okno is superior. Strategically speaking, the complex is a huge step forward in Russia's ability to forecast aggressions against it and its allies. An emphasis on advanced hi-tech weapons and military hardware is made in modern warfare. Space is playing an important role in it, particularly now that the United States is deploying a new ballistic missile defense system with some elements of it in orbit around Earth. It means that the role of Okno in military security of Russia and its allies will only grow.

[UFO UpDates Thanks Joel Carpenter 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Olson

From: **Jeff Olson** <jlolson.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 17:09:42 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:21:06 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - Olson

>From John Harney <magonia.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 00:18:33 +0100
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

>The comments on my post to my Magonia blog have confirmed
>what I wrote as being basically true. This is because of
>the strong emotional reaction to the suggestion that there
>is nothing to the UFO myth apart from popular belief and
>personal subjective experience.

I always thought that religious faith, such as expressed above,
was largely composed of - or based on-- emotion.

Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Hudson Valley UFO Meeting Tonight @ 7:30

From: Vinny Polise <Pinebushufo.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 20:42:03 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:25:01 -0400
Subject: Hudson Valley UFO Meeting Tonight @ 7:30

Hey List,

Just wanted to update you all about Wednesday night's meeting.

Many of you come to the meetings and that is greatly appreciated.

Please, especially all the new members, take a ride up and go to the monthly meetings. They are very informative and the people are just excellent.

I apologize about the late notice (under 24 hours) but I do my best... If anyone needs help finding a place to sit and watch please speak up! We are all here to help... no critics here!

Again get yourself to the most informative meetings every first Wednesday of the month.....

Thanks,
Vinny Polise
www.pinebushufo.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Air Cases - Matteson

From: Gary Matteson <mystrius.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 20:30:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:27:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Air Cases - Matteson

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 17:20:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Air Cases

>>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 20:00:48 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Air Cases

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 15:10:13 -0300
>>>Subject: Air Cases

>>>John, I have no idea why you are on this List but it has
>>>nothing to do with the investigation of the phenomenon. You
>>>pretend to be above it all when really you are just wasting
>>>time while stroking your own ego for, but what purpose I can't
>>>imagine.

>>Not at all; I just don't like to see people getting away with
>>their anti-scientific speculations, and irrational rejection of
>>sensible explanations for UFO reports.

>Nonsense Mr. Harney. Proud Science should not pretend to be the
>final arbiter of that which it reflexively and summarily
>_discounts_, that which it criticizes in a _facile_ manner, and
>in the final analysis, that which it refuses to even _look_ at.

Hello, Alfred Lehmborg.

In the not too brief time I've followed the UFO UpDates list, I
do not remember a time or two only, when I questioned your wit
and wisdom.

My conviction is, even if it's only a few more persons, however
surreptitiously, they are coming on board to examine the basis
for ages long reports of anomalous events as discussed here.

I'd care to think your view of science as relates to things
ufological would moderate a bit by reading a Paul Von Ward book
I am currently reading, Gods, Genes And Consciousness.

Even if at a snail's pace, I have reason to believe the trend is
changing for the better.

Of course, I may be in error.

Gary C. Matteson

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Michigan Researcher Links Bigfoot & UFOs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:35:04 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:35:04 -0400
Subject: Michigan Researcher Links Bigfoot & UFOs

Source: PRWeb - Ferndale, Washington, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/mgg82>

May 3 2006

Michigan Researcher Provides Evidence for Link Between Bigfoot & UFOs

At the May 7, 2006, meeting of the Michigan Mutual UFO Network, Lisa Shiel will provide compelling evidence for a connection between two usually separate esoteric phenomena - Bigfoot and UFOs. This presentation will be based on her new book "Backyard Bigfoot: The True Story of Stick Signs, UFOs, and the Sasquatch."

Lake Linden, Mich. (PRWEB) May 3, 2006 - Michigan Bigfoot expert and certified Mutual UFO Network (MUFON) field investigator Lisa Shiel will be the featured speaker at the May 7, 2006, meeting of the Michigan MUFON chapter at Walli's East Restaurant in Burton, Michigan (near Flint). During her presentation of "Bigfoot and UFOs," she will present the results of years of personal research into both phenomena and clearly explain the usually overlooked connections between them.

Shiel is a recognized expert on Bigfoot, having been interviewed in newspapers and on radio and TV. She recently founded the Michigan Upper Peninsula Bigfoot Organization (MUPBO) to probe sightings in the region and provide UP residents a source for information. Shiel earned her certification as a MUFON field investigator in January and is the only certified UFO investigator in Michigan's UP. Shiel developed her research skills through earning a master's degree in library science and certification as a professional librarian.

Slipdown Mountain Publications LLC published the first two books in her Human Origins Series of novels over the past two years. These novels wrap intriguing mysteries and nonstop adventure around her alternative theories of human evolution and her explanations of scientific close-mindedness in the fields of archaeology and anthropology. Her latest book, the nonfiction "Backyard Bigfoot: The True Story of Stick Signs, UFOs, and the Sasquatch" released in March by Slipdown Mountain, expands on her theories and offers rigorous and thoroughly documented evidence to support them. Following her presentation to Michigan MUFON, Shiel will offer copies of her books for sale and autographing.

Based in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, Slipdown Mountain Publications LLC publishes fine art prints and books on fiction, aviation history and cryptozoology. The company plans to publish two or three new books per year. Books may be purchased via the company's Web site (SlipdownMountain.com) or by phoning 906-523-6105 (or 866-686-6706 toll-free).

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:44:23 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:44:23 -0400
Subject: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?

Source: KRQE News 13 - Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA

<http://www.krqe.com/expanded.asp?ID=3D14935>

5/2/2006

Watch Video:

<http://www.krqe.com/video/expanded.asp?ID=3D4041>

Could 1964 UFO Be Lunar Lander?

SOCORRO, NM -- Something strange happened in the desert near Socorro NM, on a spring night 42 years ago, and a State Police officer was there to report it.

It has become known as the Zamora UFI Incident, named for officer Lonnie Zamora. While not as publicized as the legendary Roswell Incident, this UFO landing made national headlines at the time sparking intrigue and speculation ever since.

Experts who investigated the case have no doubt that he saw what he said he saw. But after years of harassment and ridicule, Zamora, now 73 and living in Socorro, vowed in 1994 never to speak of the incident again.

On April 24, 1964, Zamora chased a speeding vehicle southeast of Socorro. "Up about the time I came to this little road, I heard a loud roar=85a blast," Zamora told a radio station in one of his many interviews in the following days.

Sticking his head out the window, he saw what he described as a flying egg about the size of a car. Zamora also saw what looked like two people wearing white coveralls standing outside the mystery craft, and it appeared to be lifting off.

"I went up close, about 200 feet from it and got out of the car when it started making noise and the flame under it," he told his radio host. "I got scared and started running back.

"I radioed for help from the car."

These days, Zamora doesn't like to talk about what happened, but his report was taken very seriously at the time. The State Police and the U.S. Air Force launched an investigation setting off a frenzy of speculation about the mystery object and whether Zamora had an out-of-this world close encounter.

Whatever happened on that Friday night in 1964 is considered one of the most credible alleged UFO incidents in history. Not only was the witness credible - a police officer - there was actual physical evidence: a half-burned bush, imprints in the area where the legs sat, shoe prints.

"I think the policeman was sincere when he thought he saw something strange." said Dave Thomas of New Mexicans for Science

and Reason. "I don't think it came all the way from outer space."

The scientists in Thomas=92 group have a theory about what Zamora really saw on that fateful night. Their evidence for this new theory begins with a page from the log book at the White Sands Missile Range, the expansive test range whose northern border extends to the area of Zamora=92s patrol.

"The Socorro Incident in 1964 might have been an American spacecraft that was being tested at the north end of White Sands Missile Range," Thomas said. According to the log, that American spacecraft was an early prototype for a "surveyor," which evolved five years later to a lunar vehicle during the Apollo missions.

There's also the lunar lander, a NASA vehicle flown by astronaut Neil Armstrong just months before he landed on the moon. In 1964, there were only two of these landers in existence, and one of them was delivered to White Sands in April, the same month as Zamora=92s famous encounter.

Yet the skeletal landers don't match Zamora=92s description of an egg-shaped craft

"Especially with the surveyor experiments, the craft was being held up by a miniature Bell helicopter, so the combination of the helicopter holding this contraption with the legs and jets, I think would have looked very strange." Thomas said.

There are still plenty of believers who are convinced that aliens visited Socorro that warm April night. The star witness himself, however, has always looked for a more down-to-earth explanation.

"What was your immediate reaction when you realized this may be an object from outer space?" one of his radio hosts asked.

"Well, I didn't think it was an object from outer space because I don't believe in those things," Zamora replied.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 10:53:51 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:51:05 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Dickenson

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 16:23:59 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

<snip>

>So it could be that psychology and Ufology are both pioneers in
>this new reality of inherently sparse observation. Is there a
>solution? Maybe not - after all, why should we assume that
>everything that goes on in the universe is going to be
>detectable from the minute goldfish bowl, in which we happen to
>be trapped in our insignificant corner of the cosmos? Or maybe
>there is a solution, using techniques of inference which are
>currently unimaginable.

>I for one certainly don't know. Any ideas?

Hi Cathy,

Neither do I.

But Planck said - "The increasing distance of the physical world
picture from the world of the senses means nothing but a
progressive approach to the real world."

In other words, whatever's 'seen' - is not 'reality'.

Frustrating isn't it?

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Hudson Valley UFO Meeting Tonight @ 7:30 -

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 05:59:05 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 07:12:50 -0400
Subject: Re: Hudson Valley UFO Meeting Tonight @ 7:30 -

>From: Vinny Polise <Pinebushufo.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 20:42:03 EDT
>Subject: Hudson Valley UFO Meeting Tonight @ 7:30

>Just wanted to update you all about Wednesday night's meeting.

>Many of you come to the meetings and that is greatly
>appreciated.

>Please, especially all the new members, take a ride up and go to
>the monthly meetings. They are very informative and the people
>are just excellent.

>I apologize about the late notice (under 24 hours) but I do my
>best... If anyone needs help finding a place to sit and watch
>please speak up! We are all here to help... no critics here!

>Again get yourself to the most informative meetings every first
>Wednesday of the month.....

Hiya!

Do any of these fantastic people ever talk about John Ford?
Seems he's an unsung local pioneer of an interest shared by
the group... and if crazy? Was driven to it with psychotropic
drugs against his will and the unethically illegal activities
of official agencies confounding him? Maybe?

Does he ever come up in discussion? Guy seems to rot in prison
for very lawfully persecuting the sum of your interest up there,
eh? How long did John Powell, the object of the, so-called,
'plot' - stay in prison for his real crimes...

You know? It would seem Suffolk County and the Republican party
of same owes Ford millions just for the violations of his civil
rights.

.Restore John Ford and profit from it? A settlement could be
huge. Plenty for everybody...

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Air Cases - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 06:37:48 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 07:57:01 -0400
Subject: Re: Air Cases - Lehmborg

>From: Gary Matteson <mystrius.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 20:30:49 -0500
>Subject: Re: Air Cases

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 17:20:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Air Cases

>>>From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 20:00:48 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Air Cases

>>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 15:10:13 -0300
>>>>Subject: Air Cases

>>>>John, I have no idea why you are on this List but it has
>>>>nothing to do with the investigation of the phenomenon. You
>>>>pretend to be above it all when really you are just wasting
>>>>time while stroking your own ego for, but what purpose I can't
>>>>imagine.

>>>>Not at all; I just don't like to see people getting away with
>>>>their anti-scientific speculations, and irrational rejection of
>>>>sensible explanations for UFO reports.

>>Nonsense Mr. Harney. Proud Science should not pretend to be the
>>final arbiter of that which it reflexively and summarily
>>discounts, that which it criticizes in a facile manner, and
>>in the final analysis, that which it refuses to even look at.

>Hello, Alfred Lehmborg.

>In the not too brief time I've followed the UFO UpDates List, I
>do not remember a time or two only, when I questioned your wit
>and wisdom.

>My conviction is, even if it's only a few more persons, however
>surreptitiously, they are coming on board to examine the basis
>for ages long reports of anomalous events as discussed here.

>I'd care to think your view of science as relates to things
>ufological would moderate a bit by reading a Paul Von Ward book
>I am currently reading, Gods, Genes And Consciousness.

>Even if at a snail's pace, I have reason to believe the trend is
>changing for the better.

>Of course, I may be in error.

Hey Mr. Matteson;

I understand that Real science is awash with real scientists,
some of these in an 'invisible' (read timid) college, who have
done the real work of that real science at professional and

personal peril to themselves, as it pertains to UFOs, so I don't think my views need much moderating. That said I'll put your book on my list.

My contention is with selected individuals who, in my view, use the bully pulpit that same system _against_ itself - to the discredit of all I add - to prosecute a stolid status quo as bereft of relevancy as it is of courage and consistency. That's what chaps my ass. I'll eat 'em when I can.

Thanks for the note.

alienview.nul

www.AlienView.net

AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 07:38:59 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 07:58:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

>Source: KRQE News 13 - Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA

><http://www.krqe.com/expanded.asp?ID=14935>

>5/2/2006

>Watch Video:

><http://www.krqe.com/video/expanded.asp?ID=4041>

>Could 1964 UFO Be Lunar Lander?

<snip>

I think the answer to the question, is "No", and the descriptive evidence appears to support that. An examination of the test records regarding the lunar lander prototypes has been conducted and surrounding air fields were queried by the Air Force to see if they were aware of any experimental flights.

This makes for a very good feature story to follow up on a topic that most listeners and readers know little about, and could help to shape it in a mythological sense later, but there little investigation or science behind it (IMO).

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 07:38:38 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 10:33:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 07:38:59 -0400
>Subject: Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?

>>>Could 1964 UFO Be Lunar Lander?

><snip>

>I think the answer to the question, is "No", and the descriptive
>evidence appears to support that. An examination of the test
>records regarding the lunar lander prototypes has been conducted
>and surrounding air fields were queried by the Air Force to see
>if they were aware of any experimental flights.

>This makes for a very good feature story to follow up on a topic
>that most listeners and readers know little about, and could
>help to shape it in a mythological sense later, but there little
>investigation or science behind it (IMO).

Hi Steve,

And don't forget the 'Bean' at [Jay Nelson's]:

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

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Friedman Reviews Clancy

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 14:18:52 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 14:18:52 -0400
Subject: Friedman Reviews Clancy

Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website

<http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

April 23, 2006

Review of Susan Clancy's

Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by Aliens

Harvard University Press 2005
179 pages

by Stanton T. Friedman

I hadn't had high hopes for the book *Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by Aliens* by Dr. Susan A. Clancy. After all, the segment about abductions which featured her on Peter Jennings's grossly-misleading 'documentary' on February 24, 2005, was definitely unscientific. The focus was on sleep paralysis with no recognition being given to multiple persons being abducted at once, that most abductions take place other than when the abductee was sleeping in bed, and that many people recalled the details without the use of hypnosis. This despite the fact that all of these had been discussed by Budd Hopkins during his PJ interview, but never made the program. I also was not impressed with what she had to say on last July's Larry King TV show. Still I was shocked by how much bias and prejudice she shows in the book. She should have been flunked for her gross inaccuracy in her accounts, brief though they were, of various cases about which I am well informed. Remember that her so-called research was conducted at Harvard University using government research grants and the book was published by Harvard University Press. I guess they couldn't afford a fact checker.

She describes how she got into abduction research because she had been working on the false memory syndrome with regard to sexual abuse of children. There was always the problem of determining whether any abuse had ever taken place. Abductions would be much easier because "Here was a group that had 'repressed memories', but the memories would be much less painful to hear about than memories of childhood sexual abuse." No basis is given for this silly proclamation. Dr. Benjamin Simon, an outstanding psychiatrist who used medical hypnosis to help numerous shell shock war veterans regain horrifying memories and work through them, had even told Dr. James McDonald that the intensity of emotion in the Betty and Barney Hill sessions was sometimes more intense than any he had found in the military cases he had treated. I have seen the movie the Army made starring Dr. Simon about treatment of a host of anguished war veterans and their amnesia.

She goes on, "Even better, alien abductees were people who had developed memories of a traumatic event that I could be fairly certain had never occurred. A major problem with my research on false memory creation by victims of alleged sexual abuse was

that it was almost impossible to determine whether they had in fact, been abused. I needed to repeat the study with a population that I could be sure had 'recovered' false memories." Alien abduction seemed to fit the bill. She notes how she would use the same techniques with the abductees as with the sexual abuse people, and addressed the "corroboration issue since it was certain the event hadn't happened." It is hard to imagine so-called research starting out with such strong bias. Is this what passes for research at Harvard University?

Dr. Clancy describes how she got her study population. She advertised in newspapers seeking subjects "Have you been abducted by aliens?" Would she have asked for pilots or brain surgeons or persons speaking Croatian without checking their credentials?

She dumped any she thought were psychotic, for which, I suppose, we should be grateful. It isn't clear that she accepted any subjects who claimed that they had been abducted with somebody else and not out of their beds and who hadn't been hypnotized. She does admit her preconceptions that people thinking they had been abducted played Dungeons and Dragons as a kid, were computer programmers or sci-fi buffs and had attended Star Trek conventions. What is really crazy here, to me as a scientist, is that normally one expects somebody beginning research in a new area to do a literature search first. She couldn't be bothered. However, she insists "I believe I have read every account of alien abduction ever published, and just about everything that social psychologists, psychoanalysts, post modernists, journalists, physicists, biologists and ex-military personal [sic] have to say about them... I've watched nearly every American movie and TV show ever made about aliens." If she did, she must have been sleep-walking, as she seems to get almost everything wrong.

Here is a typical example of her gross inaccuracy. Speaking of a meeting with a number of abductees she says, "Highlight of Saturday evening was a conversation with two brothers from Manchester, New Hampshire. These men were relatively well known abductees who had written a book about their experiences. One night in the late 1960s they had been canoeing on a lake in Maine and had seen some weird lights across the water. A few years later one had fallen down an elevator shaft at work; he'd suffered brain damage, developed epilepsy and became severely depressed." The simple fact of the matter is that there were four people involved, not two; the event took place in August, 1976, not in the 1960s. The book *The Allagash Abductions* was written by an experienced investigator, engineer Raymond Fowler, not by the brothers. It was based on data obtained independently from each of the four. The book is, of course, not referenced though she has 14 pages of noted references including 146 items. Her own "research" papers were each cited several times.

Clancy not only seems to consider herself a truly knowledgeable abductionist, but also an expert on UFOs in general. "So far as we know there is no evidence that aliens exist." "You can't disprove alien abductions. All you can do is argue that they're improbable." Obviously she didn't intend this next comment to be referring to herself: "The Confirmatory bias=97% the tendency to seek or interpret evidence favorable to existing belief or reinterpret unfavorable evidence is ubiquitous, even among scientists." Amen, and she provides many examples of her own tendency. "We don't accept the alien abduction explanation because there is no external evidence to support it." Isn't it amazing that she never discusses physical trace cases, at least 16% of which involve reports of strange beings? She doesn't mention the many cases in which abductees separately indicate that missing time was confirmed. She never mentions Marjorie Fish's star map work connected with the Betty and Barney Hill case, though she does mention the case.

As might be expected, her comments are seriously in error. She says "Betty had spotted a bright star that seemed to be pursuing them. Nervous, they had turned off the main highway onto narrow mountain roads arriving home two hours later than expected." And she claims to have read *The Interrupted Journey* ??? Sounds to me like she read a Parade Magazine piece, by Carl Sagan, which makes the same false claims. They had both observed the large object at close range with binoculars, for goodness sake. There was a double row of windows through which Barney recalled seeing strange beings.. without hypnosis. Starlike??? She says, "Betty

was a long time believer. Betty was a fan of science fiction movies featuring aliens (she had seen Invaders from Mars) and had already read Donald Keyhoe's Flying Saucers Are Real .

This is more unadulterated hogwash. Betty read the book AFTER the experience, had not been a sci-fi fan, or seen the movie. Clancy says Betty and Barney were "advised to undergo hypnosis, in order to determine whether, as she firmly suspected, they had been abducted." Their purpose was to see if the Doctor could rid Barney of his ulcers and find out what happened during the missing time. Clancy then says Barney had seen "The Bellerophon Shield," an episode of the science fiction TV series The Outer Limits, and that his drawing of an alien is based on what he saw. Simon had asked him about sci-fi movies. He and Betty were too busy to watch such stuff. It would be interesting to know just where Clancy's misinformation comes from besides her fertile imagination. She certainly hadn't read the book carefully or Terence Dickinson's The Zeta Reticuli Incident or watched the UFO Incident on NBC or spoken with Betty or Barney or Dr. Simon or John Fuller or even Betty's niece, Kathy Marden, very familiar with the case and possessor of Betty's files. John Fuller's files are at Boston University not far from Harvard. Clancy obviously hadn't been there either. I have done all these things. An artist I know watched "The Bellerophon Shield" and indicated that the alien's facial features did not match drawings made in response to Barney's description and was about 6 feet tall or much taller than the Hill aliens.

Demonstrating both her bias and ignorance, she claims, "Betty and Barney Hill=97the mom and pop of abductees=97became famous in abduction history in the 1960s because, in the words of Seth Shostak, an astronomer associated with the SETI Institute, "They were more or less Mr. and Mrs. Front Porch." An interracial couple in New England in 1961 were hardly Mr. and Mrs. Front Porch, whatever that is supposed to mean. Surely no reasonable person could consider Seth Shostak an expert on any aspect of ufology, no less abductions. I debated with him for three hours on Coast to Coast Radio (audience vote was 57% for me, 33% for him, 10% undecided) and have read many of his articles and books. He never displays any knowledge of abductions or UFOs in general. There are no references to large-scale scientific studies such as Blue Book Special Report 14, or Dr. Hynek's The UFO Experience or the Congressional Hearings of 1968. His comments on Larry King and Peter Jennings demonstrate no knowledge at all, though they certainly demonstrate his confirmatory bias. Clancy and Shostak certainly share an affinity for "Don't bother me with the facts, my mind is made up," and "What the public doesn't know, I won't tell them," and "Do your research by proclamation, investigation is too much trouble."

Clancy doesn't discuss the UFO evidence either. She almost gets into the Condon Report with this strange comment: "In 1969, the National Academy of Sciences sponsored a study of all the available evidence on UFOs. The conclusion: 'On the basis of present knowledge, the least likely explanation of unidentified flying objects is the hypothesis of extraterrestrial visitations by intelligent beings.'" The fact is, this is from a brief summary by the NAS at the beginning of the 965-page Condon report. The NAS didn't sponsor the study. The Air Force did. It was certainly not a study of all available evidence. The NAS review committee did no investigations itself=97not one single case.

Clancy misrepresents the Travis Walton case, speaking disdainfully of his books claiming he was abducted two weeks after the Hill case movie and describing his experience on National TV. No mention, of course, of his being gone for five days and the initial zapping being observed by five other people, and all the rest of the investigative work done by APRO and others.

Clancy mentions Kenneth Arnold flying his "private jet." It was very definitely a prop plane and there was a ground witness. Her clear and unambiguous bias=97there are no UFOs and no aliens=97is demonstrated by her comment, "Show me an alien and I'll believe they exist." This is scientific? She only believes in the existence of things she can see???? Surely that leaves out love, hate, neutrons, gamma rays, black holes, etc.

As might be expected, Clancy gets Roswell all wrong. She repeats

garbage from Air Force disinformation expert Colonel Weaver that Jesse Marcel's story first came out in the National Enquirer in 1978=97even though it was 1980, and after Bill Moore and I had spoken with sixty-two people about the case. I gave the late Bob Pratt, who wrote the article, Jesse's contact information. She has the date the rancher Mac Brazel found the wreckage and the date he came into town, the date Jesse went out, and other details, all wrong.

Clancy says that The Roswell Incident claimed that "Pieces of aliens had been among the debris. This was attested to by more than seventy witnesses who had some knowledge of the event." This is totally false; no such claim is made in the book, to which I was a major contributor. She really blasts off: "The evidence for a crashed spaceship and dead extraterrestrials was entirely anecdotal consisting of firsthand reports from people who 'wished to remain anonymous' and even more tenuous second and third hand reports (so-and-so told what's-his-name who told me that such-and-such really happened thirty years ago)." This nonsense comes from a woman claiming to have read everything about UFOs and aliens. I am a physicist who has written more than eighty UFO articles and two books relating to Roswell and was a major contributor to The Roswell Incident. No, I am not referenced at all. There are lots of real people named by me and Don Berliner and Kevin Randle and Don Schmitt=97none referenced=97and other serious researchers as opposed to Clancy's pseudoscientific claims. The video "Recollections of Roswell" has firsthand testimony from twenty-seven witnesses=97all named.

One could write a lot more about the trash in this book and the self-serving nonsense about being objective. Not surprisingly there is a blurb on the back from Dr. Elizabeth Loftus, one of the leaders of the False Memory Syndrome cult-like group: "Abducted is an enormously brave, smart, original book." I suppose that is true once one recognizes that most of it is Fiction masquerading as Truth.

Stan Friedman

fsphys.nul
www.stantonfriedman.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Secrecy News -- 05/03/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 12:37:17 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 14:27:26 -0400
Subject: Re: Secrecy News -- 05/03/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 54
May 3, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** CURING ANALYTIC PATHOLOGIES
** JASON ON QUANTIFICATIONS OF MARGINS AND UNCERTAINTIES
** CRS REPORTS THAT BEGIN WITH AN "I"

CURING ANALYTIC PATHOLOGIES

A new study published by the CIA Center for the Study of Intelligence calls for a fundamental reconceptualization of the process of intelligence analysis in order to overcome the "pathologies" that have rendered it increasingly dysfunctional.

"Curing Analytic Pathologies" by Jeffrey R. Cooper has been available up to now in limited circulation in hard copy only. Like several other recent studies critical of U.S. intelligence, it was withheld from the CIA web site. It has now been published on the Federation of American Scientists web site.

Author Cooper provides a thoughtful critique that notes the intrinsic difficulties of intelligence analysis and observes how current organizational practices have exacerbated them.

"The Intelligence Community presently lacks many of the scientific community's self-correcting features," he writes.

One major impediment to improving analysis is the hypertrophied secrecy practices that prevail in intelligence organizations.

"Unfortunately, the more that evidence and judgments are restricted in dissemination by compartmentation and distribution limitations, the more likely it is that questionable judgments will pass unchallenged."

Fundamentally, the whole concept of the "intelligence cycle" -- referring to the conventional sequence of collection, processing, analysis and dissemination -- is misleading, Cooper argues, and should be jettisoned.

"With its industrial age antecedents, it usually conveys the notion of a self-contained 'batch' process rather than a continuous spiral of interactions."

Taking Cooper's thesis seriously, one could respectfully say that his new study embodies some of the defects in intelligence analysis that he writes about.

Thus, the study presents what is essentially one moment in an ongoing conversation and freezes it in a nicely produced but

static document. This reflects the kind of spurious finality that Cooper dismisses as the "conceit of finished intelligence."

And then the CIA, by disseminating the document in hardcopy only, sharply limited its audience and effectively precluded a "continuous spiral of interactions" regarding its contents.

That last part, at least, can be corrected.

See "Curing Analytic Pathologies: Pathways to Improved Intelligence Analysis" by Jeffrey R. Cooper, Center for the Study of Intelligence, December 2005 (5 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/cia/product/curing.pdf>

Author Cooper said he would welcome feedback from interested readers. Comments can be posted on the Secrecy News blog:

http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/2006/05/curing_analytic_pathologies.html

Alternatively, Cooper's contact information can be obtained from Secrecy News.

JASON ON QUANTIFICATIONS OF MARGINS AND UNCERTAINTIES

The latest study by the JASON scientific advisory panel to be approved for public release has the forbidding title "Quantifications of Margins and Uncertainties" (QMU).

The meaning of this term is somewhat elusive, as discussed in the report, but it involves a methodology for assessing the reliability of complex technical systems, and specifically the performance and safety of the U.S. nuclear stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing.

After a lengthy review process, the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration released the March 2005 report in its entirety in response to a Freedom of Information Act request from the Federation of American Scientists.

See "Quantifications of Margins and Uncertainties," March 23, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/jason/margins.pdf>

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) relied on the JASON report in a recent study on the nuclear weapons stockpile that also included a relatively clear description of QMU.

See "Nuclear Weapons: NNSA Needs to Refine and More Effectively Manage Its New Approach for Assessing and Certifying Nuclear Weapons," GAO Report No. GAO-06-261, February 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/gao/gao-06-261.pdf>

The somewhat mysterious JASON panel was the subject of Ann Finkbeiner's well-received new book, "The JASONS: The Secret History of Science's Postwar Elite" (SN, 04/06/06).

CRS REPORTS THAT BEGIN WITH AN "I"

Some notable recent reports of the Congressional Research Service include the following:

"Intelligence Issues for Congress," updated April 10, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/IB10012.pdf>

"Iran: U.S. Concerns and Policy Responses," updated April 6, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL32048.pdf>

"Israel: U.S. Foreign Assistance," updated April 26, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/IB85066.pdf>

"India-U.S. Relations," updated April 6, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/row/IB93097.pdf>

"Indonesia: Domestic Politics, Strategic Dynamics, and American Interests," updated April 3, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/row/RL32394.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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 18:01:27 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 14:39:13 -0400
Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Miller

>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 13:44:28 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 21:27:29 +0100 (BST)
>>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 15:00:23 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>>>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2006 20:12:22 +0100 (BST)
>>>>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

<snip>

Hi James,

Firstly, thank you for a much clearer explanation of your views.

>>So the suits in your government are a bunch of liars yet you
>>come down hard on the concept of whistleblowers who tend to
>>highlight the lies your government tells.

>I am saying government officials have their own agenda in
>pronouncements and we do not know what it is.

>So any statements they make may be a lie.

>Since we do not know for sure which statements are lies or
>non-lies, we must assume they are all lies unless we have
>proof otherwise. But where can we get proof? Do we trust data
>from the government or do we try to obtain our own data
>independently? I say the latter.

I think to assume that all government statements and utterances
are lies unless there is proof to the contrary is a bit strong.
It is impractical to waste one's time trying to prove what they
say all the time so there has to be some element of trust
somewhere surely.

>Whistleblowers are also not to be assumed as pure truth-tellers
>either. Who knows what their agenda is? Who knows whether they
>have been intentionally misled?

>Blatant acceptance of either government or whistleblowers
>group is not prudent. Independent proof is needed.

No argument with the above.

<snip>

>As such, I am somewhat disturbed when people decide

>_on_their_own_ to release classified information (or which
>may be classified if it had gone through the right channels).
>One would hope that the whole rationale of classified
>information is to help in the security and defense of the
>country. I naively think that a large percentage of such
>documents truly pertain to maintaining the country's
>security.

Any casual persual of Steve Aftergoods FAS site will immediately show you there is massive over clasification. Classification is the knee jerk reaction of many if not most government departments. No one wants to know America's or the UK's nuclear secrets but at the same time, there is such a thing as public interest and open government. Finding the balance is the key but that balance has never been found and it has always tilted in the government's favour. Time for a change. And whistle blowers help with that change.

>You seem to want to know everything that is going on in secret
>in the government, perhaps because you do not trust them. My
>belief is that many secrets (not all) are for the security and
>defense and thus it makes no sense for the public to know
>unless one wants to reduce security and defense (or doesn't
>care). Statements by the government may be made that are
>>false in order to not reveal secrets and thus maintain
>security and defense.

I don't want to know "everything that is going on in secret in the government" but I certainly do want to know what any government knows about UFO's. Why not? After all, it doesn't relate to national security in any way whatsoever, does it? That's what they tell us so, why can't they tell us? Because they haven't got a clue themselves? Too bad. I won't think any the worse of them. In fact I'd sympathise.

>Trust must be earned. If you can independently verify
>governement data, then its okay.

>All this may seem like paranoia, but its really just the
>application of logic. The whole point of discussing this is
>that there is a group of UFOlogists who think that if they
>get cooperation and answers from the government, then all is
>well.

Well if we did get cooperation then it would be more than we're getting right now. And if those answers were backed up with open reasoning instead of just blanket statements, then what would be wrong with that?

>Such an approach seems to have many flaws that cannot be
>resolved without independent verification using instrumented
>field research. Are you going to be satisfied if the
>government makes the official pronouncement that UFOs can all
>be explained and are not alien?

I don't want to hear what I would like to hear. I would like to hear the truth. My views however on field research have mellowed quite a bit more since my last reply to Rob Kritkauskys and just by my own reasoning, I can see some of my errors. Ignoring the element of speed, a very obvious one, is one of them. But you seem to pin this up as the be all and I still have some reservations about it and am also mystified as to why you appear to want to block out any other avenue of investigation.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 18:11:05 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 14:42:14 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Miller

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 19:35:21 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 16:16:49 +0100 (BST)
>>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:30:20 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>><snip>

>>>Ufology is dead in the same way that psychical research is
>>>dead, as after almost a century and a half of research the
>>>latter has produced absolutely nothing that might be said to
>>>expand the range of human understanding.

>>So, Ufology is dead, ghost hunting is dead, and you spend
>>your weekend at a conference about pink dog faeces and frogs
>>with testicles the size of the moon.

>>I'm telling you, you really can't make this drivel up.

>>BTW - I thought conferences were where shiester researchers
>>and other purveyors of lies went in order to sell more
>>books and line their pockets, or is that just UFO
>>conferences? What did you buy there John?

>The tickets were freebies, bought nothing at the conference
>(stood a couple of rounds in the pub afterwards) and had a
>bloody good time with a group of people - sceptics and non-
>sceptics - with many contrasting views, who are capable of
>conducting a genuine discussion without descending into school
>yard name-calling. The basic difference between most Fortean
>and many ufologists.

>I don't recall any talks on dog faeces or frogs testes; but
>those I did hear were all most interesting and well argued,
>even if I didn't agree with them.

>Try to get along for next year's UnCon, Stuart, you might even
>enjoy it, you obviously need something to enjoy, stuck up
>there in Altrincham.

I could never attend one of those John. I'm not middle class
enough, I don't have a serious beard, I don't smoke a pipe, I'm
too young, I don't care for home brewed beer and I don't wear
anoraks.

At least now we know that any conference is, after all, OK as
long as one doesn't have to pay for the tickets.

And I'd not be quite so quick to knock Altrincham. I wasn't
kidding when I said I'd go off and sort out a conference. Watch

this space.

On another point, a few days ago I said this;

>If what John H. wrote is a true reflection of his views, then
>again it brings up the question of why he is here. No, this is
>not another suggestion that they leave this List, very far
>from it, but it seems their presence here is nothing short of
>an evangelical mission, which is kind of ironic, isn't it, to
>convince us foolhardy ignoramus's that we are on the wrong
>road, are fatally misguided and deluded, and that if only we
>could see sense - their sense, then the cloud of obscurity
>would be lifted and all would be well.

And your evil twin said, in reply to a similar query from Don Ledger:

>Not at all; I just don't like to see people getting away with
>their anti-scientific speculations, and irrational rejection
>of sensible explanations for UFO reports.

Seems I was right.

I presume as the two of you are joined at the hip, his mission is yours as well. In order to assist, I would gently suggest that you might try the Toys RUS site for plastic armour, toy swords, white knight all-in-one suits and plastic horses so you can ride to the rescue of us all. We're ever so grateful and if you are going to save us from our ignorance and "anti-scientific speculations" then you might as well look the part.

<http://tinyurl.com/m3yhv>

And keep your hands to yourself at the checkout!

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 14:15:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 16:24:18 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Lehmborg

>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website

><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>April 23, 2006

>Review of Susan Clancy's

>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by Aliens

>Harvard University Press 2005

>179 pages

>by Stanton T. Friedman

>I hadn't had high hopes for the book Abducted: How people Come
>to Believe They Were Kidnapped by Aliens by Dr. Susan A.
>Clancy. After all, the segment about abductions which featured
>her on Peter Jennings's grossly-misleading 'documentary' on
>February 24, 2005, was definitely unscientific.

<snip>

Seems the 'blond' was leading the 'blind' after all... and
all those blond jokes were abundantly appropriate.

alienview.nul

www.AlienView.net

AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 3](#)

Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Smith

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 15:57:15 -0400 (EDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 16:26:50 -0400
Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence? - Smith

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 18:01:27 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>>From: James Smith <zeus001002.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 13:44:28 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: CE3/4/5 Evidence?

>Firstly, thank you for a much clearer explanation of your views.

Glad to be able to make myself more clearly understood.

Note: I have a new email. JC Smith=James Smith.

>>I am saying government officials have their own agenda in
>>pronouncements and we do not know what it is.
>>So any statements they make may be a lie.
>>Since we do not know for sure which statements are lies or
>>non-lies, we must assume they are all lies unless we have
>>proof otherwise. But where can we get proof? Do we trust data
>>from the government or do we try to obtain our own data
>>independently? I say the latter.

>I think to assume that all government statements and utterances
>are lies unless there is proof to the contrary is a bit strong.
>It is impractical to waste one's time trying to prove what they
>say all the time so there has to be some element of trust
>somewhere surely.

Yes, in the real world we have to make assumptions of truth
without verification otherwise we won't get anything done.
However, for our purpose in this forum, when we focus
specifically upon UFOs as the topic the government would make a
pronouncement about, it is safest to assume the statements are
lies until "proven" otherwise. If you want to accept their
statements as gospel regardless of proof, then obviously you
will be setting yourself up for disappointment when they state
UFOs are all prosaic. I am sure you want any statements they
make about UFOs to be accompanied by "proof", but, again, without
an independent means of acquiring proof, we keep having to
accept their word for it at some level.

For instance, they can trot out all sorts of "proof" that UFOs
are prosaic. Does that get us anywhere since they can pick and
choose the cases and/or make up the data? Even if they want to
show UFOs are alien ships, we have a similar problem, although
UFO proponents may be less inclined to disagree with them if
they gave us a FLIR video of alien spaceships harassing an Air
Force jet.

So much depends on their intent and motivation,
not only of the politicians, but the bureaucrats
and military-types, none of which likely coincide.

>>As such, I am somewhat disturbed when people decide
>>on their own to release classified information (or which
>>may be classified if it had gone through the right channels).

>>One would hope that the whole rationale of classified
>>information is to help in the security and defense of the
>>country. I naively think that a large percentage of such
>>documents truly pertain to maintaining the country's
>>security.

>Any casual persual of Steve Aftergoods FAS site will immediately
>show you there is massive over clasification. Classification is
>the knee jerk reaction of many if not most government
>departments. No one wants to know America's or the UK's nuclear
>secrets but at the same time, there is such a thing as public
>interest and open government. Finding the balance is the key but
>that balance has never been found and it has always tilted in
>the government's favour. Time for a change. And whistle blowers
>help with that change.

Upon reconsideration, I think you are right that there is a
tendency for officials to over-classify, especially since 9-11.
It is much simpler to classify things (or simply shred after
self-defined retention periods) than to spend time trying to
determine if it can be released. Yet, the overwhelming majority
of governmental organizations have reams of unclassified stuff
no one really is interested in. Of course there is the good-ole
FOIA which, if tedious and time consuming and somewhat
fallible/unsatisfactory, at least offers the opportunity for
legitimate reclassification.

I agree with you that the balance is hard to obtain given the
landscape of enemies the West finds itself confronting. But the
topic of UFOs and military defense do seem like touchy, likely-
classifiable topics which I would be surprised if they were
significantly public unless there was absolutely nothing to UFOs
(i.e. all prosaic).

Whistleblowers do serve a purpose in general (see Shuttle), and
there may be scenarios where they could be useful for advancing
understanding of UFOs. Still, what they do is highly risky to
both themselves and our security and I wonder if it is worth
such risk.

>>You seem to want to know everything that is going on in secret
>>in the government, perhaps because you do not trust them. My
>>belief is that many secrets (not all) are for the security and
>>defense and thus it makes no sense for the public to know
>>unless one wants to reduce security and defense (or doesn't
>>care). Statements by the government may be made that are
>>>false in order to not reveal secrets and thus maintain
>>security and defense.

>I don't want to know "everything that is going on in secret in
>the government" but I certainly do want to know what any
>government knows about UFO's. Why not?
>After all, it doesn't
>relate to national security in any way whatsoever, does it?
>That's what they tell us so, why can't they tell us? Because
>they haven't got a clue themselves? Too bad. I won't think any
>the worse of them. In fact I'd sympathise.

Off the top of my head,

1) UFOs may be secret vehicles of our own making and if a secret
vehicle is known about then it can be countered more easily by
enemies. Why reveal a secret to us even if we helped pay for it
if the reveal will cause the vehicle to lose value?

2) UFOs are hostile (or at least superior) non-terrestrial
vehicles which the government (vastly funded military) can do
nothing about. It does no good for you or us to know this fact
since you or us ALSO have no power to stop the UFOs.

3) UFOs are completely inexplicable to the military but
revealing this shows inherent limits in the sensor
infrastructure which could be exploited by the enemies of the
West. Note that even though it may make us feel better to know
their failings, this really affects security albeit indirectly!

>>Trust must be earned. If you can independently verify
>>governement data, then its okay.

>>All this may seem like paranoia, but its really just the
>>application of logic. The whole point of discussing this is

>>that there is a group of UFOlogists who think that if they
>>get cooperation and answers from the government, then all is
>>well.

>Well if we did get cooperation then it would be more than we're
>getting right now. And if those answers were backed up with open
>reasoning instead of just blanket statements, then what would be
>wrong with that?

They may be interested in cooperation, but they certainly don't
want to cooperate with the vast number of UFOphiles. If there
were scientists investigating the UFO phenomenon (directly or
indirectly), preferably already with instrumented field data in
hand, then it is likely they would be knocking on the door and
asking to play. In my opinion, this would be something to
discourage, but that's just me (since I don't trust their
motives).

>>Such an approach seems to have many flaws that cannot be
>>resolved without independent verification using instrumented
>>field research. Are you going to be satisfied if the
>>government makes the official pronouncement that UFOs can all
>>be explained and are not alien?

>I don't want to hear what I would like to hear. I would like to
>hear the truth.

But that's the rub, how can you determine truth unless you
determine the truth (raw data) yourself?

>My views however on field research have mellowed
>quite a bit more since my last reply to Rob Kritkausky and just
>by my own reasoning, I can see some of my errors. Ignoring the
>element of speed, a very obvious one, is one of them. But you
>seem to pin this up as the be all and I still have some
>reservations about it and am also mystified as to why you appear
>to want to block out any other avenue of investigation.

I don't really want to block these avenues.

People will do what they want to do based on their skills,
interests, etc. But looking back at the past mountain of UFO
cases/photos, I am not hopeful that one or two more mountains of
UFO cases/photos is going to make any difference in resolving
the issue of what UFOs are. Sure it make some slight impact on
whether people believe UFOs are possible. It may show trends in
locational/temporal acitivity useful for sensor placement. It may
show special effects which point the way to new types of
sensors.

The exopolitics/disclosure approach is questionable based on my
assumptions regarding governmental/whistleblower motivations.
Too many convolutions (i.e.cross/doublecross) in that data
stream. Sure there may be some useful data, but it must be
correlated with other independent sources.

Anybody besides Rob and Kyle King who is interested in this kind
of UFO research, let me 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: Pelicanism - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 16:38:32 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 07:44:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Pelicanism - White

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 11:36:39 -0500
>Subject: Pelicanism [was: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up]

<snip>

>Specifically, the theory - if that's the word for it - was
>concocted by Scottish debunker James Easton. In the discussion
>that followed, physicists and other scientific sophisticates
>demonstrated that the explanation could not be true for a
>variety of reasons, not the least of which is that it makes
>claims that the laws of physics cannot sustain.

Someone should have asked those esteemed 'scientists' if they were referring to the 'laws of physics' taught at university, or the full set of laws of physics, the extent of which is entirely unknown (and may always be in this life.)

Eleanor White

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 16:48:12 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 07:46:47 -0400
Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up - White

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 17:09:42 -0700
>Subject: Re: You Couldn't Make This Drivel Up

<snip>

>I always thought that religious faith, such as expressed above,
>was largely composed of - or based on-- emotion.

Mine's based on observation of all facets of life, reading the Bible, listening to what other people say, and my experiences (particularly those that seem non-random.) Although I attended church as a youngster, my heartfelt commitment didn't happen until my 40s, after sizing all the above factors up. It came on gradually.

I can't speak for others, but I wouldn't say there was much if any emotion forming my faith.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 07:48:38 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

I find it amazing how many ghost hunting groups there are out there now and the tools they are using to actively seek out ghosts. It seems like almost every town/city has at least one such club/group/society.

Not content with reading about past ghost cases or getting the government's secret information about ghosts or finding the scoop from the latest ghost whistleblower, average folk are going out there to find the truth about ghosts.

And look at the tools they bring to bear on their work. Sure they have cameras, but they also have infrared/thermal detectors/sensors, EMF detectors, ion detectors, Geiger counters and audio recorders of various kinds depending on budget and interest.

Now we must ask ourselves, why are there so many folk willing to spend valuable time (especially sleep time) looking for the truth about ghosts?

Well, it is a critical issue for all thinking beings whether this lifetime is all we got. But also, they seem to have the feeling that they can get closer to an answer by seeking the truth themselves rather than wait for pronouncements of the "experts" (Church?, science?, government?).

Pretty impressive.

Yes, I agree that they are somewhat unscientific and hamhanded and inelegant, but they are learning because they are trying.

So what happened to UFO instrumented field research? People seem interested in getting the truth about UFOs but apart from looking into the sky every once in a while (hopefully with a camera on a tripod), most are willing to allow the Internet or TV tell them the "truth".

Is it because ghost sightings occur much more frequently than UFO sightings???!!! That would be very ironic. True, ghost instrumented field research benefits from the fact that a ghost report location is repeated (i.e. a "haunt") thus the odds should be higher to get some data since the ghost should reappear based on who knows what criteria. But UFOs benefit from the fact that they seem to cover large distances so multiple instrument clusters in fairly separated locales can sight the same object.

My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

A shame really.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 14:17:34 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 07:53:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Kasten

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 14:15:34 -0500
>Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website

>><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>>April 23, 2006

>>Review of Susan Clancy's

>>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were
>Kidnapped by Aliens

>>Harvard University Press 2005
>>179 pages

>>by Stanton T. Friedman

>Seems the 'blond' was leading the 'blind' after all... and
>all those blond jokes were abundantly appropriate.

Alfred:

Stan provides an insightful commentary and all you can
do is provide a sexist retort/flip comment.
I'll be sure to simply delete any e-mail from you in
the future because apparently you have a bias against
blonds. And, I am a blond.

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

From: **Craig Beasley** <fallingleaf.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 16:24:40 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 08:00:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:44:23 -0400
>Subject: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?

>Could 1964 UFO Be Lunar Lander?

>SOCORRO, NM -- Something strange happened in the desert near
>Socorro NM, on a spring night 42 years ago, and a State Police
>officer was there to report it.

>It has become known as the Zamora UFI Incident, named for
>officer Lonnie Zamora. While not as publicized as the legendary
>Roswell Incident, this UFO landing made national headlines at
>the time sparking intrigue and speculation ever since.

<snip>

>"The Socorro Incident in 1964 might have been an American
>spacecraft that was being tested at the north end of White Sands
>Missile Range," Thomas said. According to the log, that American
>spacecraft was an early prototype for a "surveyor," which
>evolved five years later to a lunar vehicle during the Apollo
>missions.

>There's also the lunar lander, a NASA vehicle flown by astronaut
>Neil Armstrong just months before he landed on the moon. In
>1964, there were only two of these landers in existence, and one
>of them was delivered to White Sands in April, the same month as
>Zamora's famous encounter.

>Yet the skeletal landers don't match Zamora's description of an
>egg-shaped craft

>"Especially with the surveyor experiments, the craft was being
>held up by a miniature Bell helicopter, so the combination of
>the helicopter holding this contraption with the legs and jets,
>I think would have looked very strange." Thomas said.

<snip>

This is so utterly bad. Three major points:

1. The spacecraft prototypes for both the Surveyors and the LM would have been tested on the ground, and not as full up flying platforms. The Surveyor *might* have been held in helicopter suspension (for what nonsensical reason), but the LM would never have been.

2. Neither spacecraft had enough thrust to be properly flight tested in Earth's gravity.

3. Specifically for the LM, the flight training and concept testing was conducted by an analog vehicle. An example can be seen at Johnson Space Center in Houston, where all such testing was conducted, IIRC. Furthermore, the training/testing platform and very little crossrange capability and would never had been in Lonnie Zamora's vicinity, even if it had been operated out of Socorro.

Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

This article is just more humorous and somewhat disappointing bilge.

J. Craig Beasley

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: Art School Rationalism? - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 22:16:09 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 08:04:09 -0400
Subject: Re: Art School Rationalism? - Rimmer

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 16:24:38 +0100
>Subject: Art School Rationalism? [was: UFOs Are Back]

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 23:30:20 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>I've responded to this post already, but there's another
>issue here that I thought might merit a thread of its own:

>>The real
>>indicator of ufology's terminal decline is the total lack of new
>>ideas in the subject, and the total inability to form any
>>rational, testable, scientific hypothesis after sixty years of
>>reporting, investigating and theorising.

>I'm just wondering, John, why you cite "rational" and "testable"
>as separate criteria for a scientific hypothesis? A scientific
>hypothesis is, after all, exactly one which is testable. Surely
>you aren't suggesting that science should be subject to
>non-empirical influences?

You're just reading too much into my words here. Naturally
scientific hypotheses should be testable

--
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 22:28:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 08:05:57 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Rimmer

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 18:11:05 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 19:35:21 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 1 May 2006 16:16:49 +0100 (BST)
>>>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>>So, Ufology is dead, ghost hunting is dead, and you spend
>>>your weekend at a conference about pink dog faeces and frogs
>>>with testicles the size of the moon.

>>>I'm telling you, you really can't make this drivell up.

>>>BTW - I thought conferences were where shiester researchers
>>>and other purveyors of lies went in order to sell more
>>>books and line their pockets, or is that just UFO
>>>conferences? What did you buy there John?

>>The tickets were freebies, bought nothing at the conference
>>(stood a couple of rounds in the pub afterwards) and had a
>>bloody good time with a group of people - sceptics and non-
>>sceptics - with many contrasting views, who are capable of
>>conducting a genuine discussion without descending into school
>>yard name-calling. The basic difference between most Fortean
>>and many ufologists.

>>I don't recall any talks on dog faeces or frogs testes; but
>>those I did hear were all most interesting and well argued,
>>even if I didn't agree with them.

>>Try to get along for next year's UnCon, Stuart, you might even
>>enjoy it, you obviously need something to enjoy, stuck up
>>there in Altrincham.

>I could never attend one of those John. I'm not middle class
>enough, I don't have a serious beard, I don't smoke a pipe, I'm
>too young, I don't care for home brewed beer and I don't wear
>anoraks.

As you've never attended a UnCon your total ignorance of the
average attendee is understandable. Most are considerably
younger than me and Harney (which isn't difficult, I'll grant
you), few if any smoke pipes, I can't recall any home-brewed
beer around the place. I didn't check on the social background
of the three or four hundred people there, but by their general
appearance most looked as though they'd be more at home at an
anti-globalization demonstration than reading the Daily Mail in
the saloon bar of the Orange Tree.

>At least now we know that any conference is, after all, OK as
>long as one doesn't have to pay for the tickets.

Absolutely!!!

>And I'd not be quite so quick to knock Altrincham. I wasn't
>kidding when I said I'd go off and sort out a conference. Watch
>this space.

Free tickets for Pelicanists?

--
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 22:04:25 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 08:12:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Ledger

UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website
><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>April 23, 2006

>Review of Susan Clancy's
>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by
>Aliens

>Harvard University Press 2005 179 pages

>by Stanton T. Friedman

Stan,

Why don't you post this in the Amazon review section for the book. It might prevent some people from wasting their money.

<http://tinyurl.com/mq5un>

I note that Scientific American reviewed this as well. Obviously they didn't learn anything from their cock-up over the Korean Stem Cell research fraud perpetrated by Woo Suk Hwang which Sci-Am peer reviewed and reported in Sci-Am.

Michael Shermer blew it as well. He's now supported a book that is full of factual inaccuracies.

Quote:

Michael Shermer, editor of Skeptic Magazine, and author of Why People Believe Weird Things "Clancy [offers] a superb contribution to our understanding of human memory, mental anomalies, and how the mind works."

You might send your piece to him as well, Stan.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Olson

From: **Jeff Olson** <jlolson.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 20:56:09 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 08:14:41 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Olson

UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website
><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>April 23, 2006

>Review of Susan Clancy's
>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by
>Aliens

>Harvard University Press 2005 179 pages

>by Stanton T. Friedman

<snip>

Very well said, Stanton, as always. Much appreciation.

Why do so many "debunkers" believe it's utterly unnecessary to actually know anything about the subject? I'm relatively new to the UFO phenomenon (in terms of actually semi-seriously studying it), and I find this highly puzzling.

Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

PRG Update - May 4, 2006

From: **Stephen G. Bassett** <ParadigmRG.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 00:57:28 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 08:19:26 -0400
Subject: PRG Update - May 4, 2006

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

Update - May 4, 2006

Paradigm Clock

www.paradigmclock.com/paradigmclockportal.html

The Paradigm Clock was reset to 11:59:45 on April 24.
Partial explanations for the new time can be found at:

www.paradigmclock.com/chronicleexplanations.html

PRG Websites
www.paradigmclock.com

The PRG websites portaled at:

www.paradigmclock.com

have undergone a long overdue remodeling and integration.
The PRG hub page at:

www.paradigmclock.com/main.html

best reflects these changes. The effect is to better highlight the total range of projects being pursued by PRG and by other disclosure focused organizations toward ending the truth embargo. More changes and additions are pending.

Campaign 2006: Get Out the Questions

www.x-ppac.org/Get_out_the_questions.html

It's another election year. For the next 6 months, people seeking a seat in the Congress of the United States will be speaking and debating across the country. They want your vote. You have the right and the obligation to ask them about any issue you see fit. If that issue is controversial, all the better. The American electorate has always had the power at its disposal to bring the implications of UFO/ET issue directly to our political leadership. The power resides in the microphones present at every debate, speech, and town hall meeting.

Confront candidates and incumbents with key questions on the issue. They want to serve you, they want your vote - therefore they had better be prepared to answer your questions. At the above URL you will find examples of questions you might copy into your word processor and take with you to the next political forum. They are direct, grounded and supportable and all have one thing in common - even if the candidate refuses to respond, the question itself will inform the public and media present who hear it.

Feel free to pass these questions on to anyone who might be in a position to ask them.

PRG Direct Support Network

www.paradigmclock.com/PRGDirect.htm

PRG Direct=E2=84=A2 is a free service of Paradigm Research Group in support of the researchers, activists, media and philanthropists behind extraterrestrial-related phenomena research and exopolitics. The idea is simple. These individuals sell books, videos and products to support their work. While most items are available from distributors like Amazon.com, when you buy direct the author keeps more of the purchase - 5 to 10 times more.

PRG Direct will link you directly to the author's websites and the selling pages for these products. It will also provide links to business web pages of PRG supporters and the side businesses of researchers and activists.

If you are a researcher, activist or PRG supporter and doing direct sales of books, videos and/or other products, please email PRG for possible inclusion in PRG Direct.

Upcoming Conferences

www.paradigmclock.com/conferences.html

Conspiracy Con May 27-28

www.conspiracycon.com/index1.html

ET Civilizations and World Peace June 9-11

www.exopoliticsinstitute.org/conference.htm

World Peach Forum 2006 June 23-28

www.peaceinspace.org

Paradigm Research Group
E-mail: ParadigmRG.nul
URL: www.paradigmclock.com
Cell: 202-215-8344
4938 Hampden Lane, #161
Bethesda, MD 20814

3rd Annual Exopolitics Expo - The X-Conference

Hilton Gaithersburg - TBA 2006

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

The 'Dark' Cosmos

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 23:04:05 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 08:25:59 -0400
Subject: The 'Dark' Cosmos

Source: Science Frontiers, No. 165, May-Jun 2006, p. 1
Derby, Derbyshire, UK

<http://www.science-frontiers.com>

Astronomy

The 'Dark' cosmos: What's next?
by William R. Corliss

Once upon a time, not really very long ago, the sky was filled with bright stars, wandering planets, and stately galaxies. We thought our eyes took in the entire universe. It was grand but we were blind in many ways. There is much more!

Then along came radio telescopes and satellite carrying instruments that brought quasars, molecular clouds, and entities otherwise invisible into our ken.

Another window to the unseeable opened when astronomers perceived that some sort of gravitational glue kept the spinning spiral galaxies from flying apart and, in addition, that "something else" was accelerating the expansion of the universe. Thus were born dark matter and dark energy - named, but neither seen nor comprehended.

Figuring in everything, we learned that only about 4% of the cosmos is made out of the kind of mass we feel under our feet and see in the heavens. Everything else (96% of the universe) is "dark". It is logical to declare that we really know next to nothing about the universe.

For example, astronomers now add to their catalog Virgo H121, a "dark" galaxy. They know that it is there because it's hydrogen emits radio waves. Its hydrogen alone weighs in at 100 million suns - but there is much, much more to Virgo H121 than hydrogen: a massive complement of dark matter holds Virgo H121 together gravitationally. It is truly a "dark galaxy."

(Anonymous; 'Dark Galaxy', Discover, 26:33, December 2005)

Comments. What else out there is "dark"? To find out we must unshutter our eyes; that is, explore other properties of the cosmos besides electromagnetic radiation, the effects of gravity, and excess expansion of the universe. Some neglected characteristics of cosmos are:

- Seriality and coincidence: the possible tendency of events and things to follow one another and/or clump in time.
- The concentration and flow of information. Information, like mass/energy, in a conserved property of nature. We should map its rivers and lakes on a cosmic scale.
- Sheldrake's (still hypothetical) morphic resonance, that is, the tendency of things to emulate one another.

The anti-Anthropic Principle which compels the cosmos to

assume conditions conducive to life. This is Gaia on a cosmological scale and antithetical to current outlooks, which assume that inert matter 'allows' life to develop.

SCIENCE FRONTIERS is a bimonthly collection of scientific anomalies in the current literature. Published by the Sourcebook Project, P.O. Box 107, Glen Arm, MD 21057 USA. Annual subscription: \$8.00.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:09:39 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:09:39 -0400
Subject: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk'

Source: The Aero-News Network - Winter Haven, Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/poczr>

Thu, 04 May '06

USAF Trackers Keep An Eye Out For 'Space Junk'

Orbital Debris Monitored By GEODSS

Roughly 15,000 miles above the Earth's surface, a communications satellite provides vital information to all branches of the US military. It is one of more than 9,000 items in space that are tracked by the Ground-Based Electro-Optical Deep Space Surveillance System, known as GEODSS.

There are three operational GEODSS sites that report to the 21st Space Wing at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado. They are Detachment 1 in Socorro, NM; Detachment 2 in Southwest Asia; and Detachment 3 in Maui, Hawaii.

Each site is responsible for tracking thousands of known man-made deep-space objects in orbit around the Earth at an altitude of 10,000 to 45,000 kilometers. These objects range from active payloads such as satellites to "space junk" such as debris from launch vehicles and satellite breakups.

"As various on-orbit satellites perform their military, civilian or scientific functions, we monitor the relative presence of every man-made deep-space object in earth orbit," said Bruce Bookout, GEODSS site manager with Northrop Grumman Technical Services.

"Those (who) utilize space to fight the (war on terrorism) need to ensure those assets are available and are under no threat," Mr. Bookout said. "We act as a passive police force, watching for natural or artificial interference."

Each GEODSS site transmits its orbital data to US Strategic Command's Joint Space Operations Center located at Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station in Colorado Springs, Colo. The center maintains a satellite catalog of every man-made object in Earth's orbit.

GEODSS performs its mission using a one-meter telescope equipped with highly sensitive digital camera technology, known as Deep STARE. Each detachment has three of these telescopes that can be used in conjunction with each other or separately. These telescopes are able to "see" objects 10,000 times dimmer than the human eye can detect.

The Deep STARE system is able to track multiple satellites in the field of view. As the satellites cross the sky, the telescopes take rapid electronic snapshots, showing up on the operator's console as tiny streaks. Computers then measure these

streaks and use the data to figure the current position of a satellite in its orbit. Star images, which remain fixed, are used as references or calibration points for each of the three telescopes.

"Space is the ultimate high ground, giving us the ability to communicate over long distances and determine exact locations through the Global Positioning System," said Maj. Jay Fulmer, Det. 2 commander.

"Many of our (servicemembers) serving on the front lines use technology that is greatly enhanced through the use of space," Major Fulmer said. "(Our detachments, which are) part of a global space surveillance network, ensure the US and our allies have the ability to operate unencumbered in the medium of space, allowing our troops direct access to space-derived force enhancements."

Thinking "big" is what these guys do.

"As mankind continues to explore and exploit the realm of space there needs to be some accounting and understanding of the medium," Mr. Bookout said.

"Space is a new realm to the human experience. We've learned much during the last 50 years, but we still have much more to learn," Mr. Bookout said. "Space surveillance provides critical information on the location of every man-made object in space. (It ensures) our space-based assets are protected from potential on-orbit collisions or from adversaries who might try to take away our abilities to operate in space. This guarantees the warfighter access to space-derived tools they need to execute their mission."

(Aero-News salutes Master Sgt. Scott King, 40th Air Expeditionary Group Public Affairs)

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

US Seeks Laser Weapon To Down Enemy Satellites

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:17:28 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:17:28 -0400
Subject: US Seeks Laser Weapon To Down Enemy Satellites

Source: Physorg.Com - Tilburg, The Netherlands

<http://www.physorg.com/news65861565.html>

May 03, 2006

Space and Earth science

US Seeks Laser Weapon To Shoot Down Enemy Satellites: report

The US government is conducting research into building a ground-based laser weapon that could destroy enemy satellites in orbit, the New York Times reported Wednesday.

The secret project, which according to the Times was partially made public through Air Force budget documents submitted to Congress in February, would use beams of concentrated light to destroy enemy satellites in orbit.

The weapon is part of a wide-ranging effort to develop defensive and offensive space weapons, the Times said, citing federal officials who spoke on condition of anonymity.

The weapon would use sensors, computers and flexible mirrors to counteract the atmospheric turbulence.

"The White House wants us to do space defense," a senior Pentagon official who oversees several space programs, including the laser effort, told the Times. "We need that ability to protect our assets" in orbit.

But any potential weapon applications of the research, if approved, "are out there years and years and years into the future," the official said.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

Something In Sky Over Terrace BC

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:24:21 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:24:21 -0400
Subject: Something In Sky Over Terrace BC

Source: The Terrace Standard, British Columbia, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/m7247>

May 03 2006

Something Was In The Sky Over Terrace On April 24

Terrace's Reputation as a UFO sighting hot spot continues thanks to two independent reports from two couples who both saw mysterious lights in the sky the evening of April 24.

The lights were described as blue-coloured balls with tails coming out the back, says Houston, B.C.-based UFO researcher Brian Vike.

Vike, one of North America's leading UFO researchers, said having two independent reports makes the occurrence all that more tantalizing.

"In the first report there were three balls and in the second, two. Whether one was behind the other then, I don't know," he continued.

The sightings were at about the same time - shortly after 7:30 p.m. - as well and the weather conditions that evening were excellent.

"That this took place during daylight makes it very interesting," Vike said.

The first couple was on Munroe St. on the Bench and the second in the arena parking lot. Their sightings were toward the south. Neither reported a sound coming from the respective objects.

"They moved together, silently through the sky from our right to our left sides," reported the wife of the first couple's observation.

"They were fast, but slow enough that we both could say 'Do you see that?' and look back."

The woman added that she would not have told anyone but that her husband "is a non-believer of anything, and even he saw it."

The husband of the second couple said their sighting looked like flares or a welding spark.

"One large one and a smaller one underneath. I jumped out of the truck and said, 'Did you see that?' and she said 'yes,'" he said of his wife.

"[It] was kind of spooky. Never seen anything like this before in my life - probably never again," the man continued.

Vike welcomes information from anybody else who saw something in

the sky shortly after 7:30 p.m. on April 24.

Terrace at one time ranked near the top of UFO sightings for all of Canada.

Vike can be reached at hbcufo.nul His Web site is:

<http://www.hbccufo>

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 4](#)

New Lie Detection Tech Worries Ethicist

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:29:11 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 15:29:11 -0400
Subject: New Lie Detection Tech Worries Ethicist

Source: Physorg.Com - Tilburg, The Netherlands

<http://www.physorg.com/news65886740.html>

May 03, 2006

[Many links in article at site]

New Lie Detection Technology Worries Stanford Ethicist
by Emily Saarman - Stanford University

For many, the phrase "lie detection" probably brings to mind an image of a polygraph machine and an intimidating movie-style interrogation, possibly with a subject who could expertly "beat the polygraph." But ethicist and law Professor Hank Greely said this image is about to change.

Recent advances in neuroscience promise to bring lie detection technology far beyond the notoriously unreliable polygraph and into a realm that Greely said bears eerie resemblance to scientific mind reading.

Greely, the Dean F. and Kate Edelman Johnson Professor in Law, discussed his concerns about the new lie detection technology at a campus Science, Technology and Society seminar April 14. Greely said he is excited by the potential for improved lie detection but concerned that it could lead to personal-privacy violations and a host of legal problems=97especially if the techniques prove unreliable.

"If unreliable lie detection gets used, people's lives will be blighted," Greely said. "I think it's crazy for us to let these technologies be used for lie detection until we have clear, robust, peer-reviewed research that shows how well they work."

During the seminar, Greely discussed five emerging lie detection techniques. These include electroencephalograms (EEGs), which measure brain waves using electrodes taped to a subject's head and claim to detect patterns related to specific brain processes, including recognition of a scene or person. Another technique uses facial microexpressions, facial expressions lasting just a fraction of a second that can be captured on film, to reveal otherwise invisible emotions or reactions. A thermal imaging technique, claiming that the area around the eye gets warmer when a person lies, attempts to reveal deception by measuring the temperature of the eye area. Finally, two different techniques use images of brain activity to highlight lying-specific brain patterns, Greely said. Near infrared laser spectroscopy shines invisible infrared light through the skull and reflects it off the brain to reveal activity on the surface of the brain. And functional magnetic resonance imaging, or fMRI, uses powerful magnets to build a map of activity throughout the brain.

The most promising of these techniques is fMRI, Greely said, which measures oxygen usage throughout the brain. Active parts of the brain use more oxygen than inactive portions, so the fMRI

can accurately pinpoint the parts of the brain at work at any given time.

In several small scientific studies, researchers have shown that telling a lie activates different parts of the brain than telling the truth, Greely said. Subjects who were lying activated a greater percentage of their brains, as well as different regions, than subjects who were telling the truth.

While Greely said he believes fMRI technology has tremendous potential for lie detection, he said there is still a lot of work to be done before the results of these tests can be trusted. To date, all fMRI lie detection studies have used only a small number of subjects who were asked to lie about simple things such as the identity of the playing card in their hand, he said. How these findings will bear out in real-life circumstances with diverse subjects of different races, ages and mental states remains to be seen. "Deception is not a very clear-cut, well-defined thing," Greely said. "We know people can remember things that never happened. How does that show up on an fMRI lie detection test?"

But companies who hope to profit from new lie detection techniques are not so cautious. Two private for-profit companies—No Lie MRI Inc. of La Jolla, Calif., and Cephos Corp. of Pepperell, Mass.—plan to begin selling fMRI-based lie detection services by the end of the year. And because there are no regulations to control lie detection technology, Greely cautioned, they can sell lie detection services without ever proving how well they work.

At first, the technology will likely be used only at the request of a person who wishes to bolster his or her credibility with a clean lie detection test. But Greely predicted that, in time, new lie detection techniques will find their way into civil and criminal investigations and may even be considered in court trials.

To illustrate the danger posed by inaccurate lie detection, Greely described a scenario in which a person is arrested for assault and an ineffective lie detector indicates that the person is lying when he or she denies the charges. "It could be that the case against you is pretty weak but the district attorney and the police decide to proceed anyway because they're so falsely confident in this lie detector test," Greely said. "You end up going to trial, maybe getting convicted, maybe going to jail. That would be pretty serious."

Beyond such concerns, Greely said there are ethical reasons to view the new technology with caution. "Even if it's proven to be safe and effective, we need to make decisions about when it can be used and by whom," he said. "We've never really had to confront these issues before because the polygraph has never been reliable enough for the courts to take it seriously."

Employees currently are protected from lie detection tests administered by their employers under the 1988 federal Employee Polygraph Protection Act. But, according to Greely, there are no laws controlling the use of lie detection by educational institutions, parents, friends or spouses. Like any parent of a teenager, Greely said he wishes he knew where his son really went last night, but he is not sure that using lie detection to find the answer would be ethical.

"I think it's important to consider that whole set of issues about when we think it's justifiable to invade the privacy of someone's mind," Greely said.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 07:50:21 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 09:17:53 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Lehmborg

>From: Kathy Kasten <catja90024.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 14:17:34 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 14:15:34 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>>>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website

>>><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>>>April 23, 2006

>>>Review of Susan Clancy's

>>>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were
>>Kidnapped by Aliens

>>>Harvard University Press 2005
>>>179 pages

>>>by Stanton T. Friedman

>>Seems the 'blond' was leading the 'blind' after all... and
>>all those blond jokes were abundantly appropriate.

>Stan provides an insightful commentary and all you can
>do is provide a sexist retort/flip comment.
>I'll be sure to simply delete any e-mail from you in
>the future because apparently you have a bias against
>blonds. And, I am a blond.

Yes, delete me by all means, ma'am. Thankfully, then, for you,
you won't have to endure the following.

Blond, of course, does not refer to hair color. I observe that
there are brunettes and redheads who are excellent
representative blonds, while many blonds seem to be able to
actually refrain from blond-ism, and that many blonds are male.

More males than females, actually.

Blond, of course, refers to intellectual intransigence, a lack
of creativity, a reflexive bone-headedness, a paucity of
imagination, a stark inability to go any further than a
scratched surface, and a too ready (or convenient?) willingness
to surrender to piqued animosity.

When I keyed this yesterday I reflected for a moment on your
concerns. I presumed incorrectly that I needn't worry. I
reasoned that everyone would "get it." I erred.

I, of course, apologize for any legitimate offence...

Still, the tone of your note suggests that this isn't really the

problem you have with a single throw away comment; however accurate, or me. So the question is begged:

How 'blond' _are_ you?

Your public (or private) apology ma'am, if tendered, will be readily accepted.

[alienview.nul](#)

www.AlienView.net

AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 09:28:24 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 09:20:05 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

<snip>

>So what happened to UFO instrumented field research? People
>seem interested in getting the truth about UFOs but apart from
>looking into the sky every once in a while (hopefully with a
>camera on a tripod), most are willing to allow the Internet or
>TV tell them the "truth".

>Is it because ghost sightings occur much more frequently than
>UFO sightings???!!! That would be very ironic. True, ghost
>instrumented field research benefits from the fact that a ghost
>report location is repeated (i.e. a "haunt") thus the odds
>should be higher to get some data since the ghost should
>reappear based on who knows what criteria. But UFOs benefit from
>the fact that they seem to cover large distances so multiple
>instrument clusters in fairly separated locales can sight the
>same object.

>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>A shame really.

Hi James,

A while back the Fund for UFO Research was approached by a gentleman who had a "UFO Detector" that he had developed, and I believe that he contacted other UFO research groups as well. Aactual details being disclosed, he acknowledged that he was behind the Ghost Hunters program (aired on the SciFi Channel).

It should be noted that the "device" was never demonstrated or shown, and I'm not sure the science behind it would have detected a "UFO", but I think he was interested in seeing if there was the same interest in that phenomenon as he had found with ghosts.

Ghost stories tend to be centered on certain locations, so it's easy to determine where to investigate and set up your equipment. You can build the suspense and develop a story around the investigation into the event, so it lends itself to a television production.

To detect a UFO, one would have to have some belief that one would appear in a certain area in order to set up the equipment with some hope of success beyond random chance. There are probably a few places in the US where one might try, but there's no guarantee and it would be hard to build suspense and develop a series of documentaries in the vein of "Reality Television".

There's also a question as to how closely the UFO community wants to work with Producers that are in this for entertainment purposes, and I'm not sure how that impacts future credibility.

It would be great if local UFO groups would form and begin some sort of semi-organized examination of UFO events and reports, but that's really already in place with MUFON. Unfortunately, it's too loosely based (IMO) and lacks any scientific structure. And in the end, it's really only popular in a few areas. It's a volunteer effort with little return for the investment of time, and in the Washington Metro area there's a quarterly meeting in Northern Virginia and that's the extent of local interest.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: **Craig Beasley** <fallingleaf.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 09:01:44 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 09:22:25 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>I find it amazing how many ghost hunting groups there are out
>there now and the tools they are using to actively seek out
>ghosts.

<snip>

>And look at the tools they bring to bear on their work. Sure
>they have cameras, but they also have infrared/thermal
>detectors/sensors, EMF detectors, ion detectors, Geiger counters
>and audio recorders of various kinds depending on budget and
>interest.

<snip>

>UFO
>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>A shame really.

James,

I agree. Have you thought of more specific ways to change this situation? I mean, other than just saying "Do more"?

I am most certainly a nuts and bolts guy, and for my purposes it would be immensely helpful to have more raw data.

J. Craig Beasley

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 10:46:55 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 09:25:12 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Boone

>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website

><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>April 23, 2006

>Review of Susan Clancy's

>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped
>by Aliens

>Harvard University Press 2005
>179 pages

>by Stanton T. Friedman

>I hadn't had high hopes for the book Abducted: How people
>to Believe They Were Kidnapped by Aliens by Dr. Susan A.
>Clancy. After all, the segment about abductions which featured
>her on Peter Jennings's grossly-misleading 'documentary' on
>February 24, 2005, was definitely unscientific. The focus was on
>sleep paralysis with no recognition being given to multiple
>persons being abducted at once, that most abductions take place
>other than when the abductee was sleeping in bed, and that many
>people recalled the details without the use of hypnosis. This
>despite the fact that all of these had been discussed by Budd
>Hopkins during his PJ interview, but never made the program. I
>also was not impressed with what she had to say on last July's
>Larry King TV show. Still I was shocked by how much bias and
>prejudice she shows in the book. She should have been flunked
>for her gross inaccuracy in her accounts, brief though they
>were, of various cases about which I am well informed. Remember
>that her so-called research was conducted at Harvard University
>using government research grants and the book was published by
>Harvard University Press. I guess they couldn't afford a fact
>checker.

'Nuff said!

What's alarming here is that this book was produced under the
watchdog eye of government and academia, that's scary.

If Dr. Clancy's work went that far over so many years and the
procedures and protocols of ethics and standards somehow went
awry for that long, what else has slipped through the cracks of
one of the world's top universities? Does that doctor you visit
for your maladies have a Harvard degree?

Mr. Friedman knows my sentiments on the matter.

What I would suggest as a means to let the mainstream news and
hallowed halls of academia know that they're not going to get
away with such obviously sloppy work is to toss their own
standards back at them.

How?

Easy, each of you professionals in your various fields of the

sciences and humanities, especially those of you who have taught in academia or publish in academic journals, put together your own rebuttals as Mr. Friedman has and present them to Harvard's various boards of ethics and standards and demand Dr. Clancy's work be brought to bear. The campus newspapers, message boards and even their activities offices should be contacted and demanded to address these issues brought up by Dr. Clancy's book. Not in a hostile way but in a way that the true data is presented. This isn't or shouldn't be an 'off with her head' scenario, but one of professional concern and procedure that Harvard should have been doing all along.

Her data is correct or it isn't. If the taxpayers paid in part or in full for these works then the taxpayers deserve to have the works professionally examined and if any out points, brought to the fore and the floor.

If memory serves, one needs three or more points of error to present these to Harvard and the government. It may be there are far more than three instances of error on Dr. Clancy's part. If so, she should be commanded by Harvard to address them as any other professional under their banner must do.

Must do.

Perhaps George Noory can call Dr. Clancy to the carpet on Coast to Coast AM with a list of out points provided by those of you with counter points and debate each. Our families and friends attend or attended Harvard. I know because I've had a small army of them. Yes I've asked some of them about it and the contrast is they're stand firm that anyone publishing any study or research item under a Harvard banner has to go through a rigorous series of standards and ethics. They point out if Dr. Clancy put out anything with as many glaring errors as have been pointed out she should have been called in and straightened out. It's that way with any college or university worth it's salt. Any of you who had professors like I've had know dang well you had better have your data correct and footnoted.

We who are studying the UFO area know what's correct and not. Can you imagine the level of inaccuracies in other works and news stories?

Another case of back to basics for us 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 13:34:21 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 09:27:09 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

<snip>

>Is it because ghost sightings occur much more frequently than
>UFO sightings?! That would be very ironic. True, ghost
>instrumented field research benefits from the fact that a ghost
>report location is repeated (i.e. a "haunt") thus the odds
>should be higher to get some data since the ghost should
>reappear based on who knows what criteria. But UFOs benefit from
>the fact that they seem to cover large distances so multiple
>instrument clusters in fairly separated locales can sight the
>same object.

>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>A shame really.

There's big difference between trying to find some proof of
abnormality in in a closed and finite space and that that exists
in several billions of cubic miles of airspace and infinite
space. Ghost phenomenon is driven by/founded on some religious
principle that promises [holds out] life after death. No
religion could survive without it. Your comment about solace is
well taken.

I'm not frustrated, very often fascinated, but not frustrated.
I'm continually fascinated by skeptics who invent new science to
explain away these anomalies such as low altitude [well below 60
miles], horizontal meteors.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 13:40:35 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 09:30:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander? -

>From: Craig Beasley <fallingleaf.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 16:24:40 -0500
>Subject: Re: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 06:44:23 -0400
>>Subject: Could 1964 Socorro UFO Be Lunar Lander?

>>Could 1964 UFO Be Lunar Lander?

>>SOCORRO, NM -- Something strange happened in the desert near
>>Socorro NM, on a spring night 42 years ago, and a State
>>Police officer was there to report it.

>>It has become known as the Zamora UFI Incident, named for
>>officer Lonnie Zamora. While not as publicized as the
>>legendary Roswell Incident, this UFO landing made national
>>headlines at the time sparking intrigue and speculation ever
>>since.

><snip>

>>"The Socorro Incident in 1964 might have been an American
>>spacecraft that was being tested at the north end of White
>>Sands Missile Range," Thomas said. According to the log,
>>that American spacecraft was an early prototype for a
>>"surveyor," which evolved five years later to a lunar
>>vehicle during the Apollo missions.

>>There's also the lunar lander, a NASA vehicle flown by
>>astronaut Neil Armstrong just months before he landed on the
>>moon. In 1964, there were only two of these landers in
>>existence, and one of them was delivered to White Sands in
>>April, the same month as Zamora's famous encounter.

>>Yet the skeletal landers don't match Zamora's description of
>>an egg-shaped craft

>>"Especially with the surveyor experiments, the craft was
>>being held up by a miniature Bell helicopter, so the
>>combination of the helicopter holding this contraption with
>>the legs and jets, I think would have looked very strange."
>>Thomas said.

><snip>

>This is so utterly bad. Three major points:

>1. The spacecraft prototypes for both the Surveyors and the LM
>would have been tested on the ground, and not as full up
>flying platforms. The Surveyor **might** have been held in
>helicopter suspension (for what nonsensical reason), but the
>LM would never have been.

>2. Neither spacecraft had enough thrust to be properly flight
>tested in Earth's gravity.

>3. Specifically for the LM, the flight training and concept

>testing was conducted by an analog vehicle. An example can be
>seen at Johnson Space Center in Houston, where all such
>testing was conducted, IIRC. Furthermore, the training/testing
>platform and very little crossrange capability and would never
>had been in Lonnie Zamora's vicinity, even if it had been
>operated out of Socorro.

>This article is just more humorous and somewhat disappointing
>bilge.

Craig,

More than a few of the skeptics on this List have tried to float
the Lunar Lander theory for the Socorro incident and have been
shot down every time. All they had to do was Google the lander
and they would see the problems with the lander in this
situation. The reporter could have done the same thing. Bilge is
right.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 14:15:33 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 09:32:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Ledger

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 20:56:09 -0700
>Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website
>><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>>April 23, 2006

>>Review of Susan Clancy's
>>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by
>>Aliens

>>Harvard University Press 2005 179 pages

>>by Stanton T. Friedman

>><snip>

>>Very well said, Stanton, as always. Much appreciation.

>>Why do so many "debunkers" believe it's utterly unnecessary to actually know anything about the subject? I'm relatively knew to the UFO phenomenon (in terms of actually semi-seriously studying it), and I find this highly puzzling.

Join the club, Jeff. I often see authors of books about UFOs vilified for "making money"[hah!] off of the phenomenon [a myth in itself], me being one of them, but no one ever says anything about the debunkers-and Clancy is the queen of that lot.

I wrote another book about an airline crash off Nova Scotia. On different occasions I been taken to task for writing about this crash; so much human suffering was involved, I was informed. This same remark came from a local book seller who had a few dozen books on the Titanic mind you [never mind the Second World War]-which I pointed out. I finally started asking people how they knew about the crash. "Well," They'd say, "It was all over the television and in the papers for weeks." So I'd ask if they thought the TV networks-all 30+ of them-and newspapers-probably several thousand-did this for nothing which is usually met with uncomprehending stares.

If you have some time to badly waste, go to Amazon for the Clancy book and see the reviews from the Scientific American writer and Skeptic magazine's editor, Michael Shermer.

No critical thinking there.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

A Twist On Fermi

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 19:01:46 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 12:01:42 -0400
Subject: A Twist On Fermi

Hello List,

In his 'Alpha to Omega - The Constants of Nature', John D Barrow illuminated the Fermi Paradox by way of the average motorist's query - "Why are the other lanes faster?". It turns out to be a statistical thing - just because more of us are packed into the slower lanes.

So, considering the low density of the universe, and thinking of intelligent life, he wrote - "it is not surprising that other star systems are so far away and contact with extraterrestrials is so difficult... like us, they will have evolved unperturbed by beings from other worlds until they reached an advanced technological stage."

However, for every thousand or more cars in a jam, there's somebody doing 100+ on empty highways somewhere. (Great - if good tyres, etc.).

Does it mean some of us primitives are that much more likely to be 'perturbed' before reaching an advanced stage? I.e. by the ultra-fast one or two species who don't follow statistical trends.

If so - prodigies, like speedsters, can score low on moral sensibility.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: The 'Dark' Cosmos - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 14:36:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 12:05:02 -0400
Subject: Re: The 'Dark' Cosmos - Maccabee

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 23:04:05 -0700
>Subject: The 'Dark' Cosmos

>Source: Science Frontiers, No. 165, May-Jun 2006, p. 1
> Derby, Derbyshire, UK

><http://www.science-frontiers.com>

>Astronomy

>The 'Dark' cosmos: What's next?
>by William R. Corliss

>Once upon a time, not really very long ago, the sky was filled
>with bright stars, wandering planets, and stately galaxies. We
>thought our eyes took in the entire universe. It was grand but
>we were blind in many ways. There is much more!

>Then along came radio telescopes and satellite carrying
>instruments that brought quasars, molecular clouds, and entities
>otherwise invisible into our ken.

>Another window to the unseeable opened when astronomers
>perceived that some sort of gravitational glue kept the
>spinning spiral galaxies from flying apart and, in addition,
>that "something else" was accelerating the expansion of the
>universe. Thus were born dark matter and dark energy - named,
>but neither seen nor comprehended.

<snip>

>Comments. What else out there is "dark"? To find out we must
>unshutter our eyes; that is, explore other properties of the
>cosmos besides electromagnetic radiation, the effects of
>gravity, and excess expansion of the universe. Some neglected
>characteristics of cosmos are:

>- Seriality and coincidence: the possible tendency of events and
>things to follow one another and/or clump in time.

>- The concentration and flow of information. Information, like
>mass/energy, in a conserved property of nature. We should map
>its rivers and lakes on a cosmic scale.

Hmmmm... conservation of information?

It seems to me that information, which is represented by
'meaningful' (meaning is in the mind of the beholder) variations
as opposed to variations that are 'noise' (meaningless), is
continually degraded by random fluctuations in whatever 'field'
is transmitting the information (sound field, electromagnetic
field, gravitational field).

Transmission of information requires "memory" - needed to
remember what the information is, of course - and memory is

degraded by random fluctuations.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 14:36:17 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 12:09:16 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>I find it amazing how many ghost hunting groups there are out
>there now and the tools they are using to actively seek out
>ghosts. It seems like almost every town/city has at least one
>such club/group/society.

<snip>

>So what happened to UFO instrumented field research? People seem
>interested in getting the truth about UFOs but apart from
>looking into the sky every once in a while (hopefully with a
>camera on a tripod), most are willing to allow the Internet or
>TV tell them the "truth".

>Is it because ghost sightings occur much more frequently than
>UFO sightings?! That would be very ironic. True, ghost
>instrumented field research benefits from the fact that a ghost
>report location is repeated (i.e. a "haunt") thus the odds
>should be higher to get some data since the ghost should
>reappear based on who knows what criteria.

I think that is a major part of the answer. One has the feeling
that the probability of getting something is 'great' and the
search area is confined.

When 'Bubba' sightings started in Gulf Breeze, FL in Nov. 1990
there were at first a few investigators who diligently stayed
out on cold - yes, in Florida - winter nights... night after
night... to watch. And they were many times rewarded for their
efforts. So often, in fact that the number of people watching
increased during the months of 1990 and 1991.

Yes, this was a long flap that got worldwide attention. But
there were numerous people with video cameras, still cameras,
special lenses, etc... just as you have suggested with the
ghost hunting. Even infrared film and magnetic and acoustic
devices.

And I think this was all because these sightings were happening
repeatedly in a confined area of several square miles.

>But UFOs benefit from
>the fact that they seem to cover large distances so multiple
>instrument clusters in fairly separated locales can sight the
>same object.

Maybe, but you don't know which direction a UFO will go
after "visiting" one instrumented site.

>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small

>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>A shame really.

All we have to do is point out that ghosts use UFO/saucers as transport mechanisms and we'll have all the ghost researchers looking for 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 17:00:32 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 12:30:37 -0400
Subject: Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Olson

From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
To: <- UFO UpDates Subscribers -> <UFO-UpDates.nul>
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 12:09 PM
Subject: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk'

>Orbital Debris Monitored By GEODSS

>Roughly 15,000 miles above the Earth's surface, a communications
>satellite provides vital information to all branches of the US
>military. It is one of more than 9,000 items in space that are
>tracked by the Ground-Based Electro-Optical Deep Space
>Surveillance System, known as GEODSS.

I'm guessing that GEODSS has photographed many *interesting*
things flitting by in space that are neither "junk" nor
conventional Earth-based craft.

Has anything of that nature related to GEODSS ever been leaked?

Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Frager

From: **Richard Frager** <science.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 21:30:27 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 12:33:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Frager

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 20:56:09 -0700
>Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website
>><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>>April 23, 2006

>>Review of Susan Clancy's
>>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by
>>Aliens

>>Harvard University Press 2005 179 pages

>>by Stanton T. Friedman

><snip>

>Very well said, Stanton, as always. Much appreciation.

>Why do so many "debunkers" believe it's utterly unnecessary to
>actually know anything about the subject? I'm relatively new
>to the UFO phenomenon (in terms of actually semi-seriously
>studying it), and I find this highly puzzling.

That's easy, because it is much easier to practice science by
proclamation than science by investigation.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Links To FBI Files

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 13:12:40 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 13:12:40 -0400
Subject: Links To FBI Files

Links To FBI Files

Animal/Cattle Mutilation 1/12/98

Animal Mutilation Project

<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/ufoanim.htm>

128 pages - 5 .pdf Files

The material concerning the Animal Mutilation Project contains accounts of animal mutilations which were reported during the late 1970's. The FBI became involved when fifteen mutilations occurred in New Mexico. Various theories concerning the origins of the mutilations were explored by the FBI, including satanic cults, UFOs, pranksters, and natural predators. The investigation failed to identify any individuals responsible for the mutilations.

Majestic 12 1/12/98

<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/majestic.htm>

22 pages - 1 .pdf File

Subject concerns an FBI inquiry into a possible unauthorized disclosure of classified information when a document marked "Top Secret" was made public. The investigation was closed after it was learned that the document was completely bogus.

Roswell 1/12/98

ROSWELL

1 page - .pdf File

This one-page teletype dated July 8, 1947, conveyed information originating from the United States Air Force. The teletype's details purported that an object, possibly a flying disc, was recovered near Roswell, New Mexico.

Unidentified Flying Objects

<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/ufo.htm>

1600 pages - 16 .pdf Files

The material concerning the Animal Mutilation Project contains accounts of animal mutilations which were reported during the late 1970's. The FBI became involved when fifteen mutilations

occurred in New Mexico. Various theories concerning the origins of the mutilations were explored by the FBI, including satanic cults, UFOs, pranksters, and natural predators. The investigation failed to identify any individuals responsible for the mutilations.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Sci-Fi Man

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 13:25:04 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 13:25:04 -0400
Subject: Sci-Fi Man

Source: The Northwest Meridian - Aurora, Oregon, USA

http://www.nwmeridian.com/content/060504_04_pl.php

May 5, 2006

Sci-Fi Man
by Tracy Macdonald
Special to the Northwest Meridian

The film "Roswell: The U.F.O Cover-up" (1994) tells the story of USAF Major Jesse Marcel's attempt to understand the events that unfolded in the southeastern New Mexico desert in July of 1947.

The picture's executive producer, Paul Davids, will be on hand to take questions at the screening of the film at McMenamins Kennedy School Theater in Northeast Portland.

When Major Marcel (played by Kyle MacLachlan) is called out to investigate the mysterious debris discovered by a local rancher, he concludes (allegedly, along with his colleagues) that the ranch was the site of a UFO crash. The tables turn, however, and Marcel soon becomes the fall guy for a government cover-up, and then the object of press mockery, when his superiors claim the debris in the rancher's prairie came not from a flying saucer, but a typical weather balloon.

Confused and disillusioned, Marcel spends the next 30 years torn between honoring his duty as a soldier and discovering the truth about what really happened. When he attends the 30-year reunion for the members of his Air Force unit, suffering from a heart ailment and faced with his own impending mortality, he's overtaken by his desire to solve the mystery, or at least finally commit himself to asking the hard, potentially dangerous questions, whatever the risks and whatever the cost.

Davids, who also wrote and directed the 1996 documentary "Timothy Leary's Dead", and more recently, "The Sci-Fi Boys", released earlier this year, was interviewed by Northwest Meridian via email about "Roswell", and his career as a writer, filmmaker and UFologist.

Northwest Meridian: Your film implies that there was a massive government conspiracy to conceal the truth about Roswell. Do you believe that this conspiracy is real, or were you just intrigued by the story?

Paul Davids: I have read about and researched this case since 1987. I think I've read nearly everything written on the subject. There are two books which provide the details of the so-called "conspiracy" with greater accuracy and depth than any others I've come across: "UFOs and the National Security State", by Richard Dolan, and "The Missing Times", by Terry Hanson. Both present what I think is an entirely convincing view that we do have extraterrestrial visitors, and that the facts have been officially and deliberately suppressed since at least 1947.

I personally cannot find any fault with the points of view, so eloquently presented, in those books. Also, in the last year the former Defense Minister of Canada Paul Hellyer has stated in public interviews that this conspiracy does exist and that "flying saucers from other worlds" are as real as airplanes.

(Hellyer) stated that he is convinced the claims of Lt. Colonel Philip Corso in the book "The Day After Roswell" are essentially correct, i.e., that this has been one of the most highly classified issues for over half a century, and that the failure to inform and educate the public has been appalling. His views have not been widely reported in the U.S. media, but once again, in all my research, nothing has convinced me that he's mistaken, including several government reports that declare Roswell to be "Case Closed".

NWM: Were the other people involved in the making of your film believers in the government cover-up?

I personally cannot find any fault with the points of view, so eloquently presented, in those books. Also, in the last year the former Defense Minister of Canada Paul Hellyer has stated in public interviews that this conspiracy does exist and that "flying saucers from other worlds" are as real as airplanes.

(Hellyer) stated that he is convinced the claims of Lt. Colonel Philip Corso in the book "The Day After Roswell" are essentially correct, i.e., that this has been one of the most highly classified issues for over half a century, and that the failure to inform and educate the public has been appalling. His views have not been widely reported in the U.S. media, but once again, in all my research, nothing has convinced me that he's mistaken, including several government reports that declare Roswell to be "Case Closed".

NWM: Were the other people involved in the making of your film believers in the government cover-up?

Davids: Captain Kevin Randle (U.S. Air Force) and Donald Schmitt are the authors of a book called "UFO Crash at Roswell", upon which we loosely based the drama of the film. They are both "believers" in the cover-up, and Captain Randle was a military technical advisor to our film. Don Schmitt for many years was the Director of Special Investigations for the J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies in Chicago. Apart from them, I believe I was the only person involved who had a driving passion to tell the story because I felt it was urgent and credible.

The others were not necessarily "disbelievers" but took the position they didn't know much and were curious to learn more. Of everyone, Kyle MacLachlan was probably the most skeptical, or at least very cautious about saying anything to give the impression he was a "UFO believer". It shows what a superb actor he was. His personal beliefs had no influence whatsoever on his magnificent performance as Major Jesse Marcel. Martin Sheen was open-minded about the story, but he is what I would call a devoted Catholic with special interests in reported sightings of the Virgin Mary. He could accept the possibility of UFO's only insofar as he did not feel it conflicted with his Catholic faith, which actually does not at all rule out the possibility of intelligent life on other worlds ("In my Father's house are many mansions...").

Interestingly, since we made the movie, Monsignor Corrado Balducci, who was the Vatican's Apostolic representative in Washington D.C. for many years, has been giving lectures, apparently with Papal blessing, stating that extraterrestrial visitors are real and are neither angels nor demons nor delusions. Jeremy Kagan, who directed "Roswell", and Arthur Kopit, a great American playwright credited with the screenplay writing (based on a story written by myself and Jeremy and Arthur) were what you might call "agnostic". They felt the "conspiracy" could possibly be true, perhaps was even probably true - but they (and I) felt that the drama should be done in a way that left the final result ambiguous and showed that the data, no matter which side you are on, has been "salted" with disinformation.

NWM: How do you think the public reaction to the Roswell incident - and the government's explanation of that incident -

would be different today than in 1947?

Davids: I don't think the rancher would necessarily have summoned the authorities (the sheriff and the military) before alerting the media, and a total cover-up would have been more difficult. Also, the public today would be much more skeptical about a military pronouncement, for instance when the Army changed the first announcement from "flying saucer" to "weather balloon". There was a very similar incident in Brazil in recent years, and much more information leaked out, much more quickly, than was the case in the Roswell Incident where military people felt it was their sworn duty to reveal nothing for decades. The "crash dummy" report at the Pentagon in 1997 drew an unintended reaction of public ridicule and hostile rejection. All military statements were much more likely to be accepted without much questioning back in 1947, so soon after World War II.

NWM: You have been a Science Fiction fan since childhood. What fueled your initial attraction to this genre?

Davids: My love of the sci-fi double features that came out every Saturday during my childhood. Some of them (such as "Forbidden Planet", with Robby the Robot,) were masterpieces that stimulated my imagination for years. I absolutely loved the space films of George Pal including "The War of the Worlds" (the first one, from 1953), plus films such as "The Thing From Another World" and the "Day the Earth Stood Still". And I was of the Baby Boom generation who grew up on Forrest J Ackerman's "Famous Monsters of Filmland" magazine, which I relished, even though my parents had a dim view of it. But all of this was Science Fiction for me. It did not occur to me that extraterrestrial contact may already have taken place until 1987, the year I had a close range daylight disc sighting with my son and daughter.

NWM: How has your work in this genre evolved over the years?

Davids: It's not so much that my work in this field has "evolved" as that I have gone where the opportunities have taken me.

I never expected to be the production coordinator of "The Transformers" television show, which was on every day beginning in the mid-1980's - it was a lucky break - I was called in to take the place of someone I knew who was leaving the show and who had to be replaced immediately.

I seized the opportunity to develop "Roswell" as a film after the experience of my daylight disc sighting, and after doing much research. For years I wanted to do a film based on the research of Richard C. Hoagland, who passionately believes there were extraterrestrial civilizations on both the Mars and the Moon, and that there are archeological remains there. We came very close to launching the film, but ultimately it has not happened yet. I co-wrote six "Star Wars" sequel books with my wife because the opportunity was there - Lucasfilm was interested in having some sequel books developed and published, to keep the public aware of "Star Wars" up until the fourth film would come out.

Finally, I made "The Sci-Fi Boys" out of a passion for the sci-fi genre and the feeling that there was a story that had to be told about the "pioneers" of the genre who inspired my generation of filmmakers (and also Peter Jackson's generations of filmmakers). What started as a dream without great hope of commercial release became very real once Peter Jackson saw and loved my first edit of the film and agreed to be in it.

NWM: Can you expound briefly upon the idea of Science Fiction as a mechanism of cultural and political criticism?

Davids: Science Fiction has often been used as a mechanism of cultural and political commentary, a way to teach us about the predicaments we are in as human beings by showing us fictional extrapolations of what might come to pass or what could happen. Two excellent examples are Ray Bradbury's "Fahrenheit 451" (about censorship and book burning in a society which does not allow reading) and "The Day After Tomorrow", which dramatized the extreme possibilities of climate change. But there are hundreds of examples. From a literary point of view, it's often easier for authors to couch their political attitudes and social

criticisms by creating fictional literary universes. "Gulliver's Travels" is one of the early examples, and the anti-war attitudes of "20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" is another.

Finally, I made "The Sci-Fi Boys" out of a passion for the sci-fi genre and the feeling that there was a story that had to be told about the "pioneers" of the genre who inspired my generation of filmmakers (and also Peter Jackson's generations of filmmakers). What started as a dream without great hope of commercial release became very real once Peter Jackson saw and loved my first edit of the film and agreed to be in it.

NWM: Can you expound briefly upon the idea of Science Fiction as a mechanism of cultural and political criticism?

Davids: Science Fiction has often been used as a mechanism of cultural and political commentary, a way to teach us about the predicaments we are in as human beings by showing us fictional extrapolations of what might come to pass or what could happen. Two excellent examples are Ray Bradbury's "Fahrenheit 451" (about censorship and book burning in a society which does not allow reading) and "The Day After Tomorrow", which dramatized the extreme possibilities of climate change. But there are hundreds of examples. From a literary point of view, it's often easier for authors to couch their political attitudes and social criticisms by creating fictional literary universes. "Gulliver's Travels" is one of the early examples, and the anti-war attitudes of "20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" is another.

NWM: What inspired the creation of your new film, "The Sci Fi Boys"?

Davids: "The Sci-Fi Boys" shows the evolution of Science Fiction in cinema. Kellen Quinn, a critic and commentator for the Tribeca Film Festival, called it "a must-see for anyone who has screamed, gasped or laughed at a movie monster". I have not only screamed, gasped and laughed at movie monsters, I started out making them when I was nine years old and all I had was an 8mm home movie camera and my own ingenuity, plus copies of Famous Monsters magazine that gave away a few of the "trade secrets" of Hollywood. All of those secrets have since changed, but the love of movie monsters is still with me.

These monsters, throughout the decades, have often stolen the limelight from the actors who share the movies with them - and the creatures that once scared us are now like our long lost friends from childhood. We love to collect model kits of them, or build them and paint them. Once we covered our eyes when they came on-screen because they represented our darkest nightmares. Today we can laugh at those nightmares of days gone by and know that we survived them.

Our real problem (now) - the problem of all of us as human beings in today's society - is the issue of whether we can we survive the actual nightmares of living in this current era, an era of too many lethal weapons and too many leaders and soldiers and others who are willing to use them on innocent civilians all over the world. If we can ever lick that monster, then as a human species, we will have won, and we will have a future out there among the stars. If we cannot lick that monster, then we are witnessing something terrible in our lifetimes, the collapse and destruction of what could have been, what might have been, a magnificent and peaceful worldwide human civilization, with all of mankind respecting everyone regardless of cultural and religious differences. As Michael Rennie stated (as the character Klaatu) in "The Day the Earth Stood Still": "The choice is up to you".

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Aliens Have Landed

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:04:02 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:04:02 -0400
Subject: Aliens Have Landed

Source: Today - Colorado State University - Pueblo, Colorado, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/koe79>

5/4/200

Life

Aliens Have Landed
By Melodie Roberts

Beyond the blue sky and the clouds, through the wounded ozone layer and into the darkness, the stars speckle around empty planets that scientists have researched for centuries to discover no visible life forms.

Outside of what humans have been able to see, beyond the solar system, as we know it: who knows?

All we have are clues.

Those clues are the reason Robert Hastings, UFO lecturer, was at the university on April 17.

He has lectured at over 500 universities in the past 12 years and has been studying UFOs for the past 33.

Twelve people sprinkled the technology auditorium and Hastings said he was disappointed with the turnout.

His audiences usually run about 200-250 students, but because of the spring season and finals coming up, few attended, but he still told his story.

Hastings was here to educate, but not argue with people.

He explained that dealing with disbelievers comes with the territory.

"Have an open mind. Let me present my case, rather than taking my word for it. Here are my sources," Hastings explained.

"I'm not a missionary. I'm not seeking to convert skeptics into so-called believers," Hastings said at the beginning of the lecture.

Hastings and many others have uncovered government UFO documents since the Freedom of Information Act was passed in 1966.

By the mid-1970s people figured out how to use the act to force the government to release policies of secrecy regarding UFOs.

In 1974, the first UFO document was released thanks to the act.

Hastings has used the act for his own research to collect information to share with students and educate them about what could really be out there.

Hastings shared many documents with the audience, among them, an article from the New York Times published in 1960.

The article included a quote from Roscoe Hillenkoetter, first division retired vice admiral from the Air Force.

He was also a board member of The National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena, a research organization promoting the release of classified material of UFOs.

Behind the scenes, officers are soberly concerned about UFOs, Hillenkoetter stated, "The Air Force has silenced its personnel... these so-called flying saucers do indeed exist."

Another document Hastings included in the presentation was from the General Tuning Letter published Sept. 23, 1947.

"The phenomenon is something real and not visionary or fictitious," the document said.

The Pentagon responded to the documents saying they were just a pile of hoaxes, hallucinations and misidentification of known objects.

Hastings pointed out that government agencies continue to deny the facts even with the massive amount of documents about the reality of UFOs now made available to the public.

Along with stories of abduction and people opening up to their experience through hypnotism, there were pictures of flying saucers, a video about UFOs and disturbing evidence about what the government is doing behind closed doors included in the lecture.

There were additions to information of which the audience had already heard, like the Roswell, N.M., story.

A letter was sent to J. Edgar Hoover from Gui Hottel, a special agent in charge of the Washington FBI offices.

The March 1950 document was recovered in Mexico and said officials had found three flying saucers, three soft bodies that were 3-foot tall dressed in metallic cloth.

Hastings said that the site was near the only atomic bomber case in the world. He stressed the link between aliens and nuclear weapons.

The speaker had many examples of nuclear missiles disengaging for no reason.

At one missile site, 10 nuclear warheads malfunctioned simultaneously.

He said one missile dropping like that is rare.

Hastings believes that the aliens are warning us not to mess with nuclear weapons for we could destroy mankind.

"We are all in for a very interesting future," Hastings said. "What we have seen here tonight is more relevant than anything the government has said. Some advanced race is monitoring our progress."

"(The presentation was) extremely insightful, original and interesting. I liked it a lot," said Erica Contreras, a junior nursing major.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Tourist Shoots 'UFO' In Penang

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:07:46 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:07:46 -0400
Subject: Tourist Shoots 'UFO' In Penang

Source: The New Straits Times - Wilayah Persekutuan, Malaysia

<http://tinyurl.com/ej7cm>

05 May 2006

Tourist Shoots 'UFO' In Penang

Was Penang visited by aliens on Tuesday?

Could the object in the picture be an Unidentified Flying Object? These are among the questions raised after the object was captured on film by a guest at the Paradise Sandy Beach Resort in Tanjung Bungah on Tuesday.

The Australian tourist was photographing the sunrise around 8am from the balcony of his hotel room when he caught the object on film.

The tourist, who wished to remain anonymous, only realised the presence of the object a day later, when he was checking out.

[image]

Hotel public relations officer Virginia Scully said the tourist left a copy of the photograph with the hotel before leaving for Australia.

"He asked if we had seen such sightings from the hotel," Scully said at the hotel yesterday.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Follow The Nitrogen To Extraterrestrial Life

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:12:08 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:12:08 -0400
Subject: Follow The Nitrogen To Extraterrestrial Life

Source: Eureka Alert.Org - Washington, DC, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/lgkf2>

4-May-2006

Follow The Nitrogen To Extraterrestrial Life

The narrow search for water may miss important clues, say USC geobiologists

The great search for extraterrestrial life has focused on water at the expense of a crucial element, say geobiologists at the University of Southern California.

Writing in the Perspectives section of the May 5 issue of Science, four USC researchers propose searching for organic nitrogen as a direct indicator of the presence of life. Nitrogen is essential to the chemistry of living organisms.

Even if NASA were to find water on Mars, its presence only would indicate the possibility of life, said Kenneth Nealson, Wrigley Professor of earth sciences in the USC College of Letters, Arts and Sciences.

"It's hard to imagine life without water, but it's easy to imagine water without life," Nealson said.

The discovery of nitrogen on the Red Planet would be a different story.

"If you found nitrogen in abundance on Mars, you would get extremely excited because it shouldn't be there," Nealson said.

The reason has to do with the difference between nitrogen and carbon, the other indispensable organic element.

Unlike carbon, nitrogen is not a major component of rocks and minerals. This means that any substantial organic nitrogen deposits found in the soil of Mars, or of another planet, likely would have resulted from biological activity.

Dimming the hopes of life-on-Mars believers is the makeup of the planet's atmosphere. The abundant nitrogen in Earth's atmosphere is constantly replenished through biological activity. Without the ongoing contribution of living systems, the atmosphere slowly would lose its nitrogen.

The extremely low nitrogen content in the Martian atmosphere suggests that biological nitrogen production is close to zero.

However, the authors write, it is possible that life existed on Mars at some hypothetical time when nitrogen filled the atmosphere.

Co-author Douglas Capone, Wrigley Professor of environmental biology in USC College, said NASA should establish a nitrogen detection program alongside its water-seeking effort. He noted that next-generation spacecraft will have advanced sampling capabilities.

"What we're suggesting here is basically drilling down into geological strata, which they're going to be doing for water anyway," Capone said.

"The real smoking gun would be organic nitrogen."

Said Nealson: "If your goal is to search for life, it would be wise to include nitrogen."

In their acknowledgments, the authors thanked the students of the Spring 2004 Geobiology & Astrobiology course at USC, with whom Nealson and Capone began their discussion on how to search for life outside earth.

"That's really what stimulated this [paper]," Nealson said.

###

The authors also thanked NASA, the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation for their financial support.

Along with Nealson and Capone, USC graduate student Beverly Flood and former USC Research Professor Radu Popa (now a professor of biology at Portland State University) contributed to the Perspectives 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

The House The Venusians Built

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:20:05 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:20:05 -0400
Subject: The House The Venusians Built

Source: The Independent - London UK

<http://news.independent.co.uk/world/americas/article362146.ece>

05 May 2006

Life On Other Planets: The House The Venusians Built

When George Van Tassel began work on the domed structure he called the Integratron, he claimed it was designed by architects from Venus. It was never finished but last weekend, a group of devotees celebrated his memory with a Retro UFO Convention. Andrew Gumbel reports from Landers, California

There was a time when every UFO nut in America would dream of making a pilgrimage to the Integratron, an arresting white dome structure rising in the wilds of the Mojave Desert where beings from other worlds would regularly make themselves felt and where, it was said, power was being generated to rejuvenate human bodies and ward off death itself.

This was the spiritual home of George Van Tassel, a former aircraft inspector with Lockheed who moved to the desert in the auspicious year of 1947 - when the Cold War got going in earnest and an alien spacecraft supposedly crashed at Roswell, New Mexico - and soon began receiving communications from alien beings with such names as Knut, Ashtar and Lo. A group of devotees would gather for Van Tassel's Friday night channelling sessions at a large desert boulder known as Giant Rock, and even larger crowds turned out for his annual spacecraft conventions.

When Van Tassel died in 1978, he left the Integratron just short of completion, with no written instructions on how to go about finishing it. (His architects, who were visitors from Venus, hadn't wanted their secrets to fall into the wrong hands, and communicated by telepathy alone.) And so the place languished. One owner thought of turning the six-sided building into a disco. Another was rumoured to be using it as a methamphetamine lab. Last weekend, though, it was back to something resembling its old glory, as a group of Van Tassel devotees made it the centrepiece of a one-day Retro UFO Convention. Old-timers recalled the glory days of spotting mysterious lights in the desert sky. Present-day believers spoke enthusiastically about their own close encounters, everywhere from Arizona to New York City. Those blessed with actual contact with the aliens - known in the vernacular as "contactees" - were welcomed like prophets for the new millennium, complete with shiny silver hats and cloaks that looked eerily like cast-offs from the Star Trek wardrobe department.

Professors and lecturers, some noticeably more learned than others, offered talks on everything from the sorcerer Aleister Crowley and his "Scarlet Women", who may or may not have created a "tear in the fabric of space and time", to the theory that a portal in Antarctica leads to a secret world of underground

cities populated by reptilian aliens flitting in and out of 15 different dimensions.

Attending the festivities was a hodge-podge of conspiracy-mongers, eccentrics, bemused onlookers treating the whole thing as an elaborate game of dress-up and storytelling, and people genuinely looking for alternative forms of spiritual enlightenment. Tattooed soldiers and their girlfriends from the nearby military base at Twenty-Nine Palms mingled with dreamy New Age fanatics and the sort of ordinary whitebread couples who wouldn't look out of place at a suburban mall.

Their pay-off was people such as Michael the Universal Kabbalist, also known as Orion Starseed, a meek-looking man in his late fifties who showed up in silver and purple robes and a shaggy white wig and explained to anyone who cared to listen that the space people had inducted him to a higher level of consciousness that he now felt compelled, like a religious missionary, to share with the rest of his fellow humans.

"I have strong intuitive knowledge of my many life journeys in the Orion System," he explained in a pamphlet-length biography he passed out to anyone interested. "I am one of many who have chosen to visit Earth at this juncture to help rise the light energies of those souls who have found their inner light and to help prepare them for the Ascension of the Earth."

In person, Michael was rather less nebulous, explaining how he was scarred by his war experiences in Vietnam, got heavily into alcohol and drugs, and hung out with an outlaw biker gang in the high desert for nine years before suffering a near-fatal heart attack and becoming convinced he had been touched by an other-worldly light that revealed to him the full complexities of the universe. "I was snorting drugs and having a great time, not a care in the world, until they showed up," he said, sounding almost wistful.

Even more zealous was Hans Peterman, author of a book called Gravity, Matter and Space Travel, who delivered a bewildering two-hour lecture about hidden underground cities on both Earth and Mars, an ancient interplanetary war that led to a Martian colonisation of our world, and the links between ancient pyramids built by the inhabitants of Atlantis and the modern-day military bunker within the bowels of Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado.

In his world view, the aliens live among us but are mostly invisible because they inhabit entirely different dimensions of space-time. "They coexist with us," he said, "but only at specific frequencies. Now you see 'em, now you don't." Occasionally, Peterman offered personal anecdotes to back up his theories - he said he'd been to the Antarctic and knew where the secret entrance to the underworld was - and other times he simply asserted he was speaking "the truth, ladies and gentlemen, the truth ... no ifs or buts about it".

His audience, including a man in dark glasses who had covered his bald head in silver paint, lapped up every word. "The Bermuda Triangle - what is it really?" Peterman threw out at one point. A mousy woman near the back suggested, a little uncertainly, that it was an interdimensional portal. "Yes!" Peterman responded enthusiastically. "Definitely an interdimensional portal."

Once your brain takes a trip down this road, there is really no end to the fun it can have. That was certainly the attitude taken by Greg Bishop, a bona fide researcher and editor of a magazine specialising in weird Americana entitled The Excluded Middle. "I'm not here to poo-poo them or be a debunker," he told the audience at his own lecture, where he compared UFO devotees to the once-reviled prophets and mystics of ancient religions living off thorns in the desert. "You get nothing out of that."

The whole UFO phenomenon is a strange, uniquely American hybrid of religious inspiration, technological wonder and pop culture, frequently blended with personal stories of grief, loss and trauma. It was perhaps no coincidence that LRon Hubbard, the founder of Scientology, came in for frequent mentions at the convention. You don't have to be Tom Cruise to find irresistible appeal in a sci-fi religion based on mythical tales of space creatures, intergalactic warfare, flashing lights and ordinary

individuals blessed with the power to communicate with a higher intelligence in the great blue yonder.

Jerry Pippin, a radio host who broadcasts his programme The UFO Files from Oklahoma, said there had been no let-up in the number of sightings reported. "We never lack for material," he said. He had himself experienced his first UFO sighting, in the skies above Phoenix, Arizona, just last November, and sounded almost childishly excited about it. It is no longer just the western American desert that the aliens appear to enjoy visiting, as they did at the height of the Cold War in the 1950s. These days, Pippin said, there are as many sightings in the big cities to the east such as Chicago and New York.

In the end, the convention was about two centrepieces, both of them more or less religious. The first was the Integratron itself. An actor pretending to be George Van Tassel returning from the beyond led a tour, describing among other things how he had avoided the use of any metal materials in building the dome, as his friends from Venus directed. Upstairs, visitors were invited to lounge on beds and cushions and let their consciousnesses drift to other dimensions as a New Age space guru calling himself Arjuna hummed "celestial sounds" and blew into a Tibetan horn.

The pseudo-Van Tassel became downright defensive when someone drew a parallel between the supposed energy-collecting properties of the Integratron and the once-notorious "orgone box" devised by the psychiatrist and free love advocate Wilhelm Reich. "They're not at all the same," he said hotly. "His was a box, this is a dome!"

Some of the more true-believing visitors appeared entirely unfazed by the fact that the Integratron was both unfinished and manifestly incapable of delivering on its promise of cell rejuvenation and eternal life. "I feel absolutely marvellous!" one woman said after the Tibetan horn routine.

The other object of veneration was Giant Rock, just a few miles away, where the Van Tassel phenomenon first took off. The Rock had been sacred to local native Americans for centuries; the US government had then acquired the land and built a small airstrip next to it. In the 1930s, a man called Frank Critzer had hollowed out an underground home for himself beneath the boulder, only to die in a showdown with local police who came to investigate rumours - apparently unfounded - that he was a Nazi spy.

Van Tassel held his first channelling sessions in Critzer's old bunker, which has since been filled in. He also opened a restaurant catering to incoming airmen; Howard Hughes himself was said to have dropped by for a slice of pie.

Intriguingly, an Indian shaman once predicted that Giant Rock would be split in two. And, a few years ago, that is exactly what happened. According to local lore, a clean break down the middle would have spelt the end for humanity; as it was, only a small chunk fell away, suggesting there is still hope for us. The UFO devotees at the convention were in no doubt - this was a sign from higher space intelligence. Conventioneers duly went on a mini-pilgrimage to Giant Rock, where they discovered not an atmosphere of religious veneration so much as the roar of motorbikes and dune buggies and a rock smeared from top to bottom with crude graffiti. It looked for all the world like an alien invasion. Only, from the point of view of a UFO nut, it was entirely the wrong sort of alien.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 02:21:34 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:22:07 -0400
Subject: Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Hatch

>From: <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -<UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 12:09 PM
>Subject: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk'

>Source: The Aero-News Network - Winter Haven, Florida, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/poczr>

>Thu, 04 May '06

>USAF Trackers Keep An Eye Out For 'Space Junk'
>Orbital Debris Monitored By GEODSS

<snip>

I'm glad there are some good eyes looking upward. But, suppose they see something really anomalous? What are the chances we will hear anything about it? Are they nil, zero, or something in between?

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 10:28:28 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:27:32 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Craig Beasley <fallingleaf.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 09:01:44 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>I find it amazing how many ghost hunting groups there are out
>>there now and the tools they are using to actively seek out
>>ghosts.
>>And look at the tools they bring to bear on their work. Sure
>>they have cameras, but they also have infrared/thermal
>>detectors/sensors, EMF detectors, ion detectors, Geiger counters
>>and audio recorders of various kinds depending on budget and
>>interest.

>>UFO research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.
>>A shame really.

>I agree. Have you thought of more specific ways to change this
>situation? I mean, other than just saying "Do more"?

The main reason I even bother to bring it up on this List is to see if there are other folk interested or already working on this kind of thing. I mean there are so many people on the planet and you would think that anything one can think of as being a good idea means that ten other people have beat you to it.

Also, since I have not been in the UFO field for a long time, I want to understand what has stopped people from pursuing this kind of research.

Money may be one limit, but with cheap computers and cheap digital video connected to computers and clever, cheap interfaces of other sensors to computers, it seems that this is pretty cheap. Radar is not cheap, but it is not absolutely needed initially. Get some good results and you will get money.

Are there other reasons I am missing?

Laziness, perhaps?

Time consuming watching of the heavens can probably get old fast. But cheap automated systems on today's computers can help move the process into the short attention span of modern folk. If people can install SearchSETI screen savers, then why not SearchUFO monitoring software/hardware?

Fear? I would think that getting this kind of data would be similar to the rush one gets from seeing a ghost (I have not) or recording/hearing an EVP. What keeps folk from this "rush"?

>I am most certainly a nuts and bolts guy, and for my purposes it

>would be immensely helpful to have more raw data.

Having examined some raw data (not images, since that is not my expertise) and you are right that you can extract _alot_ of information from such data streams.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 10:58:02 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:29:18 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 09:28:24 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>So what happened to UFO instrumented field research? People
>>seem interested in getting the truth about UFOs but apart from
>>looking into the sky every once in a while (hopefully with a
>>camera on a tripod), most are willing to allow the Internet or
>>TV tell them the "truth".

>>Is it because ghost sightings occur much more frequently than
>>UFO sightings???!!!! That would be very ironic. True, ghost
>>instrumented field research benefits from the fact that a ghost
>>report location is repeated (i.e. a "haunt") thus the odds
>>should be higher to get some data since the ghost should
>>reappear based on who knows what criteria. But UFOs benefit from
>>the fact that they seem to cover large distances so multiple
>>instrument clusters in fairly separated locales can sight the
>>same object.

>>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>A while back the Fund for UFO Research was approached by a
>gentleman who had a "UFO Detector" that he had developed, and I
>believe that he contacted other UFO research groups as well.
>Actual details being disclosed, he acknowledged that he was
>behind the Ghost Hunters program (aired on the SciFi Channel).

I don't think he was "behind" the Ghost Hunter's program.

The fellow you are referring to is Ron Milione. He is a member
of "The Atlantic Paranormal Society" (TAPS) aka "Ghost Hunters"
and acts as "R&D advisor". (See the TAPS web site or Google him
and find his web site... his site does not give me alot of
confidence in him). He comes up with some instruments for Ghost
Hunter's/TAPS and based on what he says his degrees and
background is, seems knowledgable.

>It should be noted that the "device" was never demonstrated or
>shown, and I'm not sure the science behind it would have
>detected a "UFO", but I think he was interested in seeing if
>there was the same interest in that phenomenon as he had found
>with ghosts.

It looks like a magnetometer with unknown range and sensitivity.
No correlation data using the instrument has been presented.

>Ghost stories tend to be centered on certain locations, so it's
>easy to determine where to investigate and set up your
>equipment. You can build the suspense and develop a story
>around the investigation into the event, so it lends itself to a
>television production.

>To detect a UFO, one would have to have some belief that one
>would appear in a certain area in order to set up the equipment
>with some hope of success beyond random chance. There are
>probably a few places in the US where one might try, but there's
>no guarantee and it would be hard to build suspense and develop
>a series of documentaries in the vein of "Reality Television".
>There's also a question as to how closely the UFO community
>wants to work with Producers that are in this for entertainment
>purposes, and I'm not sure how that impacts future credibility.

My point was not to suggest a UFO reality show. Unless you
are suggesting that such a show would encourage people
to participate in field research. I do not know the timing for
sure but I think there was a lot of ghost field research prior to
the Ghost Hunter's show. It is likely the show did increase
that number though.

Note that on a number of Ghost Hunter's episodes the ghost (or
anything) fails to appear. So I don't think it's entirely
necessary to have the anomaly put in an appearance for the show
to work. If this was going to work for a UFO reality show, one
would want a lot more things going on than a dozen semi-automated
field stations gathering data. They could do the same thing with
Ghost Hunters (leave the equipment at a haunted site 24/7 until
they gather "absolute proof") but they don't because it doesn't
have the kind of action/tension/etc you refer to.

>It would be great if local UFO groups would form and begin some
>sort of semi-organized examination of UFO events and reports,
>but that's really already in place with MUFON. Unfortunately,
>it's too loosely based (IMO) and lacks any scientific structure.
> And in the end, it's really only popular in a few areas. It's
>a volunteer effort with little return for the investment of
>time, and in the Washington Metro area there's a quarterly
>meeting in Northern Virginia and that's the extent of local
>interest.

Yes, this is what I see too. Quite different from the early
days.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 11:10:13 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:30:27 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 13:34:21 -0300
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>There's big difference between trying to find some proof of
>abnormality in in a closed and finite space and that that exists
>in several billions of cubic miles of airspace and infinite
>space.

This is true, but I haven't seen the data by independent UFO
researchers (not military or astronomers) showing frequency of
UFO passage over fixed airspace.

It seems like something someone has done. And does such data
exist over long time periods? I have seen correlation of
sightings with time of year and I have seen Hatch's UFO report
maps.

Ghost researchers must worry that the ghost is in a closet or
some other location away from any cameras or sensors. However,
UFOs usually don't have such issues. Its hard to say which is
easier to capture data on. Your camera can cover a much larger
volume with UFOs but how frequent are they? How many days
between sightings? I guess the same question applies to ghosts.
But for UFOs you only have to look up. With ghosts, you have to
look in every nook and cranny (constantly) in a building
otherwise you may miss something.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 11:19:43 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:33:05 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Kaeser

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 10:46:55 EDT
>Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website

>><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>>April 23, 2006

>>Review of Susan Clancy's

>>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by Aliens

<snip>

>What's alarming here is that this book was produced under the
>watchdog eye of government and academia, that's scary.

Agreed. 'nuff said!

That's a pretty alarming on the face of it. Please provide any documented evidence you have that the "government" is monitoring publications and perhaps blocking those they disagree with. In "academia" I would expect and hope for it to some degree, but certainly not from what are supposed to be the elected Government.

Personally, I think this is a publication that is little more than a book written to support a pre-conceived conclusion to the abduction phenomenon by a credentialed author. Stanton has done a very good job of pointing out the flaws, but certainly the author has little concern about what we feel, so that's really more for our consumption. But, I agree that it should be posted as a review on Amazon for all to see. But I think it's a mistake to give this book some sort of special status in this field. It's just another skeptical book many can avoid.

My copy was a Christmas present from a skeptical friend and I have placed a copy of Stanton's review within it.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 13:53:35 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 14:36:03 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 14:36:17 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 17:02:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>But UFOs benefit from
>>the fact that they seem to cover large distances so multiple
>>instrument clusters in fairly separated locales can sight the
>>same object.

>Maybe, but you don't know which direction a UFO will go
>after "visiting" one instrumented site.

What I meant was that ghosts are apparently stuck to one site,
while UFOs cover a larger distance. So, if randomly distributed,
you can wait until a UFO decides to show up at a site, but for a
ghost, you must go to where it 'haunts'. Sure you may have to
wait a month for the UFO to show up, but with an automated
system this is less of a problem than having to lay in a lawn
chair 24/7.

>>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>All we have to do is point out that ghosts use UFO/saucers as
>transport mechanisms and we'll have all the ghost researchers
>looking for UFOs.

Right! Now there is an idea!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 5](#)

Re: Aliens Have Landed - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 13:43:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 05 May 2006 15:03:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Aliens Have Landed - Lehmborg

>Source: Today - Colorado State University - Pueblo, Colorado, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/koe79>

>5/4/200

>Life

>Aliens Have Landed
>By Melodie Roberts

>Beyond the blue sky and the clouds, through the wounded ozone
>layer and into the darkness, the stars speckle around empty
>planets that scientists have researched for centuries to
>discover no visible life forms.

>Outside of what humans have been able to see, beyond the solar
>system, as we know it: who knows?

>All we have are clues.

>Those clues are the reason Robert Hastings, UFO lecturer, was at
>the university on April 17.

<snip>

I'm gratified that Mr. Hastings is out there, still, as I know
he lights a freaking ufological fire everywhere he goes. He lit
me up over a decade ago and I thank him, once again, for it.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Morton

From: Dave Morton <Marspyrs.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 16:26:59 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 06:36:44 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Morton

>Date: Wed, 03 May 2006 14:18:52 -0400
>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Friedman Reviews Clancy
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>

>Source: Stanton T. Friedman's Website

><http://www.stantonfriedman.com/>

>April 23, 2006

>Review of Susan Clancy's

>Abducted: How people Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped
>by Aliens

>Harvard University Press 2005
>179 pages

>by Stanton T. Friedman

<snip>

>One could write a lot more about the trash in this book and the
>selfserving nonsense about being objective. Not surprisingly
>there is a blurb on the back from Dr. Elizabeth Loftus, one of
>the leaders of the False Memory Syndrome cult-like group:
>"Abducted is an enormously brave, smart, original book." I
>suppose that is true once one recognizes that most of it is
>Fiction masquerading as Truth.

I've said for a long time - and I think others have too - that
the government, academia, and the media are in bed together on
this issue of UFOs and alien abductions - especially abductions.
I guess Stan said it early on: It's a cosmic Watergate. It's
filled with coverups, lies, distortions, omissions, and powerful
tentacles reaching into the media and college campuses.

The glob of trash by Clancy that's supposed to pass for
'Science' is representative of all the other debunking books,
articles, and TV programs in its skewing, skewering, and
omission of the facts. Like television sitcoms, they are created
using a formula, and they strongly resemble one another - from
'dummies' to 'time compression' to "high-speed Mogul balloons"
to 'Mr. and Mrs. Front Porch' - they all have roughly the same
look and feel if you compare known facts to their facts. The
writing style may differ from author to author, but the
techniques used are always the same.

What's funny is the relationship between Clancy's "incredibly
bad memory" and the "False Memory Syndrome" people. Clancy
herself could be the poster child for FMS, and be adopted by
Elizabeth Loftus for that purpose.

Loftus says that Clancy's book "is an enormously brave, smart,
original book." It sounds like it's brave in the same sense that
it would be brave to write a book about The Flat Earth or The
Tropical Paradise of the Moon, as smart as something written by

a mentally retarded flying Pelican, and as original as selectively shredding parts of Shakespeare then randomly putting the pieces back together - original and random, but formulaic. She must have a really big jar of paste in her playroom!

Thank you for reviewing it, Stan. I agree with the others: Post the review on Amazon or wherever psychotic fantasy is sold.

I wonder if Amazon accepts Monopoly money or IOU's for books like this...

Dave Morton

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: **Jeanne Sloane** <info.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 18:18:13 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 06:40:28 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 13:53:35 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 4 May 2006 14:36:17 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

<snip>

>What I meant was that ghosts are apparently stuck to one site,
>while UFOs cover a larger distance. So, if randomly distributed,
>you can wait until a UFO decides to show up at a site, but for a
>ghost, you must go to where it 'haunts'. Sure you may have to
>wait a month for the UFO to show up, but with an automated
>system this is less of a problem than having to lay in a lawn
>chair 24/7.

Could some of you put together a blueprint for such a detection
and recording station? Maybe most of the equipment is already
around from kits available from someplace like:

<http://sciencekit.com>

There are probably a number of people who would be willing to
monitor their skies.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Who Is Behind It All?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 19:24:35 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 06:46:09 -0400
Subject: Who Is Behind It All?

They show up and cover up and secret away all the best UFO evidence and proof.

They fumble with people's minds.

They instill fear in our top brass, leaders, press, and public.

They somehow, some way, know when things happen in full uniform and with remarkable stealth and authority.

Yet we're told no agency in our government is interested in UFOs.

Who are these guys?

Who is behind it all?

We've seen over the past six years our own government far too unprepared to handle major disasters nor gather proper intelligence on foreign and domestic matters yet we're led to believe the same government is so astute and pervasive in covering up the UFO enigma.

We're not able, for some unknown reason, to stop drug dealing, illegal immigration, yet able to swiftly hush up and hide and curtail the good UFO stuff?

Are we sure we're that good at covering things up and looking so innocently uninterested in UFOs?

Seems to me some error is afoot here. Either we're that good... or somebody else is.

Somebody else is.

Brain, are you pondering what I'm pondering?

Is there really some 'Shadow Government' some say exists? If so, are we sure it's terrestrial?

Generalizations notwithstanding, just a tickle and a giggle question often popping up in UFO debates with the public round here.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Re: Aliens Have Landed - Friedman

From: **Stanton Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 20:58:23 -0300
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 06:49:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Aliens Have Landed - Friedman

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Friday, May 05, 2006 3:04 PM
>Subject: Aliens Have Landed

>Source: Today - Colorado State University - Pueblo, Colorado, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/koe79>

>5/4/200

>Life

>Aliens Have Landed
>By Melodie Roberts

>Beyond the blue sky and the clouds, through the wounded ozone
>layer and into the darkness, the stars speckle around empty
>planets that scientists have researched for centuries to
>discover no visible life forms.

>Outside of what humans have been able to see, beyond the solar
>system, as we know it: who knows?

>All we have are clues.

>Those clues are the reason Robert Hastings, UFO lecturer, was at
>the university on April 17.

>He has lectured at over 500 universities in the past 12 years
>and has been studying UFOs for the past 33.

>Twelve people sprinkled the technology auditorium and Hastings
>said he was disappointed with the turnout.

<snip>

Obviously the PR effort by the college wasn't that great. On March 23 I spoke at Pikes Peak Community College in Colorado Springs, Colorado. For the first time ever they filled their auditorium (305) and actually scheduled a second lecture for later that evening. About 200 second time around... Just in case somebody thinks the poor attendance in Pueblo means nobody is interested.

I can't blame the inaccuracies in the coverage on Hastings. Obviously the tone was OK.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 17:51:06 -0700
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 06:52:10 -0400
Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy - Olson

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 04 May 2006 14:15:33 -0300
>Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 20:56:09 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Friedman Reviews Clancy

>If you have some time to badly waste, go to Amazon for the
>Clancy book and see the reviews from the Scientific American
>writer and Skeptic magazine's editor, Michael Shermer.

>No critical thinking there.

Thanks, Don. I need to check out some of your stuff :).

The only thing I've heard Michael Shermer say that I agree with
is that there is no God. That's it. I guess our both being
atheists doesn't amount to much of a philosophic bond.

Best,
Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 01:28:54 -0300
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 06:54:46 -0400
Subject: Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk' - Ledger

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 02:21:34 -0700
>Subject: Re: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk'

>>From: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -<UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 12:09 PM
>>Subject: USAF Trackers Watch For 'Space Junk'

>>Source: The Aero-News Network - Winter Haven, Florida, USA

>><http://tinyurl.com/poczr>

>>Thu, 04 May '06

>>USAF Trackers Keep An Eye Out For 'Space Junk'
>>Orbital Debris Monitored By GEODSS

><snip>

>I'm glad there are some good eyes looking upward. But, suppose
>they see something really anomalous? What are the chances we
>will hear anything about it? Are they nil, zero, or something in
>between?

I don't think the odds are that good, Larry.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Hacker Fears 'UFO Cover-Up'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 07:14:25 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 07:14:25 -0400
Subject: Hacker Fears 'UFO Cover-Up'

Source: BBC News - London, UK

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/click_online/4977134.stm

5 May 2006

Hacker Fears 'UFO Cover-Up'

In 2002, Gary McKinnon was arrested by the UK's national high-tech crime unit, after being accused of hacking into NASA and the US military computer networks.

He says he spent two years looking for photographic evidence of alien spacecraft and advanced power technology.

America now wants to put him on trial, and if tried there he could face 60 years behind bars.

Banned from using the internet, Gary spoke to Click presenter Spencer Kelly to tell his side of the story, ahead of his extradition hearing on Wednesday, 10 May. You can read what he had to say here.

Spencer Kelly: Here's your list of charges: you hacked into the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and NASA, amongst other things. Why?

Gary McKinnon: I was in search of suppressed technology, laughingly referred to as UFO technology. I think it's the biggest kept secret in the world because of its comic value, but it's a very important thing.

Old-age pensioners can't pay their fuel bills, countries are invaded to award oil contracts to the West, and meanwhile secretive parts of the secret government are sitting on suppressed technology for free energy.

SK: How did you go about trying to find the stuff you were looking for in NASA, in the Department of Defense?

GM: Unlike the press would have you believe, it wasn't very clever. I searched for blank passwords, I wrote a tiny Perl script that tied together other people's programs that search for blank passwords, so you could scan 65,000 machines in just over eight minutes.

SK: So you're saying that you found computers which had a high-ranking status, administrator status, which hadn't had their passwords set - they were still set to default?

GM: Yes, precisely.

SK: Were you the only hacker to make it past the slightly lower-than-expected lines of defence?

GM: Yes, exactly, there were no lines of defence. There was a permanent tenancy of foreign hackers. You could run a command when you were on the machine that showed connections from all over the world, check the IP address to see if it was another military base or whatever, and it wasn't.

The General Accounting Office in America has again published another damning report saying that federal security is very, very poor.

SK: Over what kind of period were you hacking into these computers? Was it a one-time only, or for the course of a week?

GM: Oh no, it was a couple of years.

SK: And you went unnoticed for a couple of years?

GM: Oh yes. I used to be careful about the hours.

SK: So you would log on in the middle of the night, say?

GM: Yes, I'd always be juggling different time zones. Doing it at night time there's hopefully not many people around. But there was one occasion when a network engineer saw me and actually questioned me and we actually talked to each other via WordPad, which was very, very strange.

SK: So what did he say? And what did you say?

GM: He said "What are you doing?" which was a bit shocking. I told him I was from Military Computer Security, which he fully believed.

SK: Did you find what you were looking for?

GM: Yes.

SK: Tell us about it.

GM: There was a group called the Disclosure Project. They published a book which had 400 expert witnesses ranging from civilian air traffic controllers, through military radar operators, right up to the chaps who were responsible for whether or not to launch nuclear missiles.

They are some very credible, relied upon people, all saying yes, there is UFO technology, there's anti-gravity, there's free energy, and it's extra-terrestrial in origin, and we've captured spacecraft and reverse-engineered it.

SK: What did you find inside NASA?

GM: One of these people was a NASA photographic expert, and she said that in building eight of Johnson Space Centre they regularly airbrushed out images of UFOs from the high-resolution satellite imaging. What she said was there was there: there were folders called "filtered" and "unfiltered", "processed" and "raw", something like that.

I got one picture out of the folder, and bearing in mind this is a 56k dial-up, so a very slow internet connection, in dial-up days, using the remote control programme I turned the colour down to 4bit colour and the screen resolution really, really low, and even then the picture was still juddering as it came onto the screen.

But what came on to the screen was amazing. It was a culmination of all my efforts. It was a picture of something that definitely wasn't man-made.

It was above the Earth's hemisphere. It kind of looked like a satellite. It was cigar-shaped and had geodesic domes above, below, to the left, the right and both ends of it, and although it was a low-resolution picture it was very close up.

This thing was hanging in space, the earth's hemisphere visible below it, and no rivets, no seams, none of the stuff associated with normal man-made manufacturing.

SK: Is it possible this is an artist's impression?

GM: I don't know... For me, it was more than a coincidence. This woman has said: "This is what happens, in this building, in this space centre". I went into that building, that space centre, and saw exactly that.

SK: Do you have a copy of this? It came down to your machine.

GM: No, the graphical remote viewer works frame by frame. It's a Java application, so there's nothing to save on your hard drive, or at least if it is, only one frame at a time.

SK: So did you get the one frame?

GM: No.

SK: What happened?

GM: Once I was cut off, my picture just disappeared.

SK: You were actually cut off the time you were downloading the picture?

GM: Yes, I saw the guy's hand move across.

SK: You acknowledge that what you did was against the law, it was wrong, don't you?

GM: Unauthorised access is against the law and it is wrong.

SK: What do you think is a suitable punishment for someone who did what you did?

GM: Firstly, because of what I was looking for, I think I was morally correct. Even though I regret it now, I think the free energy technology should be publicly available.

I want to be tried in my own country, under the Computer Misuse Act, and I want evidence brought forward, or at least want the Americans to have to provide evidence in order to extradite me, because I know there is no evidence of damage.

NASA told Click that it does not discuss computer security issues or legal matters. It denied it would ever manipulate images in order to deceive and said it had a policy of open and full disclosure, adding it had no direct evidence of extra-terrestrial life.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Re: UFOs Are Back - Pope

From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 11:43:56 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 08:07:39 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back - Pope

>From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Apr 2006 00:38:47 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: UFOs Are Back

>>From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Apr 2006 09:10:03 +0100
>>Subject: UFOs Are Back

>>In response to recent 'ufology is dead' articles in the media,
>>my agent asked me to write something for the publishing
>>industry, setting the record straight.

>>Here's the article:

>>Source: The Andrew Lownie Literary Agency - London, UK

>>http://www.andrewlownie.co.uk/articles/2006/april_07UFO.shtml

<snip>

>Of more relevance to those interested in the study of alien
>encounters is the other argument being put forth -- that
>'ufology is dead' because there are fewer ufo sightings or alien
>encounters being reported in recent years.

<snip>

I don't think one can draw meaningful conclusions about the state of ufology solely on the basis of a statistical analysis of sighting reports. For a start, there's no central database. Furthermore, the figures relate not to UFO sightings, but to those sightings that were reported. The proportion of sightings that are reported will vary and may depend on a number of factors including awareness of where one can make a report, and the extent to which one believes one's report will be properly investigated. Much of this will depend on recent media coverage of the phenomenon. Many of the problems have been discussed on this List before:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2004/feb/m15-012.shtml>

The Ministry of Defence has figures dating from 1959 onwards, but I was well aware that even the MOD had only a piece of the puzzle:

<http://tinyurl.com/kngx5>

I suspect that the health (or otherwise) of ufology doesn't lend itself to measurement by any single factor. A number of different measuring criteria would need to be used, all of which (like number of sightings) are themselves hard to measure, or have other problems associated with them. These include - but are not limited to - the following:

The extent to which governments take a serious interest in the phenomenon.

The extent to which scientists take an interest in ufology.

The number of UFO conferences being organised, and attendance at such conferences.

The number of new UFO documentaries in production, and viewing figures for existing UFO documentaries.

The amount of other media coverage of the phenomenon.

The number of new UFO books being commissioned, and the number of existing UFO books being read.

The extent to which school projects on UFOs are taking place.

The extent to which ufologists are producing significant new material on UFO investigations and research.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Important Breaking News

From: Gary Anthony <garyant.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 13:11:55 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 08:26:36 -0400
Subject: Important Breaking News

Dear colleagues,

For many years we have endeavoured to discover the precise roles, policies and actions of the Ministry of Defence concerning UFO phenomena. This focus has been directed from various perspectives, most recently utilising the new UK Government's Freedom of Information Act.

The information we have uncovered reveals a hitherto unknown and far-reaching aspect of the MoD's involvement in the study of UFOs.

Newly discovered documentation supports and validates the research and conclusions of serious UFO researchers, whilst highlighting several concerns the MoD have about the potential within the UFO phenomena.

The information has already been released to us in its entirety by the MoD and will shortly be available to the general public.

We expect a great deal of media interest and so advise paying close attention to the UK Press and television news sources beginning with the BBC on Sunday evening (7th May).

For further information please visit www.uk-ufo.org from Monday, 8th May.

Regards

Gary Anthony
David Clarke
Joe McGonagle
Andy Roberts

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 6](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 14:03:30 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 14:29:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 19:24:35 EDT
>Subject: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>We're not able, for some unknown reason, to stop drug dealing,
>illegal immigration, yet able to swiftly hush up and hide and
>curtail the good UFO stuff?

>Are we sure we're that good at covering things up and looking so
>innocently uninterested in UFOs?

>Seems to me some error is afoot here. Either we're that good...
>or somebody else is.

Good questions Greg,

Get the impression that we don't see gov't (or corporate
`media') admitting reality on UFOs for same reason we don't see
it on things like taxation, real crime stats (mostly fraud in
gov't & corps, but murkier stuff too) - they have too much to
lose, or at least think so.

There's a quote - "strangely, the sighting wasn't truthfully
reported" that could apply on many occasions, however, try it in
Google and the answer links UFOs with those in authority.

I'm still wondering about that one - a UFO credibly seen
hovering over the (high-security) house of a top politician
whose policies were actively harming many, many people.

And still do - tho' now being applied by those claiming to be
political "opposition"?

Like you say - strange.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

May 07, 2006

Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
Jack Grimston

They didn't come from outer space: UFOs crash on Planet Sceptic

BRITAIN=92s defence intelligence chiefs have come up with a detailed scientific explanation to solve the mystery of unidentified flying objects.

After a four-year inquiry, they have concluded that most sightings can be explained by a little-understood atmospheric phenomenon.

Scientists at the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) describe how glowing "plasmas" of gas are created by charges of electricity. Air flows then sculpt the plasmas into aerodynamic shapes which appear to fly at extraordinary speeds through the sky.

The document is emphatic that UFOs do not come from alien civilisations or hostile powers, but equally it does not dismiss those who claim to have seen them as fantasists or hoaxers.

Instead, the scientists say such plasmas can play tricks on the mind, creating vivid impressions. They note that "local [electromagnetic] fields... have been medically proven to cause responses in the temporal lobes of the brain".

As a result, UFO witnesses may not be mad but instead suffering from "extended memory retention and repeat experiences" induced by the plasmas.

Their report says that, though UFOs have "defied credible description" as to their cause, they are confident that they now have "a reasonably justified explanation".

It goes on to recommend that the findings on UFOs =97 of which more than 100 are sighted in most years =97 could be developed for "novel military applications", adding that Russia is already investigating such weapons.

The report has been released under the Freedom of Information Act following an application by Dr David Clarke, a lecturer at Sheffield Hallam University, and Gary Anthony, a fellow researcher. The pair will give a presentation on the results this week.

It has been a bad year for conspiracy theorists. Last month, the "Roswell incident", another favourite, was debunked. John Humphreys, a special effects expert behind the television cyber-presenter Max Headroom, claimed he was one of the hoaxers behind grainy black and white footage supposedly showing an autopsy on alien corpses in 1947. He said the bodies were latex models.

Files released last year under freedom of information laws showed that the Ministry of Defence maintained a special unit, named S4F, responsible for logging sightings of UFOs by the public and the military, which numbered 88 in 2004.

Those files gave detailed accounts of sightings but did not indicate that the intelligence services were using the information as the basis of an inquiry codenamed Project Condign.

They began their inquiry in 1996, apparently without the knowledge of Michael Portillo, who was then defence secretary and responsible for the DIS.

The project was intended to assess any military danger UFOs might pose to Britain (it concludes they pose none).

The investigation by the DIS=92s section DI55 was completed in 2000 under Geoff Hoon, now Europe minister, when other branches of the same agency were busy trying to find Saddam Hussein=92s weapons of mass destruction.

The document, marked UK Eyes Only and entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air Defence Region, analyses 30 years of evidence on UFOs. Only 11 copies of the report were made.

"Credited with the ability to hover, land, take off, accelerate to exceptional velocities and vanish, they can reportedly alter their direction of flight suddenly and clearly can exhibit aerodynamic characteristics well beyond those of any known aircraft or missile," states the report.

While some non-hoax sightings of UFOs may be caused by wrongly identifying aircraft, various optical illusions or obvious natural phenomena, the most common explanation, the report concludes, is "several types of rarely encountered natural events within the atmosphere and ionosphere".

It describes how an "electrically charged... gaseous mass" can form in the atmosphere which is often invisible to radar but resembles the bright, fast-moving, round or cigar-shaped objects typically reported by UFO spotters.

Although the plasmas share the characteristics of reported UFOs, they remain a mystery. "The method of formations of the electrically charged plasmas... is not fully understood," the report finds.

Many of the other phenomena reported by UFO spotters can be explained by plasmas. For example, the report says the space between two plasmas sometimes "forms an area... from which the reflection of light does not occur", giving the impression of a "black =91craft=92, often triangular and even up to hundreds of feet in length".

In addition, the report finds that because plasmas are electrically charged, they can change shape or colour if hit by another energy source, such as a radio signal sent by a UFO spotter. "This has led =91ufologists=92 to imagine that an =91alien response=92 is being given to their signals," the report says.

Additional reporting: Tom Baird

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 16:54:34 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:24:42 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 19:24:35 EDT
>Subject: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>We've seen over the past six years our own government far too
>unprepared to handle major disasters nor gather proper
>intelligence on foreign and domestic matters ...

>We're not able, for some unknown reason, to stop drug dealing,
>illegal immigration, ...

The answer is spelled: A-G-E-N-D-A

I suggest such "failures" were planned that way.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:26:50 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 14:03:30 +0100
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 19:24:35 EDT
>>Subject: Who Is Behind It All?

><snip>

>>We're not able, for some unknown reason, to stop drug dealing,
>>illegal immigration, yet able to swiftly hush up and hide and
>>curtail the good UFO stuff?

>>Are we sure we're that good at covering things up and looking so
>>innocently uninterested in UFOs?

>>Seems to me some error is afoot here. Either we're that good...
>>or somebody else is.

>Good questions Greg,

>Get the impression that we don't see gov't (or corporate
>`media') admitting reality on UFOs for same reason we don't see
>it on things like taxation, real crime stats (mostly fraud in
>gov't & corps, but murkier stuff too) - they have too much to
>lose, or at least think so.

>There's a quote - "strangely, the sighting wasn't truthfully
>reported" that could apply on many occasions, however, try it in
>Google and the answer links UFOs with those in authority.

>I'm still wondering about that one - a UFO credibly seen
>hovering over the (high-security) house of a top politician
>whose policies were actively harming many, many people.

>And still do - tho' now being applied by those claiming to be
>political "opposition"?

>Like you say - strange.

>Cheers

>Ray D

Thanks Ray. Can always count on you for a level-headed reply.

I'm still worried however at the efficiency of the on the ground intimidations. I was stunned one day to run into one of these during an investigation many years ago. Just appeared out of nowhere, weird looking people who knew just what to say but didn't realize the expert with me was the official technical inspector for the company the event occurred at. I didn't know what to do but get good and mad and believe you me that worked! I guess growing up in and around the Bronx and Brooklyn worked. Takes a lot to ruffle my feathers and threats don't work.

I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 23:33:12 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:28:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Rimmer

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 19:24:35 EDT
>Subject: Who Is Behind It All?

>They show up and cover up and secret away all the best UFO
>evidence and proof.

>They fumble with people's minds.

>They instill fear in our top brass, leaders, press, and public.

>They somehow, some way, know when things happen in full uniform
>and with remarkable stealth and authority.

>Yet we're told no agency in our government is interested in
>UFOs.

>Who are these guys?

>Who is behind it all?

>We've seen over the past six years our own government far too
>unprepared to handle major disasters nor gather proper
>intelligence on foreign and domestic matters yet we're led to
>believe the same government is so astute and pervasive in
>covering up the UFO enigma.

>We're not able, for some unknown reason, to stop drug dealing,
>illegal immigration, yet able to swiftly hush up and hide and
>curtail the good UFO stuff?

>Are we sure we're that good at covering things up and looking so
>innocently uninterested in UFOs?

>Seems to me some error is afoot here. Either we're that good...
>or somebody else is.

Or there's nothing much to cover up, so you don't actually need
a super-secret, super-efficient shadow government to do the job

>Somebody else is.

>Brain, are you pondering what I'm pondering?

>Is there really some 'Shadow Government' some say exists? If so,
>are we sure it's terrestrial?

>Generalizations notwithstanding, just a tickle and a giggle
>question often popping up in UFO debates with the public round
>here.

Ah, but who's covering up the Shadow Government? The shadow
Shadow Government?

--

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:36:11 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:36:11 -0400
Subject: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

Source: BBC News - London, UK

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4981720.stm>

Sunday, 7 May 2006

UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens
Mark Simpson
BBC News

A confidential Ministry of Defence report on Unidentified Flying Objects has concluded that there is no proof of alien life forms.

In spite of the secrecy surrounding the UFO study, it seems citizens of planet Earth have little to worry about.

The report, which was completed in 2000 and stamped "Secret: UK Eyes Only", has been made public for the first time.

Only a small number of copies were produced and the identity of the man who wrote it has been protected.

His findings were only made public thanks to the Freedom of Information Act, after a request by Sheffield Hallam University academic Dr David Clarke.

The four-year study - entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK - tackles the long-running question by UFO-spotters: "Is anyone out there?"

The answer, it seems, is "no".

The 400-page report puts it like this: "No evidence exists to suggest that the phenomena seen are hostile or under any type of control, other than that of natural physical forces."

It adds: "There is no evidence that 'solid' objects exist which could cause a collision hazard."

So if there are no such things as little green men in spaceships or flying saucers, why have so many people reported seeing them?

Well, here is the science bit.

"Evidence suggests that meteors and their well-known effects and, possibly some other less-known effects are responsible for some unidentified aerial phenomena," concludes the report.

"Considerable evidence exists to support the thesis that the events are almost certainly attributable to physical, electrical and magnetic phenomena in the atmosphere, mesosphere and ionosphere.

"They appear to originate due to more than one set of weather and electrically-charged conditions and are observed so

infrequently as to make them unique to the majority of observers."

People who claim to have had a "close encounter" are often difficult to persuade that they did not really see what they thought they saw. The report offers a possible medical explanation.

"The close proximity of plasma related fields can adversely affect a vehicle or person," states the report.

"Local fields of this type have been medically proven to cause responses in the temporal lobes of the human brain. These result in the observer sustaining (and later describing and retaining) his or her own vivid, but mainly incorrect, description of what is experienced."

There are, of course, other causes of UFOs - aeroplanes with particularly bright lights, stray odd-shaped balloons and strange flocks of birds, to name but a few.

Yet, it will be difficult to convince everyone that there is a rational explanation for all mysterious movements in the sky.

Some UFO-spotters believe governments will always cover up the truth about UFOs, because they are afraid of admitting that there is something beyond their control.

It is not clear how much time and effort the MoD has spent looking at the skies in recent years, but it appears there are no plans for an in-depth UFO report like the one written in 2000.

A MoD spokesperson said: "Both this study and the original "Flying Saucer Working Party" [already in public domain in the national Archives] concluded that there is insufficient evidence to indicate the presence of any genuine unidentified aerial phenomena.

"It is unlikely that we would carry out any future studies unless such evidence were to emerge."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Extracts From 'Hearing On Life In The Universe'

From: **Sergey Shpakovsky** <sergejsh.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 04:31:15 -0400 (EDT)
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:44:07 -0400
Subject: Extracts From 'Hearing On Life In The Universe'

Hello List,

I found quite interesting and sometimes funny reading - Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics Hearing on Life in the Universe. It was, actually, mentioned here before, years ago, but not these 2 parts:

Extracts from:

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics Hearing on Life in the Universe

July 12, 2001

Link on house.gov: <http://tinyurl.com/gaj9k>

(For "Who is Who" in this dialog, please read Appendix at the end of message)

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LIFE AND INTELLIGENT LIFE

Mr. GORDON. Dr. Weiler, would you define for me, please, in terms of extraterrestrial life, the difference between life and intelligent life?

Dr. WEILER. The difference between life and intelligent life?

Mr. GORDON. Yes, sir.

Dr. WEILER. I will look for any help I can get on this one.

Mr. GORDON. Well, what are we defining...

Dr. WEILER. How do we define intelligence is what you are asking?

Mr. GORDON. No. I...

Dr. WEILER. Oh.

Mr. GORDON. No. I think the difference between life and intelligent life is that - I mean, these are two different terms. Aren't they?

Dr. WEILER. Well...

Mr. GORDON. Well, okay.

Dr. WEILER. Let me try...

Mr. GORDON. Well, somebody else. Dr. Tyson, why don't you give it a try?

Dr. TYSON. I would be happy to try. I think we have this egocentrism about our species that we define ourselves to be intelligent and nothing...

Mr. GORDON. I have only got 5 minutes. Let me try...

Dr. TYSON. Yes. Sure. Sure. And let us...

Mr. GORDON. Be pretty quick.

Dr. TYSON. We define ourselves as intelligent and nothing else being so. And in that definition we imagine that we are the only species to contemplate our fate.

Mr. GORDON. So intelligent life is just us then.

Dr. TYSON. That is commonly - I don't think of it that way, but the broadest sense of that does...

Mr. GORDON. All right. Dr. Farmer, what would - how would you define the difference between life and intelligent life?

Dr. FARMER. The question of intelligence...

Mr. GORDON. In terms of extraterrestrial.

Dr. FARMER. Yeah. I think the question of intelligence, you know, is more difficult to handle. But from a practical standpoint, I think it is a species that is able to modify its environment through technology and other means to substantially have control over their destiny. And I think that, you know, in terms of humankind, that is kind of what sets us apart.

Mr. GORDON. All right. And try to bring me - you know, a bacteria, microbe - that is life. Correct?

Dr. FARMER. Absolutely.

Mr. GORDON. Okay. Now, take me up to where it is intelligent life.

Dr. FARMER. Well, you know, and...

Mr. GORDON. And it is actually boys and girls, and then they have kids, and then they are able to hunt.

Dr. FARMER. I think, you know, I would trace it personally - and I know specialists in this area, but from my standpoint, I would view it in terms of the first technology developments that allowed humans to really gain an advantage in their environment.

Mr. GORDON. So is that levers and...

Dr. FARMER. Things like - yeah, the first Clovis points and things that they could use to hunt...

Mr. GORDON. Uh-huh.

Dr. FARMER [continuing]. To actually become very efficient, effective hunters...

Mr. GORDON. Okay. And what...

Dr. FARMER [continuing]. And some people believe that that led to the extinction of a lot of other species.

Mr. GORDON. I mean, I asked this question because there just seems to me an enormous difference between discovering extraterrestrial life and intelligent life. Do you want to - and would you want to add anything to our definition here and then I will go to the next question?

Dr. CHYBA. I would only add, Mr. Gordon, that with respect to the ancestors of humans, by about 30 million years ago, there were several species of dolphins on this planet who had brains that were larger related - in relation to their bodies than some of our tool-using ancestors...

Mr. GORDON. Uh-huh.

Dr. CHYBA [continuing]. Did. So it is not clear to me that we are the only intelligent species that have evolved or...

Mr. GORDON. So would you define - if we found a dolphin somewhere,

would you consider that intelligent life...

Dr. CHYBA. I think that we would.

Mr. GORDON [continuing]. If you see one now?

Dr. CHYBA. As a practical matter, the only type of intelligence we are going to detect any time soon is technical intelligence, and humans are essentially unique in that respect.

Mr. GORDON. All right. Well, why don't we just start with Dr. Tyson. Again, I don't mean to be abrupt.

We just have a short period of time here. This is hard, hard, I know, to - you want to put premises. But just give me your own gut feeling as to odds that there is extraterrestrial life and then that there is extraterrestrial intelligent life.

Dr. TYSON. Yeah.

Mr. GORDON. What odds? Just give me some odds.

Dr. TYSON. I would say it is near certainty that there is life elsewhere in the universe of any form.

Mr. GORDON. Okay.

Dr. TYSON. And I am somewhat more skeptical about the likelihood of intelligent life as we have defined it to be technologically capable, just given how rare that has exhibited itself in our own...

Mr. GORDON. Dr. Farmer, do you want to give a - give some odds here?

Dr. FARMER. Well, I would agree. I mean, I think that the kind of technical intelligence that we are talking about is probably rare.

Mr. GORDON. Well, just give me some odds. That is all I am really asking for right now.

Dr. FARMER. Well, I - you know, I think it is very hard to do. But I would - you know, these estimates that people have made are all over the map.

Mr. GORDON. Yeah. But I am just saying, you know, just...

Dr. FARMER. But within our own backyard, I would think that...

Mr. GORDON. I am just - well, you know...

Dr. FARMER. I would think on the order of hundreds of potential civilizations within our galaxy. I would feel comfortable with that.

Mr. GORDON. So do you think there is a 90 percent chance that there is life? At 80 percent? A 12...

Dr. FARMER. In our solar system, I have always said about 50/50 and that is - again, that is just - that is not...

Mr. GORDON. Okay.

Dr. FARMER [continuing]. Science. That is a personal opinion.

Mr. GORDON. Oh. No. No. That is what I am asking for. That is all I am asking for.

Dr. FARMER. And, you know, if you...

Mr. GORDON. And what about intelligent life? What kind of odds?

Dr. FARMER. In - beyond the earth and our own...

Mr. GORDON. Yeah.

Dr. FARMER [continuing]. Solar system, I would put at essentially probably nonexistent because I am...

Mr. GORDON. Okay. Dr. Weiler, how about you?

Dr. WEILER. I have learned never underestimate the ability of humans to make themselves special, number one. I believe the possibility of life, of any kind of life, including a bacterium in the solar system, is maybe 50/50; intelligent life, zero, other than the earth. In the universe, I think the probability of intelligent life is 1.0, 100 percent. To not believe in a universe with $1=7F$ - to $10=7F=7F$ stars that intelligent life only sprung up on our little special place in the universe.

Mr. GORDON. Okay. How about you? Do you want to give some odds?

Dr. CHYBA. I think that it is almost certain that life exists elsewhere, although we don't know. And I think that it is quite possible that intelligent life exists elsewhere, but the only way to find out is to search.

Mr. GORDON. So what odds - how do you define quite - 50? 40? 30? 20?

Dr. CHYBA. Mr. Gordon, I wish I knew. I just don't know.

Mr. GORDON. Yeah. But - well, I know you don't know, but what is your - if you - you know, what is your feeling? Nobody knows. Okay.

<snip>

<snip>

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Chairman ROHRBACHER [continuing]. A couple more minutes and Mr. Gordon a couple more minutes and then to break and to hold the hearing in conclusion. Okay. I am going to ask the question nobody else has the courage to ask. What about it? What about these objects flying around? And when I was a - I was a young reporter, I remember I covered a story with two policemen in Los Angeles. And these guys took their careers in their hands, because they knew anybody who would make a report like this would likely to be hurt in their career - not helped, but hurt. And they said they saw a metal object floating down the street in Los Angeles about - it must have been about three o'clock, four o'clock in the morning and they chased this thing. These were two reputable people. They have no doubt about it that they were fine men, not lying, because if they did, they were lying in a way that would really hurt their potential careers. Is it potential that we have got not only life out there, but some of those intelligent life involved with visiting this planet?

Dr. TYSON. Are you going down the line? Okay. I will be happy to start. First of all, in science, we have learned, and there are extraordinary scientific examples to back this up - we have learned in science that among all forms of evidence you could bring forth, the least reliable is eyewitness testimony. And apologies to attorneys in the audience, that is just the way it is. And it doesn't matter what it is you are talking about. It could be something that doesn't have enormous implications for having been visited by aliens. It could be spectral line strengths in a red giant atmosphere. If you are just going to say I saw it, no one will believe you unless you can bring forth higher quality evidence. And so that is my first comment.

My second comment is, I spend my life working in a museum where artifacts matter. That is what gets put on display.

Chairman ROHRBACHER. Okay. Have you ever seen any physical evidence? I mean, I have seen lots of pictures. And I mean, we have all seen these photos. Have you seen any physical evidence that would indicate to you that...

Dr. TYSON. The answer is, no, and it wasn't for want of trying. I visited, for example...

Chairman ROHRBACHER. All right.

Dr. TYSON [continuing]. The UFO Museum in Roswell to see what a museum of such artifacts would be. And it was filled with newspaper accounts of people's eyewitness testimonies...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Right.

Dr. TYSON [continuing]. Mounted and not actual artifacts. And so I was disappointed, actually. But it falls far short...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Okay.

Dr. TYSON [continuing]. Of what you would consider...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. You would like to believe it, but you don't.

Dr. TYSON. Yeah. It is...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Okay.

Dr. TYSON [continuing]. Non-compelling.

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Okay. Dr. Farmer.

Dr. FARMER. Well, I think this question of alien visitation has always managed to remain on the sort of outside of the purview of science. We have never really been able to seem to get a grip on anything that is contestable.

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Just remember, if we are sending probes out there, we are the alien visitors out there and...

Dr. FARMER. Well, that is right. Yeah.

Chairman ROHRABACHER [continuing]. It wouldn't...

Dr. FARMER. And...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Other people might want to do the same if they existed out there.

Dr. FARMER. But I - you know, I guess, I - on a personal level, I can't say that I am disinterested. I have to admit that the show 'Roswell' kind of captured my imagination last year. The great young actors - I became very concerned about the well-being of those aliens in the Earth environment. I was, you know, not so concerned about humans. Regarding human abduction, I would just love to sign up, but, you know, I raise my hand nobody picks me up. You know, I would love to go. But...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. All right. So - but you don't...

Dr. FARMER [continuing]. That is all I have to say.

Chairman ROHRABACHER. You don't believe...

Dr. FARMER. I haven't seen anything that would...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. You have seen no compelling evidence of...

Dr. FARMER. No.

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Dr. Weiler.

Dr. WEILER. Although I think life - I used to be a ground-based astronomer before I worked for NASA and I have spent thousands of hours of looking at the sky. And I would call myself an experienced observer. I have seen lots of moving objects in the sky, but I have always been able to point them out as satellites or other things. So personally, I haven't had any direct experience.

Although I believe, in my heart, that there is 100 percent chance that there is alien life out there, intelligent life, I am also a physicist and recognize the physics I understand, and we understand at this table, with the best technology we have, it would take hundreds, if not thousands of years, to make the trip to the nearest star. Unless there is some physics out there we don't understand yet, and I also believe that is true.

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Right.

Dr. WEILER. The idea of some technological society visiting us frequently just is - it is hard to contemplate.

Chairman ROHRABACHER. All right. Dr. Chyba.

Dr. CHYBA. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in your opening remarks you mentioned the film, 'The Day the Earth Stood Still,' a classic movie. And it is that film that has always made me puzzled by some other reports. It seems to me that if an extraterrestrial civilization were going to visit, they would quite possibly do the obvious thing, land right on the Ellipse near the White House. Why is it that so often they seem to buzz remote places rather than come down over a city? But nevertheless, I would have to say that...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. And make contact with some of the most uninteresting people.

Dr. CHYBA. I have to say that fundamental to the scientific attitude is to have an open mind. So I think that we should keep an open mind. But that open mind has to be coupled with skepticism. That has to be coupled with skepticism in our own research and it has to be coupled with skepticism toward eyewitness testimony. But we need to keep an open mind.

Mr. Chairman, just returning to your previous comments, right before you asked the question, again, we are not asking for an earmark. All we would like to see is a level playing field where the SETI science is treated in the same way, peer-reviewed way, as other science.

Chairman ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much. Just for the record, this Chairman does not dismiss all of these reports. I mean, I - when I was a young man, those two policemen were very convincing, and they saw something. I don't know what they saw. They were trained observers, and we have seen reports from people who are very credible. Now, I don't know what it is, and there may be black - and I know that there are black programs in the United States Government. I worked in the White House for a while where there was incredible things going on right in the next office, and I didn't know about it. And let me just say that - and that - I think that is true of every White House. But different things go on next door in different White Houses. And we won't go into any details.

But let me just say, I think that a healthy skepticism is important, but I think an open mind toward these things is also important.

Dr. TYSON. Your mind shouldn't be so open that your brains fall out. So just - open minds are important, but...

Chairman ROHRABACHER. That is what I say. I am open-minded, but I am not the Grand Canyon.

Dr. TYSON. Right.

Chairman ROHRABACHER:
Dana Rohrabacher, Chairman, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, U.S. House of Representatives
<http://rohrabacher.house.gov/Biography/>

Mr. GORDON:
Bart Gordon, Member, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, U.S. House of Representatives
<http://gordon.house.gov/about/>

Dr. WEILER:
Edward J. Weiler, Associate Administrator, Office of Space Science, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)
http://www.nasa.gov/about/highlights/weiler_biography.html

Dr. TYSON:
Neil deGrasse Tyson, Director, Department of Astrophysics and Hayden Planetarium, American Museum of Natural History, New York City
<http://research.amnh.org/users/tyson/>

Dr. FARMER:
Jack D. Farmer, Representative, Arizona State University, NASA Astrobiology Institute
<http://geology.asu.edu/~jfarmer/biography/pro.html>

Dr. CHYBA:

Christopher F. Chyba, Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI) Institute, and Associate Professor, Department of Geological and Environmental Science, Stanford University

<http://cisac.stanford.edu/people/christopherfchyba/>

Link to Hearing on Life in the Universe can be found at:

<http://www.house.gov/science/hearings/index.htm>

-> Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee Hearings

Sergey

Toronto

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Obvious Spin

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 13:11:16 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:47:02 -0400
Subject: Obvious Spin

"Secret: UK Eyes Only" is FoI'd

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4981720.stm>

Sunday, 7 May 2006, 11:06 GMT 12:06 UK

Quote:

"Evidence suggests that meteors and their well-known effects and, possibly some other less-known effects are responsible for some unidentified aerial phenomena," concludes the report.

"Considerable evidence exists to support the thesis that the events are almost certainly attributable to physical, electrical and magnetic phenomena in the atmosphere, mesosphere and ionosphere.

"They appear to originate due to more than one set of weather and electrically-charged conditions and are observed so infrequently as to make them unique to the majority of observers."

To me that's saying (carefully) - "We don't know - and so will just try to explain it away".

But more obvious spin shows in BBC's title - "UFO study finds no sign of aliens".

A not-so subtle mis-representation of the report's actual words - "no evidence exists to suggest that the phenomena seen are hostile or under any type of control, other than that of natural physical forces."

We can see:

- 1) careful gov't/ military mis-representation of witness reports;
- 2) further media mis-representation of already slanted "gov't/military findings".

Seems they're both afraid to face up to something.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 10:00:52 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:49:34 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Shell

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>May 07, 2006

>

>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma

>Jack Grimston

>After a four-year inquiry, they have concluded that most
>sightings can be explained by a little-understood atmospheric
>phenomenon.

>Scientists at the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) describe how
>glowing "plasmas" of gas are created by charges of electricity.
>Air flows then sculpt the plasmas into aerodynamic shapes which
>appear to fly at extraordinary speeds through the sky.

OK, I guess we can all stop worrying, accept this definitive
final solution to the mystery, and find other hobbies.

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

From: Joe McGonagle <Joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:11:50 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:54:55 -0400
Subject: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

In view of the earlier-than-expected media coverage,

www.uk-ufo.org

is now open for access.

Regards,

Joe McGonagle
Gary Anthony
Andy Roberts
David Clarke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 21:22:19 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:57:31 -0400
Subject: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

Does anyone know if that military report of a test missile warhead, fired out over the Pacific some years ago and got circled in flight and 'beamed' by a UFO "tumbled into the ocean," or simply continued on its trajectory with the electronics disabled?

To my mind, there's a huge difference there.

I think the description said "tumbled into the ocean", and that would mean a considerable mechanical force would have been applied by the UFO to halt the forward momentum. The force necessary to do this would clearly take this case out of some sort of "lens aberration of the tracking telescope" explanation.

That in turn would significantly shore up the "real-ness" of at least that UFO, and maybe help debunk the debunkers.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Friedman

From: **Stanton Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 13:00:25 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 13:37:54 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Friedman

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>May 07, 2006

>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
>Jack Grimston

<snip>

It is interesting that no mention is made of plasmas around craft as part of, for example, a magnetoaerodynamic propulsion system, about which I have been talking and writing for almost 40 years.

Phil Klass at one time was also talking about atmospheric plasmas... his physics was totally flawed. How about that bit about the Humphreys dummy supposedly putting the Roswell Incident to rest, as opposed to the alien autopsy footage which Santilli has insisted has nothing to do with Roswell?

Psychologist Susan Blackmore has been talking nonsense about magnetic effects on brain lobes, along with Michael Persinger , for many years.

Can't wait to read more.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 16:20:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street (have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote - we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

That the sort of thing you mean?

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 12:12:17 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 16:14:20 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>May 07, 2006

>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
>Jack Grimston

The dynamic debunker trio strikes again. Here I thought they were coming up with something serious. I should have known better.

This drivel showed up in the Sunday paper, with the usual childish title, Relax, it's just gas, not a UFO.

Whenever David Clarke and Andy Roberts and Joe McGonagle come rushing out, breathlessly, with the latest UK government regulations/revelations we should all know better.

What a load of malarky. Why would this be kept secret? It's kept secret for some years. Why, if it's just natural phenomenon, like lightning?

Then it takes an act implemented by government to force freedom of information, then it's only to be reased to debunkers in England who have coyly previewed this as "UFO" information, when it's just more of the same nonsense.

And where's the science, that's been hidden from a public that would naturally be terrified by this new "natural phenomenon" that's more sinister than tornadoes and tsunamis and lightning and hurricanes?

Are these scientists saying that they now believe in the oft recycled ball lightning?

I now believe - what I've suspected for some time - that there is a sustained coverup of this phenomenon and that many governments have an agenda and have kept the truth from us for some 60 years. This confirms 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 16:20:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street (have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote - we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

That the sort of thing you mean?

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 17:18:40 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:18:37 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Dickenson

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 10:00:52 -0400
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma

<snip>

>>Scientists at the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) describe how
>>glowing "plasmas" of gas are created by charges of electricity.
>>Air flows then sculpt the plasmas into aerodynamic shapes which
>>appear to fly at extraordinary speeds through the sky.

>OK, I guess we can all stop worrying, accept this definitive
>final solution to the mystery, and find other hobbies.

Hi Bob,

Think we've been privileged to be present at the coining of
another "swamp gas explanation" - dignified by a magic-sounding
name - plasma.

Plasma is in a candle-flame, in your light-bulb or neon tube,
and behind a cartridge that's just been hit by a firing-pin.
It's not magic, its behavior is ruled by temperature and,
depending on the percentage of electron-movement (ionization),
by any local electro-magnetic field.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma> (physics)

Our Sun is plasma, and more extreme versions emerge from poles
of neutron stars and, on even larger scale, from galactic cores
when jetting.

How's that sort of thing arriving, in a big way, at airfields or
missile-bases?

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: Extracts From 'Hearing On Life In The

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 09:28:49 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:19:45 -0400
Subject: Re: Extracts From 'Hearing On Life In The

>From: Sergey Shpakovsky <sergejsh.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 04:31:15 -0400 (EDT)
>Subject: Extracts From 'Hearing On Life In The Universe'

<snip>

>DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LIFE AND INTELLIGENT LIFE

>Mr. GORDON. Dr. Weiler, would you define for me, please, in terms of
>extraterrestrial life, the difference between life and
>intelligent life?

<snip>

>Dr. TYSON. We define ourselves as intelligent and nothing else
>being so. And in that definition we imagine that we are the only
>species to contemplate our fate.

<snip>

>Dr. FARMER. Yeah. I think the question of intelligence, you
>know, is more difficult to handle. But from a practical
>standpoint, I think it is a species that is able to modify its
>environment through technology and other means to substantially
>have control over their destiny. And I think that, you know, in
>terms of humankind, that is kind of what sets us apart.

<snip>

>Dr. CHYBA. As a practical matter, the only type of intelligence
>we are going to detect any time soon is technical intelligence,
>and humans are essentially unique in that respect.

<snip>

>Dr. TYSON. And I am somewhat more skeptical about the likelihood
>of intelligent life as we have defined it to be technologically
>capable, just given how rare that has exhibited itself in our
>own...

<snip>

>Dr. CHYBA. I think that it is almost certain that life exists
>elsewhere, although we don't know. And I think that it is quite
>possible that intelligent life exists elsewhere, but the only
>way to find out is to search.

<snip>

Excellent work Sergey!

But seriously ladies and gentlemen:

On extra-terrestrial intelligence, these Doctors are being asked
about something they, at least officially, have no experience
with. No experience equals no witness, and conclusions that are
imperfect, at least.

Keeping that in mind, the word technology is made up of two ideas: "tekhne" from the Greek signifies skill, art, craft, or trade; and "logos" also Greek for word, speech, or one who deals with something systematically. From these we can get an admittedly arbitrary and human-centered standard for intelligent life: those who leave identifiable written or otherwise "made" records.

I suppose that could also include abduction experiences, with the recording media being the ones abducted; i.e., witness testimony.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 12:32:41 EDT
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:22:03 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Boone

>Source: BBC News - London, UK

><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4981720.stm>

>Sunday, 7 May 2006

>UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens
>Mark Simpson
>BBC News

>A confidential Ministry of Defence report on Unidentified Flying
>Objects has concluded that there is no proof of alien life
>forms.

Um, if it's confidential how come we're reading about it on the web?
>In spite of the secrecy surrounding the UFO study, it seems
>citizens of planet Earth have little to worry about.

Oh no, nothing to worry about. We can go back to other less
trivial concerns like thermo nuclear war, global criminal
organizations that are generations old, drug trade, political
gangsters and of course that age old nemesis: overeating.

>The report, which was completed in 2000 and stamped "Secret: >UK
>Eyes Only", has been made public for the first time.

I thought 'Eyes Only' meant 'Eyes Only'. That means we're not
supposed to see it if we're normal folk, right? If so they
failed.

>Only a small number of copies were produced and the identity >of
>the man who wrote it has been protected.

Let's see, a small number of copies were produced but now half a
billion people can read about it? The man who wrote it has been
protected? Anyone round here seen any of the Monty Python guys
recently?

>His findings were only made public thanks to the Freedom of
>Information Act, after a request by Sheffield Hallam University
>academic Dr David Clarke.

Well let's chalk one up to good ol' SHU!

>The four-year study - entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in
>the UK - tackles the long-running question by UFO-spotters: "Is
>anyone out there?"

>The answer, it seems, is "no".

Here's where the red pencil shows up gang. First word for today
is 'seems'.

>The 400-page report puts it like this: "No evidence exists to
>suggest that the phenomena seen are hostile or under any type >of
>control, other than that of natural physical forces."

>It adds: "There is no evidence that 'solid' objects exist which

>could cause a collision hazard."

Somehow I'm thinking the play on words game is going on here.

>So if there are no such things as little green men in spaceships
>or flying saucers, why have so many people reported seeing >them?

>Well, here is the science bit.

>"Evidence suggests that meteors and their well-known effects
>and, possibly some other less-known effects are responsible >for
>some unidentified aerial phenomena," concludes the report.

Wait, I thought 'Well here is the science bit' wouldn't have
words like 'suggests', 'possibly', 'less-known' in it.

>"Considerable evidence exists to support the thesis that the
>events are almost certainly attributable to physical, electrical
>and magnetic phenomena in the atmosphere, mesosphere and
>ionosphere.

Thesis? 'almost certainly'? I'm worried my cousins in the UK use
the phrase 'almost pregnant' alot.

>"They appear to originate due to more than one set of weather
>and electrically-charged conditions and are observed so
>infrequently as to make them unique to the majority of
>observers."

>People who claim to have had a "close encounter" are often
>difficult to persuade that they did not really see what they
>thought they saw. The report offers a possible medical
>explanation.

Often difficult to persuade? If that's what they reported then
that's what's real to them. Why would anyone want to persuade
them otherwise? Take that data and store it and apply it to
other phenomena. If it's true it'll work. What is 'offers a
possible medical explanation'? Possible?

>"The close proximity of plasma related fields can adversely
>affect a vehicle or person," states the report.

Egad! A 400 page scientific investigation leads us all the way
back to another swamp gas like explanation?

>"Local fields of this type have been medically proven to cause
>responses in the temporal lobes of the human brain. These >result
>in the observer sustaining (and later describing and retaining)
>his or her own vivid, but mainly incorrect, description of what
>is experienced."

Yes plasma does do strange things to people. Every morning I
experience this feeling of euphoria when this giant plasma thing
appears in the sky. Oh wait, it's the Sun.

>There are, of course, other causes of UFOs - aeroplanes with
>particularly bright lights, stray odd-shaped balloons and
>strange flocks of birds, to name but a few.

Strange flocks of birds? That's funny. As opposed to normal
flocks of birds? Oh those UK birds are a jolly lot they are.
Always making with the funny flight patterns to outsmart the
statue cleaners. Oh, there was an animated movie out earlier
this year about birds who worked during WWII.

>Yet, it will be difficult to convince everyone that there is a
>rational explanation for all mysterious movements in the sky.

Not really. I'm quite sure the valiant and resourceful folks
from the UK who also report seeing angels and the like will
accept something rational. Something rational like someone is
flying aircraft and spacecraft around and some are
extraterrestrial in origin.

>Some UFO-spotters believe governments will always cover up >the
>truth about UFOs, because they are afraid of admitting that
>there is something beyond their control.

Gee, ya think we should be 100% trustful of our government's
disclosures? Last time I looked there were politicians getting

busted for all sorts of criminal activity and even one for driving while on medication and alcohol.

Yeah, I'll go on believing everything I'm told by politicians.

>It is not clear how much time and effort the MoD has spent
>looking at the skies in recent years, but it appears there are
>no plans for an in-depth UFO report like the one written in
>2000.

Thank goodness!

>A MoD spokesperson said: "Both this study and the original
>"Flying Saucer Working Party" [already in public domain in the
>national Archives] concluded that there is insufficient evidence
>to indicate the presence of any genuine unidentified aerial
>phenomena.

>"It is unlikely that we would carry out any future studies
>unless such evidence were to emerge."

'Insufficient evidence to indicate the presence of any genuine
unidentified aerial phenomena...'

WTH does that mean? A report containing words and phrases like possible, almost certainly etc. can suddenly get definitive?

I think this is someone's idea of a joke and they're saying we Yanks are killing the Queens's English?

This is the funniest thing I've read in a long time. Not to say it doesn't have it's merits. Sure we should look for the prosaic but not force it.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 14:20:34 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:24:22 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Ledger

>Source: BBC News - London, UK
><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4981720.stm>
>Sunday, 7 May 2006

>UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

>Mark Simpson
>BBC News

>A confidential Ministry of Defence report on Unidentified Flying Objects has concluded that there is no proof of alien life forms.

>In spite of the secrecy surrounding the UFO study, it seems >citizens of planet Earth have little to worry about.

>The report, which was completed in 2000 and stamped "Secret: UK >Eyes Only", has been made public for the first time.

>Only a small number of copies were produced and the identity of >the man who wrote it has been protected.

>His findings were only made public thanks to the Freedom of >Information Act, after a request by Sheffield Hallam University >academic Dr David Clarke.

>The four-year study - entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in >the UK - tackles the long-running question by UFO-spotters: "Is >anyone out there?"

<snip>

The above says it all. A secret report about a natural phenomenon with the title "Secret: UK Eyes Only" and the name of the writer of the "secret" report- note it didn't say scientists- was kept secret.

In the report:

1] UAPs exist but they are not space ships. They are natural, atmospheric and other phenomena, some of which are not fully understood.

But that conflicts with #6 which states:

6]There are no artifacts left by UAPs, or radiation traces, or any useful video or still camera photos held by MoD.

So how did they determine that were natural phenomenon?

You have to read the summary to wonder about the circular reasoning. It's not off to a good start.

Then we have:

2] Although extremely rare, UAPs may pose a hazard to air traffic. No evidence for the existence of solid objects was found by the study but some natural phenomena, such as plasmas, could be dangerous to aircraft particularly those flying low and

fast (a risk assessed as being lower than bird strikes).

Note: There are about 10-15 bird strikes reported by Canadian light plane and air carriers each day. Multiply that out and you end up with a pretty big number world wide. If 1/100th of one percent were UAP related, you are going to end up with quite a few UAP/plane strikes.

3] UAPs do not pose a threat to UK airspace, and there is no evidence they are aircraft from hostile nations.

Number three conflicts with number two.

UAPs may pose a hazard to air traffic but then UAPs do not pose a threat to UK airspace.

So far the data is limited. But it seems to pick on nocturnal lights and doesn't address sightings of the huge triangular objects, or cigar shaped objects, disc shaped objects of large size or multicolored lights on large objects. At first blush it doesn't appear to be very intrusive into the field. They arbitrarily discount the abbreviation UFO while embracing UAP which I'm comfortable with being a NARCAP rep. But it still means unidentified flying object and it's the word "object" the report has a problem with because that tends to make it a solid phenomenon rather than gaseous or plasma.

Condign Report? It was picked at random apparently.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 18:25:48 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:25:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Koi

>From: Joe McGonagle <Joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:11:50 +0100
>Subject: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>In view of the earlier-than-expected media coverage,

>www.uk-ufo.org

>is now open for access.

>Regards,

>Joe McGonagle
>Gary Anthony
>Andy Roberts
>David Clarke

Hi Joe et al,

Congratulations on getting the report released.

I look forward to reading the full report when all four volumes of the report are made available by the MOD via its Freedom of Information Publication Scheme.

Given the limitations on the source data, I presume that the analysis of the MOD database is not particularly enlightening.

However, the 25 Working Papers sound like they should be fairly interesting.

Pending reading the full report, it's difficult to tell whether the points which are debatable or quite simply factually incorrect in the seemingly inconsistent list of "Key points to emerge from the MoD report on UAPs" (on your website at the page below) are actually phrased the same way in the report itself: <http://www.uk-ufo.org/condign/condrep.htm>

For now, its quite entertaining reading through the Executive Summary and working out which books were consulted (for example, for the material apparently based on Persinger, Devereux, Klass etc).

All the best,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

UFO Shoot-Downs

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 14:13:49 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:27:25 -0400
Subject: UFO Shoot-Downs

Hi Everyone!

This past Saturday on 'Strange Days... Indeed' (Episode 391), researchers Stanton T. Friedman and Frank Feschino talked about "UFO Shoot-Downs". It was a very fascinating and timely talk coming just before the Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference on May 9 where the former Canadian Defence Minister Paul Hellyer will elaborate on this serious situation.

Reading Col. Philip J. Corso's book 'The Day After Roswell' and speaking with an unnamed U.S. General only confirmed what Paul Hellyer already knew about UFOs decades earlier. Below are a few short but very important quotes from Yurko Bondarchuk's well researched book 'UFO Canada' (1979, Signet 1981). The comments in [square brackets] are mine.

"Even more baffling are some incidents over the Canada/U.S. border, which ended in the disappearance of both the interceptors and the UFOs."5 Pages 97-98

<snip>

"As in the United States, UFO chases over Canada were certainly not isolated incidents. In his investigative book, Aliens From Space, Major Donald E. Keyhoe (USMC Ret.) maintained that:

Though jet pursuits are the usual method for capture attempts, at least one country has tried a different plan. In 1954 [the same year two large and unidentified objects entered Earth orbit that created much alarm in the U.S.], U.S. Air Force Intelligence learned that Canada had set up a top-secret project, after Royal Canadian Air Force pilots had failed to bring down a UFO [see Hugh Cochrane's book "Gateway To Oblivion" and other sources for some accounts of fatal plane crashes that were attributed to encounters with UFOs]. Hoping to lure aliens into landing [In the 1950s Canadian officials were alleged to been in direct contact with the occupants of these UFOs] the Defence Research Board established a restricted landing field near its experimental station at Suffield, Alberta. All RCAF and commercial pilots were banned from the area. But there was nothing to indicate that the restricted field was reserved for the alien machines and none came near the area. Even if the aliens had known, they might not have risked landing, AFTER HUNDREDS OF EARLIER CHASES BY THE RCAF [and the freedom of the ETs to land and take-off at will could not be unconditionally guaranteed by the Canadian Government]".6 Page 98

<snip>

"Because of this emphasis on secrecy, much of the UFO activities by the military between 1952 and 1966 have remained obscured under security classifications. It was not until July 1967, during a major nationwide UFO wave [while Hellyer was at the official opening of the world's first UFO landing pad at St. Paul, Alberta - a project by the local community in celebration of Canada's Centennial], that the veil of secrecy was partially lifted. Confronted with demands for government action, Defence Minister Paul Hellyer set out to reassure the public that the

DND [Canadian Department of National Defense] was looking into the matter. At the same time, he made the surprise revelation about the existence of the DRB [under Defense Research Board chairman Osmond Solandt that provided Wilbert B. Smith with the equipment and facilities at Shirley's Bay outside Ottawa for the flying saucer observatory and who also convened Project Second Storey in response to the UFO incidents in and around the NORAD base in North Bay, Ontario] landing site."11 Page 169

While in Ottawa recently visiting my family for Orthodox Easter, I made another visit to the Canadian Museum of Contemporary Photography (it was closed this time) to try to get them to do a special public exhibit of the incredible but still secret collection of UFO photos, including gun-camera film footage of UFOs taken during pursuit by Canadian interceptors. Some of these photos have been shown in confidence to some UFO witnesses and UFO investigators and I have personally talked to a few of the people who worked with or have access to this secret UFO photo collection. Among the collection are some very revealing photos obtained from the Canadian public but which were never returned to them. I believe the time has come for these UFO photos to be declassified and made public.

Paul Hellyer should be able to help us get these UFO photos and thus prove to the whole world that UFOs piloted by the "visitors" are as real as the airplanes that fly over us. I just hope that Paul Hellyer's association with Steven Greer at the Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference on Tuesday is not used as an excuse to discredit Hellyer and discount what he has to say.

Nick Balaskas

5 Richard H. Hall, ed. 'The UFO Evidence'
6 Donald E. Keyhoe, 'Aliens From Space'
11 'Ottawa Journal, July 20, 1967

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Project Condign

From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 20:37:32 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:28:42 -0400
Subject: Project Condign

Further to recent media reports about the MOD's formerly-classified UFO study, 'Project Condign', I should clarify:

Although I was involved in the 1993/1994 discussions that led to the commissioning of the study, I had left the MOD's UFO Project by the time it began.

I am not the author of the report.

It would be inappropriate for me to criticise the report, but I do not agree with some of its conclusions, particularly where they relate to subjects such as electrically-charged atmospheric plasmas, or temporal lobe disorders, where there is no scientific consensus.

The release of this report is part of an ongoing series of releases under the Freedom of Information Act. The MOD is committed to releasing as much UFO material as possible, proactively, under the FOIA 'Publication Scheme'.

The full report will be posted on the MOD's website on 15 May.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Waskiewicz

From: Jean Waskiewicz <etjean.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 15:15:46 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:30:47 -0400
Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Waskiewicz

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 21:22:19 -0400
>Subject: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

>Does anyone know if that military report of a test missile
>warhead, fired out over the Pacific some years ago and got
>circled in flight and 'beamed' by a UFO "tumbled into the
>ocean," or simply continued on its trajectory with the
>electronics disabled?

>To my mind, there's a huge difference there.

>I think the description said "tumbled into the ocean", and that
>would mean a considerable mechanical force would have been
>applied by the UFO to halt the forward momentum. The force
>necessary to do this would clearly take this case out of some
>sort of "lens aberration of the tracking telescope" explanation.

>That in turn would significantly shore up the "real-ness" of at
>least that UFO, and maybe help debunk the debunkers.

Eleanor,

The NICAP site has this incident at:

<http://www.nicap.org/bigsurdir.htm>

Jean Waskiewicz

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Bassett

From: Steve Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:45:38 EDT
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 18:33:32 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Bassett

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>May 07, 2006

>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
>Jack Grimston

<snip>

It is fervently hoped that Joe McGonagle, Gary Anthony, Andy Roberts, David Clarke and every other well intentioned UK researcher will move quickly to rip this ridiculous UK MoD study to pieces.

It is ever apparent that the same toxic mix of lies and secrecy that is killing the United States from the inside is at work in the UK as well. Recent events outside the UFO/ET issue have only confirmed this.

If the UK and the US have some sort of suicide pact, I want no part of it, and hopefully the citizens of both nations will come to feel the same way before it's too late.

Steve Bassett
Paradigm Research 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 7](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 12:12:17 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 16:14:20 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>May 07, 2006

>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
>Jack Grimston

The dynamic debunker trio strikes again. Here I thought they were coming up with something serious. I should have known better.

This drivel showed up in the Sunday paper, with the usual childish title, Relax, it's just gas, not a UFO.

Whenever David Clarke and Andy Roberts and Joe McGonagle come rushing out, breathlessly, with the latest UK government regulations/revelations we should all know better.

What a load of malarky. Why would this be kept secret? It's kept secret for some years. Why, if it's just natural phenomenon, like lightning?

Then it takes an act implemented by government to force freedom of information, then it's only to be reased to debunkers in England who have coyly previewed this as "UFO" information, when it's just more of the same nonsense.

And where's the science, that's been hidden from a public that would naturally be terrified by this new "natural phenomenon" that's more sinister than tornadoes and tsunamis and lightning and hurricanes?

Are these scientists saying that they now believe in the oft recycled ball lightning?

I now believe - what I've suspected for some time - that there is a sustained coverup of this phenomenon and that many governments have an agenda and have kept the truth from us for some 60 years. This confirms 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 17:18:40 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 06:52:10 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Dickenson

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 10:00:52 -0400
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma

<snip>

>>Scientists at the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) describe how
>>glowing "plasmas" of gas are created by charges of electricity.
>>Air flows then sculpt the plasmas into aerodynamic shapes which
>>appear to fly at extraordinary speeds through the sky.

>OK, I guess we can all stop worrying, accept this definitive
>final solution to the mystery, and find other hobbies.

Hi Bob,

Think we've been privileged to be present at the coining of
another "swamp gas explanation" - dignified by a magic-sounding
name - plasma.

Plasma is in a candle-flame, in your light-bulb or neon tube,
and behind a cartridge that's just been hit by a firing-pin.
It's not magic, its behavior is ruled by temperature and,
depending on the percentage of electron-movement (ionization),
by any local electro-magnetic field.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma> (physics)

Our Sun is plasma, and more extreme versions emerge from poles
of neutron stars and, on even larger scale, from galactic cores
when jetting.

How's that sort of thing arriving, in a big way, at airfields or
missile-bases?

Cheers

Ray D

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 21:58:35 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 06:54:04 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Miller

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 12:12:17 -0300
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

>><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>The dynamic debunker trio strikes again. Here I thought they
>were coming up with something serious. I should have known
>better.

>This drivel showed up in the Sunday paper, with the usual
>childish title, Relax, it's just gas, not a UFO.

>Whenever David Clarke and Andy Roberts and Joe McGonagle come
>rushing out, breathlessly, with the latest UK government
>regulations/revelations we should all know better.

>What a load of malarky. Why would this be kept secret? It's
>kept secret for some years. Why, if it's just natural
>phenomenon, like lightning?

>Then it takes an act implemented by government to force
>freedom of information, then it's only to be reased to
>debunkers in England who have coyly previewed this as "UFO"
>information, when it's just more of the same nonsense.

>And where's the science, that's been hidden from a public that
>would naturally be terrified by this new "natural
>phenomenon' that's more sinister than tornadoes and tsunamis >
>and lightning and hurricanes?

>Are these scientists saying that they now believe in the oft
>recycled ball lightning>

>I now believe - what I've suspected for some time - that there
>is a sustained coverup of this phenomenon and that many
>governments have an agenda and have kept the truth from us
>for some 60 years. This confirms it.

Hi Don,

It's early days to be commenting on this but to be fair to Joe,
he has just been sat on UK TV saying he doesn't agree with all
of it. Gary Anthony has acknowledged there are inconsistencies
in it. And Dave Clark has been "forced" to sit there on UK TV
and admit that there are such things as UFOs.

The real issue I think, at least at this point, is the fact that
such a report exists. After years of lamely saying that the MoD
had no interest in UFOs, it seems after all that they did, and

this report is obviously seen at the same level as the discovery of the FSWP files.

But I, like you, would really love to see the science behind it all. And perhaps we will. There had better be some science behind it or one or two folk are going to have egg all over the place.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:17:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 06:55:34 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Lehmborg

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 12:12:17 -0300
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

>><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>>May 07, 2006

>>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
>>Jack Grimston

>The dynamic debunker trio strikes again. Here I thought they
>were coming up with something serious. I should have known
>better.

>This drivel showed up in the Sunday paper, with the usual
>childish title, Relax, it's just gas, not a UFO.

>Whenever David Clarke and Andy Roberts and Joe McGonagle come
>rushing out, breathlessly, with the latest UK government
>regulations/revelations we should all know better.

Haven't Clarke and Roberts thoroughly disgraced themselves as
admitted charlatans willing to play games with the credulities
and sensibilities of their fellow human beings... for our own
good?

Why was it that we were supposed to find anything they had to
contribute to be remotely credible, again... I forget.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 17:25:23 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 06:56:37 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

><snip>

>>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>- we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a
>jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

>That the sort of thing you mean?

>Cheers

>Ray D

Right on Ray D.

Methinks Zecharia Sitchin is on to something but needs some
extra data. I'm not one for traveling planets but the motivation
of the culprits fits.

Seems there're people around who are far more on top of things
than we are led to believe or want to believe.

As I type I just ran into one. Fit the profile and description
to a 'T'. I guess we've got them a might worried.

Origins? So far, just Earth. Probability offworld.

I'll get real worried when us U.S. citizens start having our
guns confiscated cause then I'll really know I'm on to
something.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: **Matthew James Didier** <matthew.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 17:05:05 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:07:06 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

I had to comment on this one:

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 10:28:28 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>I find it amazing how many ghost hunting groups there are out
>there now and the tools they are using to actively seek out
>ghosts. It seems like almost every town/city has at least one
>such club/group/society.

This is true... and not always for the better. Sadly, there is LESS peer review and control over what "some" groups do that refer to themselves (somewhat comically) as "ghost investigators" or "ghost researchers"... or worse yet, "ghost hunters".

I've always disliked the latter as I don't "stalk and kill" ghosts, the license here in Ontario only allows you to bag six ghosts on a weekend trip, and taxidermy! Don't even get me started on taxidermy!

Actually, about the license... which needless to say does not exist... this is the complaint... any twit who's read a book or less... more of them have simply seen a TV show... can call themselves a "ghost expert" and usually do.

They see it as a "quick way to gain fame and fortune"... oh, to be on Oprah!

Anyway, this leads to horrible so-called science by those who can't read, let alone write a scientific paper and leap to conclusions faster than a run-away Weight-Watcher's class leaps at the 2 for 1 Big Mac deal at the Golden Arches now and again.

>Not content with reading about past ghost cases...

...and never acknowledging or trying to understand the work that went before theirs or even why they are doing certain things...

>...or getting the
>government's secret information about ghosts or finding the
>scoop from the latest ghost whistleblower,

Trust me, if 'we' thought the government was doing any serious work on ghosts, we'd want to know.

>...average folk are
>going out there to find the truth about ghosts.

No, for the most part, this is what's happening:

- Average bored weenies, in a desperate attempt for fame and popularity, attempt to proclaim that they have vast knowledge on a topic that is not policed and get a few thrills and social outings in the process.

- Average thrill seekers, in a desperate attempt to prove how

brave they are (they ain't 'fraid of no ghost!) wander around places acting very clinical when they haven't even got a clue that they are looking into something unproven, unknown, and even if they found evidence, they wouldn't know how to present it properly or put in place controls to actually do it within a scientific framework.

- Average people, in a desperate attempt to prove that they, themselves, are "not average" proclaim their "psychical gift" and their ability to "summon forth" paranormality... they usually don't succeed and, again, couldn't present valid data even if they truly found it.

- Average if not below average intelligence, in a desperate attempt to prove they are just "way smarter" than you or I, set up in the study of something that their hypothesis can be accepted as "fact" (don't argue with them now!) and smarmilly tell everyone what ghosts are, why they are, and show their "evidence" (uncontrolled data and untested hypothesis presented as fact) to the world to prove their intelligence.

Oh yeah, it's a great field, the study of ghosts and hauntings... a field filled with tonnes of cow pats and little grass on which to feed.

>And look at the tools they bring to bear on their work. Sure
>they have cameras, but they also have infrared/thermal
>detectors/sensors, EMF detectors, ion detectors, Geiger counters
>and audio recorders of various kinds depending on budget and
>interest.

Because...

- Most of us (regardless of our hobbies) have a camera.
- Infrared cameras and whatnot are now common place as "no light" or "low light" things... think Sony 0-Lux
- A thermometer is not a pricey piece of equipment.
- A decent EMF meter can be picked up for under \$50.00
- Ion detectors and internal weather stations are also in price ranges that start low.
- Geiger counters are rare in the field, but not unheard of by the true "aficionado".
- Tape recorders and digital recorders are very inexpensive... and many people already have "some flavour" of them at home.

Now, here's the better question... How many of these "ghost people" know how to use the equipment, bother to take "mean" or controlled readings first, and even understand why they're using them?

The answer is probably less than 5% of what you find do/know the above.

They use the tools because "Hollywood" told them that they should.

Heck, can anyone find me anything that correlates (properly) ghostly activity and any notable change in the ambient EM fields of the "haunted" site?

I can already answer that... no.

Why do "ghost people" love there EMF detectors?

Because they're cheap, and many years ago, a movie called The Legend of Hell House with Roddy McDowell showed a "parapsychologist" using an enormous machine to "blast" the house with EMF thereby clearing the home of ghosts.

Before this movie, you are extremely hard pressed to find any of the "old tyme" ghost hunters (like Harry Price) even thinking about them.

>Now we must ask ourselves, why are there so many folk willing to
>spend valuable time (especially sleep time) looking for the

>truth about ghosts?

Take your pick:

- #1: Fame and Fortune
- #2: Popularity
- #3: Proof of their own bravery
- #4: Proof of their own intelligence
- #5: Genuine interest in the phenomena and/or survival of bodily death

Everyone will tell you it's #5... but don't believe everything that you hear.

>But also, they seem to have the
>feeling that they can get closer to an answer by seeking the
>truth themselves rather than wait for pronouncements of the
>"experts" (Church?, science?, government?).

Or themselves.

I would honestly say that 90% of the "ghost groups" out there feel that they know more than any government or religion... and they are most probably wrong.

>Yes, I agree that they are somewhat unscientific and hamhanded
>and inelegant, but they are learning because they are trying.

No they're not! Most of them have made their minds up... they're just trying to show off their spectacular abilities.

Trust me on these points... hold your nose, take a couple of Gravols and read through the slop on the internet from those extreme bastions of knowledge and study known as the "ghost investigators/researchers/hunters".

You'll never look down your nose at Ufologists again... well, not as likely to do that...

>Is it because ghost sightings occur much more frequently than
>UFO sightings????!!!

Yes... and something more important... If "X" witness sees a UFO over "X" place, it's unlikely (although not unheard of) that there will be another sighting shortly thereafter and in perpetuity.

In a "haunted location", this is not the case... there will most likely be more sightings and more information... and it's a static location for the activity.

Why, then, isn't there more good data on the subject?

Simple...

Look at "our" colleagues. Would you want the "Ghosts R Us" team in your home? Would you want them to pull up their pimped-out hearse and pull out a whackload of tripods for your new hardwood floors?

Two words, "Property Value"...

That, and just like Ufology, you find a group/organisation who shows interest, and eventually someone on a "board" will kill the study... it's not because it's invalid or pointless, it's because "faith and belief" or the CSICOPian mentality (either-or) come into play.

"Ghosts? Isn't that demons and the devil?"

"Ghosts? If people hear we're looking into that, won't we be the laughing stock of the real science world?"

>...thus the odds
>should be higher to get some data since the ghost should
>reappear based on who knows what criteria.

Provided those wonderful folks know what the heck they're doing and aren't getting excited about every flash-picture with dust in it... which is very rare.

>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

Perhaps... but if you could promise the thrill seekers that they would definitely have a sighting at "X" place at "X" time, you'd see more of 'em out there... and they'd hurt you as much as they have hurt us.

Also, to some, the study of ghosts is also the study of life after death... and since death is something that is inevitable for us all, it does raise the stakes a bit... whereas, although there is a slim chance that there may be proof of intelligent extra-dimensional/extra-terrestrial craft/life/whatever shortly... but yes, death is a given.

I've often said to my wife, a Ufologist first and ghost investigator second that evidence of Ufology being "absolute" is easy... one landing or one crash that cannot be covered up.

What if I "captured" a ghost? Would it be accepted? How do I know it is a ghost? What is the definition of a ghost? Is a poltergeist (the kind that make noise and move things only) the same as an apparition? Is a "historical repeater" (a ghost that seems to follow a historical path or set of movements without any acknowledgement of the "present" changes in environment) the same as a ghost that does acknowledge things here and now?

Would my "captured ghost" answer most of people's questions?
Probably not.

>A shame really.

I agree.

Matthew Didier - The Great Unwashed

Matthew James Didier - Founder and Director
The Toronto Ghosts and Hauntings Research Society

matthew.nul

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

"Insight, untested and unsupported, is an insufficient guarantee of truth." --Bertrand Russell

"It is impossible for any one to begin to learn what he thinks that he already knows." --Epictitus

=====
PLEASE VISIT MY PERSONAL QUEST SITE:
<http://www.doubledeckerbuses.org/oldgreenbus/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:08:48 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>- we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a
>jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

>That the sort of thing you mean?

This is one of the most paranoid and off-putting threads in a
long time. "Who is behind it all?" I'll tell you who is behind
it, just as Pogo told us a long time ago: "We have met the enemy
and he is us."

What "mysterious officials and intimidators?" Yes, in a handful
of cases we have some evidence of someone trying to intimidate
witnesses (I know of a few of these cases myself), but as
expressed here implying vast coordinated forces at work,
nonsense! Who really believes that the "evil government" is
really that organized and efficient? I don't.

And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and anti-
government raving. Whjat simplistic nonsense!

- 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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: UFO Shoot-Downs - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:44:26 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:09:55 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Shoot-Downs - Hall

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 14:13:49 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: UFO Shoot-Downs

>Hi Everyone!

>This past Saturday on 'Strange Days... Indeed' (Episode 391),
>researchers Stanton T. Friedman and Frank Feschino talked about
>"UFO Shoot-Downs". It was a very fascinating and timely talk
>coming just before the Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference on
>May 9 where the former Canadian Defence Minister Paul Hellyer
>will elaborate on this serious situation.

>Reading Col. Philip J. Corso's book 'The Day After Roswell' and
>speaking with an unnamed U.S. General only confirmed what Paul
>Hellyer already knew about UFOs decades earlier. Below are a few
>short but very important quotes from Yurko Bondarchuk's well
>researched book 'UFO Canada' (1979, Signet 1981). The comments
>in [square brackets] are mine.

>"Even more baffling are some incidents over the Canada/U.S.
>border, which ended in the disappearance of both the interceptors
>and the UFOs."5 Pages 97-98

<snip>

Nick,

Please do not cite me in this context as if I supported these
viewpoints, which I emphatically do not.

Stan Friedman has done a lot of good work in the UFO
field, which I acknowledge and appreciate, but his continued
insistence that the Feschino book is valid turns me off
completely. It is a total crock, and Stan ought to admit that he
was mistaken about it instead of continuing to endorse it.

The book is full of flat-out falsehoods that have already been
reported, so look it up if you are not aware of the truth. And
certainly Stan and I agree that Corso is definitely not to be
believed. It is a never-ending source of amazement to me that so
many people are so gullible, and apparently incapable of
applying critical judgment to such claims. No wonder that so
many people in important places look at us askance. Idiomatic
claims deserve to be considered as coming from idiots.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 23:51:09 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:12:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Rimmer

>From: Joe McGonagle <Joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:11:50 +0100
>Subject: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>In view of the earlier-than-expected media coverage,
>www.uk-ufo.org
>is now open for access.

It's quite entertaining to see the level of hysteria which is being generated amongst our transatlantic brethren by the media's rather brief summary of a lengthy report.

I suppose the idea of waiting to see the full details before responding has gone completely out of fashion.

--
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Lehmberg

From: **Alfred Lehmberg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 18:03:00 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:13:23 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Lehmberg

>From: Steve Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:45:38 EDT
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

>><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>>May 07, 2006

>>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
>>Jack Grimston

><snip>

>It is fervently hoped that Joe McGonagle, Gary Anthony, Andy
>Roberts, David Clarke and every other well intentioned UK
>researcher will move quickly to rip this ridiculous UK MoD study
>to pieces.

>It is ever apparent that the same toxic mix of lies and secrecy
>that is killing the United States from the inside is at work in
>the UK as well. Recent events outside the UFO/ET issue have only
>confirmed this.

>If the UK and the US have some sort of suicide pact, I want no
>part of it, and hopefully the citizens of both nations will come to
>feel the same way before it's too late.

I stand with you, Mr. Bassett.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

MSNBC.Com Article & UFO Poll

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:21:26 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:21:26 -0400
Subject: MSNBC.Com Article & UFO Poll

Source: MSNBC.Com

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/12675462/from/ET/>

04-07-06

Live Vote - [Poll - Visit Site To Vote]

The British Ministry of Defense confirmed that a secret study completed in December 2000 had found no evidence that "flying saucers" or unidentified flying objects were anything other than natural phenomena. What do you think?

- UFOs certainly exist. There's no way we're alone in the universe.
- UFOs might exist. Absence of evidence isn't evidence of absence.
- UFOs are pure science fiction.
- I'm not sure.

Results at time of this post:

UFOs certainly exist. There's no way we're alone in the universe. 40%

UFOs might exist. Absence of evidence isn't evidence of absence. 32%

UFOs are pure science fiction. 24%

I'm not sure. 3.9%

[Thanks to Stanton T. Friedman for 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfleming6.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 21:04:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:22:57 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Fleming

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:36:11 -0400
>Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:36:11 -0400
>Subject: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

>Source: BBC News - London, UK

><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4981720.stm>

>Sunday, 7 May 2006

>UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens
>Mark Simpson
>BBC News

>A confidential Ministry of Defence report on Unidentified Flying
>Objects has concluded that there is no proof of alien life
>forms.

And thus UFOs die yet again. It seems like only a couple weeks
have passed since their last demise.

As a matter of fact, it was only two weeks since the Guardian
article explained that the Internet did them in for good. I
wonder how long they'll stay dead this time before they have to
be killed off once 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

BBC News On MOD's UFO Report

From: Rob Simone <robsimonetalks.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 00:04:49 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:28:14 -0400
Subject: BBC News On MOD's UFO Report

One of my listeners sent me the link for the UFO report on Britain's main Evening News, the BBC about the MOD report.

This may be an attempt to try and "tighten things up" as the UFO issue is breaking loose in Mexico and elsewhere.

The BBC is reporting record hits to its website page that discusses this.

watch here:

<http://tinyurl.com/gx7pa>

Rob Simone
www.robsimone.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

UFO Conference In Altrincham UK

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 11:15:36 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 07:35:46 -0400
Subject: UFO Conference In Altrincham UK

UFO Review Magazine Presents

Saturday, June 10th 2006

A One Day Conference On Ufology And The Paranormal

at

Altrincham Masonic Hall Branksome, Clay Lane,
Timperley, Cheshire

Doors open 9:30am, Commence 10:00am.

Speakers

Making a rare UK appearance

Nick Redfern
<http://www.nickredfern.com/bio.htm>

Author of the new book "On the Trail of the Saucer Spies: UFOs
And Government Surveillance"

Now living in the States, Nick is a long standing and very well known Ufological writer and is the author of several successful books on the subject as well as on cryptozoology. He is generally recognised as the UK-92s leading researcher and has a reputation as a direct, no nonsense journalist who is prepared to get his hands dirty and doesn't like taking "No" for an answer. In 2005, he turned the world of Ufology upside down with his book Body Snatchers In The Desert which gave the most likely and most realistic explanation of what really happened at Roswell and why.

Nick will be speaking about the UK and U.S. intelligence agencies observation over the years of people involved in Ufology, and will explain why and how people were watched and also who was watched, highlighting specific cases. He should know. Special Branch kept a close eye on him for many years!

=46rom Canada, Internationally Renowned Documentary Film Maker and
UFO Researcher

Paul Kimball
<http://redstarfilms.blogspot.com/>

"The Wilbert Smith Story: Separating Fact from Fiction of a
Ufological Icon".

Wilbert Smith held both a B.Sc. and M. Sc. in Electrical Engineering, and was Senior Radio Engineer, Broadcast and Measurements Section, in the Canadian Department of Transport (DOT).

Smith's interest in the UFO phenomenon and his influential

position within the Canadian government caused him to make a proposal to the Canadian DOT to establish Project Magnet to officially investigate UFOs. Smith stated in the proposal that his group believed that they were on the track of something which may well prove to be the introduction to a new technology. In 1950 he wrote the Smith Memo. This was a memo which attracted a lot of attention around the time of the MJ-12 papers and it helped lend a certain credibility to the whole MJ-12 milieu. It was originally sent to the Controller of Telecommunications as a proposal to study officially the UFO situation. In this memo, Smith wrote, "The existence of a different technology is borne out by the investigations which are being carried on at the present time in relation to flying saucers." He also stated that by making discreet inquiries at the Canadian Embassy in Washington, DC, he had learned from Dr. Robert Sarbacher that:

A. The matter is the most highly classified subject in the United States government, rating higher even than the H-bomb.

B. Flying saucers exist.

C. Their modus operandi is unknown but concentrated effort is being made by a small group headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush.

D. The entire matter is considered by the United States authorities to be of tremendous significance.

But is all this true? Was Smith all he was cracked up to be? Paul Kimball has made a number of incisive and successful documentaries on the UFO subject and as a fellow Canadian has taken a special interest in Smith's career. Paul will be looking over Smith's career in some detail and as the title of his talk says; will separate fact from fiction.

Neil Morris

The Alien Autopsy Film --A Review and Update

In the light of the revelations brought out by the current Ant and Dec feature film, namely that the Alien Autopsy footage that appeared in public in 1995 was a fake put together by Ray Santilli, Neil Morris, who has been heavily involved in researching the validity of the film pulls together the whole sad story for us and brings us up to date with his research and recent events. Was Santilli lying back in 1995? Is he lying now? Was this the first sight that the people of this planet had of a life form from elsewhere, was it simply an autopsy performed on a disfigured human being, or was it just a cynical money making effort designed to fool the world?

Dave Sadler

<http://www.upia.co.uk/>

Chingle Hall -- The Most Haunted House In Britain

Just north of Preston, in the small village of Goosnargh, lies one of Britain's oldest and most haunted buildings (it's the oldest inhabited brick building), Chingle Hall. The house formerly known as Singleton hall was constructed in 1260 by the knight Adam de Singleton. The Hall remained in the de Singleton's family late into the 16th Century but in 1585 the Wall Family who were related to the Singletons, moved into the Hall. Its history continues to this day and over the centuries there have been many, many sightings and strange and bizarre events. Here is one example:

"In 1985, sounds of bricks being moved were recorded by a visitor in the Priest's Room, which seemed to originate in the Priest's hiding hole. He peered within and saw part of a human hand moving one of the bricks. As he watched, the hand stopped moving and disappeared. This witness later managed to capture the sounds of footsteps on tape and a shadowy form on film. Later bricks were found scattered on the floor of the Chapel on the ground floor."

Dave is the founder and co-ordinator of the Unknown Phenomena

Investigation Association

With a background in Aircraft Engineering, Dave has been involved in Paranormal and UFOlogical research and investigation since 1995, forming the UPIA in 1998 as a result of an increasing number of reports emanating from the North West of England. Dave has studied and passed The BITC and AITC courses in the Anomalous Phenomena, ran by Manchester's Association of Paranormal Investigation and Training, and has appeared in Numerous documentaries regarding the subject. For two years and along with Para.Science, Dave hosted a weekly paranormal radio show on BBC Radio Merseyside on the Roger Lyons show. He has also had many articles published in magazines and North West Newspapers. Although The UPIA investigates many unusual reports, currently investigators are basing their studies primarily in the hauntings area although another section of the group does take part in other areas.

Tickets: =A315.00 on the day at the door - =A312.50 in advance. For advance bookings, cheques only I=92m afraid to UFO Review, The New House, Church Bank, Richmond road, Bowdon, Altrincham, Cheshire WA14 3NW. Tel; 0161 929 1846

Doors open 9:30am. Commences 10:00am sharp. Ample off street parking, bar, food available, Stall holders welcome - Please contact organiser.

Organised by UFO Review. 0161 929 1846. Email at Stuart.Miller4.nul for information/directions.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 06:53:42 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 08:12:33 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Lehmborg

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 23:51:09 +0100
>Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>>From: Joe McGonagle <Joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:11:50 +0100
>>Subject: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>>In view of the earlier-than-expected media coverage,

>>www.uk-ufo.org

>>is now open for access.

>It's quite entertaining to see the level of hysteria which
>is being generated amongst our transatlantic brethren by the
>media's rather brief summary of a lengthy report.

>I suppose the idea of waiting to see the full details before
>responding has gone completely out of fashion.

Not nearly as astonishing as you risking the usual literary burn
to point it out in the first place, and your seeming
obliviousness to the credibility of known negativist proponents
of same, in the second. No surprises here, Mr. Rimmer.

Just a current iteration of 'ye olde disinformation
campaign...', an old sow in a slightly newer dress. I remind
that a kissed pig in a dress is still a kissed pig. Pucker up
butter-cup... uh!

BOHICA (Bend Over Here It Comes Again) lives!

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 8](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:01:26 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 09:14:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Clark

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>>>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

>>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>>- we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a
>>jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

>>That the sort of thing you mean?

>What "mysterious officials and intimidators?" Yes, in a
>handful of cases we have some evidence of someone trying to
>intimidate witnesses (I know of a few of these cases myself),
>but as expressed here implying vast coordinated forces at work,
>nonsense! Who really believes that the "evil government" is
>really that organized and efficient? I don't.

>And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
>evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and
>anti-government raving. What simplistic nonsense!

Let me second Dick Hall's sentiments. This is pretty dumb.

There's plenty of bad governance in the world. Official
malfeasance, too. No shortage of wrong-doing and dangerous
stupidity and arrogance. Just ask any American who lives in the
first decade of the 21st Century.

There are, in short, plenty of real things to engage one's
concern.

Nothing, however, validates conspiracy theories and lunatic talk
of "Shadow Government," whatever that's supposed to be. It's
even worse when these are tied to wildly speculative beliefs
about a vast cover-up of ET visitation.

I would hope that this thread soon fades into memory, and from
there soon thereafter.

This has not been one of the List's most edifying moments.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

UFO DATA

From: Philip Mantle <philip.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 13:04:58 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 07:53:48 -0400
Subject: UFO DATA

Report number 3 of UFO DATA magazine is now available.

In this issue we have:

Strange Creatures.
Best Case Scenario.
Alien Autopsy - The Truth.
News & Reviews.
A free DVD interview with James Bond Johnson.

Single issues are available or a one year subscription via:

www.ufodata.co.uk

Philip Mantle.
Features Editor
UFO DATA

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Mariana's UFO Film One Of The Best Produced

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 07:57:36 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 07:57:36 -0400
Subject: Mariana's UFO Film One Of The Best Produced

Source: The Great Falls Tribune

<http://tinyurl.com/kn9rb>

May 8, 2006

Mariana's UFO Film One Of The Best Produced

Great Falls area residents have seen many unidentified flying objects over the years.

Some of those people might have had too much hootch to drink at the time.

But that wasn't the case for Nicholas Mariana, who filmed strange objects from Legion baseball park with a 16mm camera in August 1950.

Mariana was general manager of the Great Falls Electrics baseball team at the time.

Little did he know that his quick-thinking work with a camera would make Mariana a heroic figure among UFO buffs.

Mariana was standing in the bleachers one day when he was amazed to see "two vehicles hovering above the pitcher's mound," his son related in an interview Saturday.

The elder Mariana, who studied journalism at the University of Montana, kept a movie camera in his glove box.

He ran for the camera, and stood in the bleachers behind home plate filming closeups of the strange objects.

After a short time, the aircrafts shot up into the air in a flash.

Soon, "they were little dots on the horizon," said the son, Nick Mariana of Victor.

Mariana's film is credited as one of the best films ever taken of possible extra-terrestrial activity. And he had a witness, his secretary, who backed up his story.

Mariana later complained the best segment of his film disappeared after he gave the movie to Malmstrom Air Force Base to analyze. Base officials denied intentionally clipping out the best closeups from the film.

Mariana once appeared on "I've Got a Secret," a TV program hosted by Gary Moore in which a panel tried to guess what secret a guest had.

Panelists didn't guess Mariana's secret.

Mariana died Aug. 20, 1999, in Oregon, but interest in his film continues.

Mariana's son, Nick, was born in Great Falls, but the family almost immediately moved to Missoula.

Today, he owns a former Great Falls business called Mr. Video. As it turned out, he had his own movie camera when he was a kid.

Nick Mariana shares his father's view that the government took the best part of the film and stuck it in a classified folder somewhere.

"They don't lose that stuff," he said. The younger Mariana thinks the vehicle may well have been from another world.

"I'm a believer," the Victor man said. "I think it's perfectly feasible that they've made contact."

At the same time, he said there are plenty of "crackpots" out there who falsely claim to have been abducted by aliens.

For years, the Marianas had the famous 15 seconds of 16 mm film around the house in a collection of movies. Then Nick Mariana tried to find it.

"It disappeared from our house," he said. Fortunately, that part of the film had already been copied.

Nick Mariana said his father was irritated that the government whacked out the best section of his movie. After all, who wouldn't object to a hatchet job of editing?

But the elder Mariana didn't dwell on what happened to his film, even if he wasn't thrilled about it.

"He just wasn't that kind of guy at all," son Nick said. That hasn't kept the Marianas from musing over the years about what the full film might have been worth to collectors.

This spring, makers of a two-hour UFO film documentary for the History Channel in Canada, All In One Films of Toronto, are trying to find friends or relatives of Mariana who heard him talk about filming the UFOs.

They also would like to talk to anyone who might have seen a showing of the Mariana film in Great Falls in the 1950s.

If you fill that bill, either e-mail or write me and I'll pass the information on to the folks upstairs in Canada.

Tribune Staff Writer Richard Ecke writes a weekly column on city life. Reach him by e-mail at recke.nul, or at (406) 791-1467 or (800) 438-6600.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: UFO Shoot-Downs - Lehmberg

From: **Alfred Lehmberg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:28:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 07:59:37 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Shoot-Downs - Lehmberg

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:44:26 +0000
>Subject: Re: UFO Shoot-Downs

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 14:13:49 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: UFO Shoot-Downs

>>This past Saturday on 'Strange Days... Indeed' (Episode 391),
>>researchers Stanton T. Friedman and Frank Feschino talked about
>>"UFO Shoot-Downs". It was a very fascinating and timely talk
>>coming just before the Exopolitics Toronto Press Conference on
>>May 9 where the former Canadian Defence Minister Paul Hellyer
>>will elaborate on this serious situation.

>>Reading Col. Philip J. Corso's book 'The Day After Roswell' and
>>speaking with an unnamed U.S. General only confirmed what Paul
>>Hellyer already knew about UFOs decades earlier. Below are a few
>>short but very important quotes from Yurko Bondarchuk's well
>>researched book 'UFO Canada' (1979, Signet 1981). The comments
>>in [square brackets] are mine.

>>"Even more baffling are some incidents over the Canada/U.S.
>>border, which ended in the disappearance of both the interceptors
>>and the UFOs."5 Pages 97-98
>
><snip>

>Nick,

>Please do not cite me in this context as if I supported these
>viewpoints, which I emphatically do not.

>Stan Friedman has done a lot of good work in the UFO
>field, which I acknowledge and appreciate, but his continued
>insistence that the Feschino book is valid turns me off
>completely. It is a total crock, and Stan ought to admit that he
>was mistaken about it instead of continuing to endorse it.

>The book is full of flat-out falsehoods that have already been
>reported, so look it up if you are not aware of the truth. And
>certainly Stan and I agree that Corso is definitely not to be
>believed. It is a never-ending source of amazement to me that so
>many people are so gullible, and apparently incapable of
>applying critical judgment to such claims. No wonder that so
>many people in important places look at us askance. Idiomatic
>claims deserve to be considered as coming from idiots.

>- Dick

With respect, Sir...

That's not tracking with what little I've been privy too in this
matter. Moreover, the publication of the book to which you refer
(and still ripping as I reviewed!) was flawed by the publisher
substantially is my understanding, and perhaps should not be

played overmuch with redlines at this point.

Sincerely, I've yet to see where, like yourself, Mr. Friedman has fallen short in any of his assertions about, well about anything, and suggest he not be dismissed on this so summarily out of hand. If Mr. Friedman is excited about Frank Feschino I suspect we're all safe getting a little excited about Frank Feschino. I'm excited, and with very little trepidation, too. Feschino's work, extant, in the opinion of this writer satisfies all the requirement for a Pulitzer. The coming second printing only more so. No hyperbole here...

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/>

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 10:35:12 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:01:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Friedman

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 18:25:48 +0100
>Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>>From: Joe McGonagle <Joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:11:50 +0100
>>Subject: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>>In view of the earlier-than-expected media coverage,

>>www.uk-ufo.org

>>is now open for access.

>Hi Joe et al,

>Congratulations on getting the report released.

>I look forward to reading the full report when all four volumes
>of the report are made available by the MOD via its Freedom of
>Information Publication Scheme.

>Given the limitations on the source data, I presume that the
>analysis of the MOD database is not particularly enlightening.

>However, the 25 Working Papers sound like they should be fairly
>interesting.

>Pending reading the full report, it's difficult to tell whether
>the points which are debatable or quite simply factually
>incorrect in the seemingly inconsistent list of "Key points to
>emerge from the MoD report on UAPs" (on your website at the page
>below) are actually phrased the same way in the report itself:
><http://www.uk-ufo.org/condign/condrep.htm>

>For now, its quite entertaining reading through the Executive
>Summary and working out which books were consulted (for example,
>for the material apparently based on Persinger, Devereux, Klass
>etc).

Thanks Isaac. The referenced quotes were indeed entertaining. I just can't wait to see actual report. I really laughed at the comment "'Until today the Condon Report produced by the University of Colorado for the US Air Force in 1969 was believed to be the only substantial government funded study of the UFO phenomenon published in English".

The Condon report covered 117 cases of which 30% could not be identified. Project Blue Book Special Report 14 was funded by the US government and covered 3201 cases of which 21.5% could not be identified completely separate from the almost 10% for which there was insufficient information. It contains over 240 tables of data, a statistical comparison between UNKNOWNNS and Knowns which showed the probability that the UNKNOWNNS were just missed KNOWNNS was less than 1% etc etc.Of course, it isn't

mentioned in Condon's report either even though he was informed of it. There were also Blue Book/Grudge reports 1-12, at least 5 Theses re UFOs at the Air War College, the Congressional Hearings of 1968, etc.

Incidentally, condign is a real word. not just a random choice of letters. Should be a barrel of laughs as the nonsense of the noisy negativists almost always is.

It also appears that no TOP SECRET data was included or TOP SECRET Code Word info. If UFOs were responsible for the crash or disappearance of British aircraft, presumably such data would have been withheld.

One wonders if the authors were aware of Jim McDonald's detailed scientific critique of Phil Klass' nonsense about plasmas explaining 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:41:47 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:03:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Lehmborg

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:01:26 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>>>>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

>>>>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>>>>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>>>>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>>>>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>>>>- we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a
>>>>jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

>>>>That the sort of thing you mean?

>>>>What "mysterious officials and intimidators?" Yes, in a
>>>>handful of cases we have some evidence of someone trying to
>>>>intimidate witnesses (I know of a few of these cases myself),
>>>>but as expressed here implying vast coordinated forces at work,
>>>>nonsense! Who really believes that the "evil government" is
>>>>really that organized and efficient? I don't.

>>>>And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
>>>>evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and
>>>>anti-government raving. What simplistic nonsense!

>>>>Let me second Dick Hall's sentiments. This is pretty dumb.

>>>>There's plenty of bad governance in the world. Official
>>>>malfeasance, too. No shortage of wrong-doing and dangerous
>>>>stupidity and arrogance. Just ask any American who lives in the
>>>>first decade of the 21st Century.

>>>>There are, in short, plenty of real things to engage one's
>>>>concern.

>>>>Nothing, however, validates conspiracy theories and lunatic talk
>>>>of "Shadow Government," whatever that's supposed to be. It's
>>>>even worse when these are tied to wildly speculative beliefs
>>>>about a vast cover-up of ET visitation.

>>>>I would hope that this thread soon fades into memory, and from

>there soon thereafter.

>This has not been one of the List's most edifying moments.

Still, Sir, there is a compartmentalization of need to know secrecies that honest men are writing about, indicating at least the seeming potentiality of that maligned sociopathy of conspiracy so reflexively denied. Ruppelt's non-admitted but referenced "lurid duels of death" with the 'other' an example.

alienview.nul

www.AlienView.net

AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Review Of Night Journeys In Ufology: 1974-1977

From: Robert Barrow <rbarr.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 09:52:23 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:09:44 -0400
Subject: Review Of Night Journeys In Ufology: 1974-1977

Wendy Connors'

Night Journeys in Ufology: 1974-1977 Case Recordings, National
UFO Reporting Center (Seattle WA), Vol 01

Copyright 2006 (May) by Wendy A. Connors

Total running time just over 44 hours, with 252 tracks, digital
print guide, mp3 format

Available from www.fadeddiscs.com

Reviewed
by
Robert Barrow

At first, the Piper Cherokee pilot sounds hesitant about describing his experience high over Colorado skies. But he trusts the interviewer enough to begin opening up and, as the recorded phone conversation from 1977 continues, he describes in detail the huge, seemingly metallic, elongated spherical object he encountered during an otherwise routine flight. Approximately the size of a DC-3, the UFO paced his aircraft and approached the pilot's right wing, forcing him to instantly bank hard to avoid a collision. How close did the thing get, asks interviewer Robert Gribble? Without skipping a beat, the pilot firmly responds, "TOO damned close!" Indeed, the mysterious object with a stainless steel-like texture closed in to a very uncomfortable distance of only 50 feet from that vulnerable right wing. An FAA representative, also interviewed about the case on the recording, expresses bewilderment and curiosity about what the pilot saw, but doesn't doubt his story. . .

With this, her most ambitious and gigantic compilation (44 incredible hours) to date, Wendy Connors has produced the ultimate UFO-related audio documentary, and if the listener doesn't come away from a thorough audition of this disc convinced that UFOs are absolutely real, and perhaps deadly serious business, then the listener may require either a generous brain transplant or relocation to a TV sitcom, where evidence of something strange never interferes with the all-is-normal fantasies upon which some of us construct our daily lives.

Sing the praises of UFO-related films and videos all you want, but never dismiss the importance of audio. There's something about the recorded voice, disembodied from a visualized talking head. Often the raw, unadulterated self-narrative of one's UFO experience reinforces the incident's integrity, and frequently voice inflections and choice of words can betray a hoax or delusion. But make no mistake, sounds hold our attention as we use our minds in an attempt to comprehend the unseen, if not the unknown.

In this remarkable collection you won't find gaggles of stuffy scientists postulating what UFOs are or are not. Instead,

refreshingly, here are folks from every walk of life reporting their UFO experiences in disturbing detail, sometimes right after they occur, and sometimes as they happen in real-time - witnesses in denial or scared out of their wits, or people who simply seek an explanation following the most bizarre event their lives will ever know. The depth of military and government agency involvement or cooperation evidenced in these telephone recordings, it must be noted, simply astounds.

Connors' most recent work for her Faded Discs project involves putting into digital format hundreds of hours of phoned-in UFO reports obtained from Robert Gribble's National UFO Reporting Center in Seattle, a service Gribble operated for twenty years, gaining credible UFO reports from all over the world until 1994, when Peter Davenport took over the data collection responsibility. Gribble, a UFO researcher since 1955, and his associates had conducted on-site investigations and interviews where necessary and amassed literally a wealth of tape-recorded (reel-to-reel and audiocassette) UFO documentation just from phone conversations. However, the world was nearly denied access to this monumental historical exercise:

"Robert Gribble was going to toss out his materials," Wendy Connors relates, "but then decided I might find them useful. I did, and what we are listening to is his gift to the UFO community. We all owe him a great deal of gratitude."

Connors describes Gribble as a treasure: "I listen to every single call he received and select what I feel is the best to put on the compilations. I also include a few reports that offer a balance to show that some sightings, although mundane, can affect people - and to show that people are more honest than not about describing what they saw. I can only remember three recordings I thought were suspect, so far.

"I really worked hard to be selective enough to zero in on the better reports and cover such areas as pilot cases, UFOs near water, triangles, radar/visual incidents, abductions and close encounters of the third kind. Also, and most important," Connors advises, "I wanted to provide human interest cases profiling that people of all types not only see UFOs, but are intelligent and reliable, even if they are only goat farmers. I hope I succeeded."

And succeed Wendy Connors does with this new entry. She knows how to pick the audio essentials, just as she did with her contributions to the late Peter Jennings' UFO documentary on ABC-TV. The program had its detractors, but in this reviewer's opinion the montage of UFO witness audios that opened the report - some of them provided by Connors, earning her a place in the end credits - gave the show a powerful start.

So - just how does one review this 44-hour colossus? Maybe it's best to start at the end, because the beginning, like most of the entries here which cover the years 1974 to 1977, takes care of itself.

Skipping far ahead to track 242, an intriguing, if not amazing, report from 1977, nearly 20 minutes long, demands our jaw-dropping attention as Gribble interviews a Naval Intelligence pilot. Having just flown a reconnaissance mission at 60,000 feet for the Central Intelligence Agency somewhere between Tokyo and Hawaii at night, he encountered a large triangular craft. Pacing his F4-11 Phantom for almost a half hour, the thing appeared dark with no lights or outward signs of propulsion equipment.

One detail raising an eyebrow with Wendy Connors was the revelation in the pilot's narrative that the object exhibited a surface appearance like foam rubber. "Track 242 is a 'barn-burner' event," she emphasizes. "A few tracks earlier on this disc is another description of a triangle with a foam rubber-like surface texture. This certainly offers some additional data on the black triangles. I've never read of this before."

Speeding ahead in excess of Mach 2.2, the F4-11 Phantom's bizarre visitor easily remained within 50 feet of the left wing. Sporting the most advanced technology available at the time, the Navy pilot utilized all the aircraft equipment he could in an attempt to identify the bogey, including turning on a powerful light and aiming it toward the object - which continued to evidence itself as a solid craft.

"This (object) had no effort at all in keeping up with me," the pilot informs Gribble. . .it defied all the laws of aerodynamics. There was no reason for it to fly."

When the UFO eventually sped away, "It took it less than ten seconds to get out of radar range - less than ten seconds to go 150 miles." The pilot acknowledges that the UFO became a momentary "speck" on his radar before it disappeared, and by the time he consumed another three seconds to flip the radar detection to a 500 mile range, the thing had already absconded at a tremendous speed, leaving no trace. The pilot's response to Gribble's question about how solid the radar return appeared was simply: "Perfect." Missile sensors and detection equipment aboard the F4-11 indicated no evidence of heat or thrust from the mysterious flight companion.

Throughout the interview, the pilot reflects integrity and intricate knowledge of his field, and doesn't hesitate to offer Gribble names and addresses to contact, to the extent that he can after his honest and puzzled description of the experience. (A footnote here: Many reports of triangular craft are sprinkled throughout this project.)

Connors' latest disc isn't for those who prefer to swallow, toothpicks and all, the latest popular UFO explanation - "plasmas" - or for those impressed with the amusing concoction of "sleep paralysis" by hopelessly uninformed Ph.D. voodoo chefs. Truly, as we explore this collection, each time we read in the track-by-track print guide that a particular case involves a "possible abduction" our skin crawls as a witness describes the ideal circumstances for an abduction, frighteningly unaware of the personal implications. And no, these folks aren't snugly tucked into bed, waiting for a (sigh. . .) sleep incident to be conjured up.

In this regard, the compilation includes such witnesses as a no-nonsense trucker in Montana whose tanker truck engine was apparently disabled by a disc-shaped UFO, temporarily stopping his watch in the process. Was there an abduction during this, his second recent UFO encounter?

Indeed, eight entries alone concern early reports of the 1975 Travis Walton abduction in Arizona, some called in by people who know Walton and the other young men involved.

Another weird incident involves a pregnant woman in New Mexico, driving a car with her young son aboard, who is unpleasantly surprised when a large blue object touches down in front of her truck and then returns to the sky. This incident involves vehicle electrical interference, perhaps a huge chunk of missing time and a possible abduction. "I don't remember, you know, seeing it leave or anything," she advises Robert Gribble, who has a knack for listening sympathetically. "I just remember looking at the (highway) car lights that were coming towards me, and it was more like I was in a daze or something." Following the encounter, her son frequently speaks of the lights they saw.

The first 18 tracks on the disc are what Connors labels Anatomy of a UFO investigation, effectively laying out both the chaos and solid research involved in 1975 when strange activities occurred over the U.S. Pacific Northwest. Was a UFO involved? A missile? A meteor or electrical phenomena? How did one object seen falling from the sky become five? Was there a crash and then a crater? Follow the phone calls and judge for yourself.

Faced with 252 tracks, it's impossible to attempt covering the abundance of wonderful mysteries available here. Yes, UFOs abound, and there's also a little Bigfoot, a trace of horrible animal mutilations and a genuine passport to the world of the unknown. One hardly knows what to make of a sergeant from Malstrom AFB when he and four friends report a confrontation with a "hideous" 15 feet-tall hairy creature that charges them after they fire a warning shot in the woods. But UFOs always take center stage at the National UFO Reporting Center, and Wendy Connors' personal selection process assures that each entry here is worthwhile, credible and often adorned with exciting and/or highly bizarre qualities. A reading of the print guide itself would make one eager to spend 44 hours with this audio document.

One caller, formerly a cadet pilot at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas in 1954, relates a story of a UFO landing 30 feet from his group, only to zip away vertically when confronted. A retired Air Force pilot almost sounds annoyed when he calls to report his car being followed by a large gray object accompanied by several smaller objects, and as is the case with many witnesses on this disc, he first made an official report to a government agency which referred him to Gribble's organization - a tribute to NUFORC's relationship with the military and police at several levels all over the country.

A Utah man relates how an object chasing his car causes a tingling in his neck and extreme electrical interference as the alternator, gauges and "everything went crazy." Numerous UFO-auto encounters are featured on the disc, as are UFO-aircraft incidents, and many cases involve multiple witnesses of good to excellent caliber. A brief but highly curious event reported by a private pilot in California involves three arrow-shaped objects flying in formation and disappearing at high speed. In Washington, an egg-shaped UFO maneuvers around a police helicopter, affecting the instruments.

Among other disc tracks is the case of children at a California school who watch a Saturn-like UFO hover over their school, accompanied by a massive vibration in the area. During one of many triangle reports included here, two police officers observe such an object with red and blue lights within 60 feet, hovering near a power generation plant, and it departs at high speed.

You say you're looking for the really, really unusual stuff? How about an incident where two green objects pace a car and gently lift it off and then back onto the road? And for those who pray every night that every troublesome debunker and hardline skeptic in the world will one day have that special UFO experience, track 212 features nothing less than a formerly doubting physicist who observes four objects on a horizontal flight path. "I sat there in a state of shock for about five minutes, because I had never believed in these things before," he confesses to Gribble, "but this is something that I've never seen before and that I can't explain.

Connors readily points out that the witness "is flummoxed by the sighting, as he didn't believe in UFOs - a perfect illustration of the phenomenon's effect on the scientific mind set when confronted with the reality of it."

Nomination for a very creepy award would be track 224, in which three young people in the state of Washington experience a close encounter of the third kind. This UFO makes noise, chases their car, lands and leaves, but not without causing electrical problems and physical effects on the passengers. Of considerable interest is what may have been a UFO occupant crossing the road in front of their car. "It looked like a tree was crossing the road," admits the caller, confessing his fear amidst nervous laughter. "In other words," Gribble asks about the entire event, "you were pretty scared?" The young witness replies, "Petrieved."

Finally, though the disc surface has barely been scratched in this review, there's a 25-minute section that absolutely must not be ignored, a UFO incident capturing the attention of at least four separate Midwestern U.S. radar facilities. From December 17, 1977 we hear an enigma in progress as Gribble attempts to sort out the status of two objects flying at supersonic speed, tracked on radar. During this ufological roller-coaster ride, the UFOs actually chase an Air Force plane, reverse course and, incredibly, may have caused equipment failure at both the Ellsworth AFB RAPCON unit and the South Dakota Weather Station. At one point, an Air Force tech sergeant tells Gribble, "Just a few minutes ago, right after we started tracking these things, we completely lost all of our radar equipment." After some checking with equipment maintenance people, Gribble is further advised: "Our radar has completely quit on us and we cannot find out the reason why." And as if things aren't already peculiar enough - maintenance men at one facility discover the external radar antenna inexplicably bent over and disabled, even though the area winds aren't blowing much in excess of 30 m.p.h.

Dramatic UFO encounters are more the rule than the exception with this disc, but even after Connors stuffs our ears and minds

with hours of truly disturbing UFO evidence via the Gribble collection, she includes at the end a "Supplemental Recordings" section, a half dozen miscellaneous selections from the NUFORC recordings archive.

Is there anything wrong with this compilation? Yes. We have no way of following up on most of these cases to learn their eventual status, and we can thank the passage of time for that. We suspect, however, that most of the incidents described remain mysteries, and the faceless voices telling us of their encounters seem no less credible and puzzled now than they originally did almost 30 years ago. Without the intervention and digital audio magic performed by Ms. Connors, these remarkable recordings may have become merely something for the morning garbage truck to pick up, haul to a landfill and destroy forever. That, dear reader, may be the scariest thought of all.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 14:53:32 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:12:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Dickenson

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>>>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

>>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>>- we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a
>>jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

>>That the sort of thing you mean?

>This is one of the most paranoid and off-putting threads in a
>long time. "Who is behind it all?" I'll tell you who is behind
>it, just as Pogo told us a long time ago: "We have met the enemy
>and he is us."

>What "mysterious officials and intimidators?" Yes, in a handful
>of cases we have some evidence of someone trying to intimidate
>witnesses (I know of a few of these cases myself), but as
>expressed here implying vast coordinated forces at work,
>nonsense! Who really believes that the "evil government" is
>really that organized and efficient? I don't.

>And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
>evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and anti-
>government raving. Whjat simplistic nonsense!

Dick,

Here's some paradigms used by authority:-

medieval Europe - "blood-libels" (mostly of Jews) which told the
thugs: "it's OK to kill, rape and burn certain groups of
people" - real reason - the rulers had borrowed huge amounts of
money from those groups and wanted debts cancelled: hence the
pogroms, which ceased when creditor families had been wiped out,
along with many, many others;

16/17/18th Cent Europe - "witch-craft trials" (mostly of
elderly, uneducated women) which told the thugs (lying bailiffs,
magistrates and judges): "it's OK to terrorize, abuse and
torture women to death" - real reason - the native culture
respected women, especially elderly ones (wise women) but the

new rulers needed to complete the seizure of common lands and tenures, first by the "Enclosures Acts" - (theft, by the rich, of poorer peoples' traditional land), then by taking the remaining tenures, demographically always in hands of old women for 5 or 10 years each generation: hence "witchcraft trials", which ceased after most traditional tenures had been grabbed;

since then more fake 'causes' (for mass torture and murder) have been too numerous to list but figure:-

- 'religion' - despite religions being peace loving;
- 'patriotism' - despite 'nations' being modern fakes, ruled or owned by alien groups and the victims mostly ordinary folk demonized by those rulers;
- 'politics' - despite ownership of 'parties' and media being controlled (sometimes very harshly) by ruling groups;
- which brought us to mid-20th Cent and people somehow getting wise (so needing to be demonized in their turn?):-

see the Brookings Institute report which "went on to propose keeping secret any contact with alien cultures under the guise of preventing a 'collapse of civilization'";

and the Robertson Panel recommendation "that the national securities agencies institute policies on intelligence training and public education designed to prepare for material defenses and the morale of the country to recognize most promptly and to react most effectively to the true intent of hostile intent or actions".

Note:

- 1) 'demons' are selected by rulers, not by ordinary people;
- 2) overwhelmingly, the victims of 'demonization' are ordinary people;
- 3) racial, religious, patriotic, political, & now scientific justification needed for 'demonization'.

Serendipitous quote from today's newsletter (from Melvyn Bragg's I-O-T) - "... further proof of the inter-connectedness of all things. An obvious comment but, as the man said, you ignore the obvious at your peril."

Cheers
Ray D

refs - < dkage2.txt > and links/<theories until NOW> and links/<magic5.html pecking> and links

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 09:16:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:13:48 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Lehmborg

>>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming6.nul>
>>To: UFOUpdates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 21:04:34 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:36:11 -0400
>>Fwd Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 11:36:11 -0400
>>Subject: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

>>Source: BBC News - London, UK

>><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4981720.stm>

>>Sunday, 7 May 2006

>>UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens
>>Mark Simpson
>>BBC News

>>A confidential Ministry of Defence report on Unidentified Flying
>>Objects has concluded that there is no proof of alien life
>>forms.

>And thus UFOs die yet again. It seems like only a couple weeks
>have passed since their last demise.

>As a matter of fact, it was only two weeks since the Guardian
>article explained that the Internet did them in for good. I
>wonder how long they'll stay dead this time before they have to
>be killed off once more?

I'm not a physicist or mathematician. Perhaps one can bear me
out or legitimately debunk me but the human race, in accordance
with mathematical and physical law, is their own proof regarding
the existence of a space-faring and intelligent *other* ...not
us?

What 'happens' is proof of concept that something can 'happen'
and what 'happens' does not 'happen' once and must continue to
'happen', even if rare?

We exist, arguably, as an intelligent and communicating space-
faring intelligence so there must be other intelligent space
faring communicators extant. Flesh this out with a very
conservatively applied Drake's equation and intelligent space-
faring communicators are rife just in this galaxy? I suspect so.
Seemingly, nothing else seems logical.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Jacobs

From: Robert Jacobs <jacobs.nul>
Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 10:59:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:17:35 -0400
Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Jacobs

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 21:22:19 -0400
>Subject: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

>Does anyone know if that military report of a test missile
>warhead, fired out over the Pacific some years ago and got
>circled in flight and 'beamed' by a UFO "tumbled into the
>ocean," or simply continued on its trajectory with the
>electronics disabled?

>To my mind, there's a huge difference there.

>I think the description said "tumbled into the ocean", and that
>would mean a considerable mechanical force would have been
>applied by the UFO to halt the forward momentum. The force
>necessary to do this would clearly take this case out of some
>sort of "lens aberration of the tracking telescope" explanation.

>That in turn would significantly shore up the "real-ness" of at
>least that UFO, and maybe help debunk the debunkers.

My name is Bob Jacobs. I'm the one who, as a lieutenant in the
U.S. Air Force was in charge of the tracking site at Big Sur,
California.

I wrote the piece about this incident for the MUFON Journal. I
have subsequently written a rebuttal to "the debunkers" claims.

The fact is that the dummy warhead in question did not hit its
target at Eniwetok Atoll.

The story as I wrote it is absolutely true. It was verified
multiple times in letters from the late, retired USAF Major
Florenz J. Mansmann in whose office at Vandenberg Air Force Base
in California, I viewed the film.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 13:40:55 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:21:22 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Ledger

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 23:51:09 +0100
>Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>It's quite entertaining to see the level of hysteria which is
>being generated amongst our transatlantic brethren by the
>media's rather brief summary of a lengthy report. I suppose the
>idea of waiting to see the full details before responding has
>gone completely out of fashion.

Are you talking about Andy Roberts attacking some us on this
side of the Atlantic, and attacking the great unwashed [his
words]the transatlantic brethern, as well?

It begins to appear that the study doesn't believe itself
either-or at least its aim to explain away UFOs as plasma. It's
skewed in the fact that it hides the researchers and the writer
of the report. Why?

Its summary stumbles all over itself. Why?

As Stan Friedman says, plasma associated with UFOs goes back to
the very early days and Paul Hill noted the effect but
attributed it to the propulsive unit that drives them. Most UFOs
are not plasmatic in nature but deemed as solid. How did the
study group get around that. They didn't.

As to your expected accusations, many of us asked questions and
we are accused of hysteria. Why?

It begins to look like the investigative group was trying to tip
off anyone who read this report that it had misgivings about its
agenda and its end objective.

They titled it the Condign Report.

I don't believe for a moment that that was random-do you? But
that's just me being hysterical.

Are you going to read the report yourself John or just waste a
lot of time being a backbencher*?

Don Ledger

*Typically the backbencher is told which way to vote, cannot
debate an issue unless s/he clears his remarks with his or her
party's presenter/sometimes author of the bill. But the
backbencher can go full tilt when it's an opposing member's bill
or resolution. The backbencher's remarks-shouted out while
another party's member has the floor and is up speaking/debating
on a bill-are usually childish in nature and meant only to throw
the speaker off the main point of the topic by using said
childish remarks. It doesn't matter if the topic is important;
debate doesn't consider the importance of a matter, only winning
the argument.

These remarks are usually in the nature of "Richard, your fly is

down." and a lot worse.

The Backbencher strives to get out of the backbenches and amount to something and be important other than just a pre-determined vote. Some never get out of the back benches, because the party determines that the greatest value they have is to do what they are told.

The Whip says, "Eddy, vote Yea when Bill 102 comes up."

Eddy, "What's bill 102 about about?"

Whip, "Doesn't matter, just vote Yea on Bill 102. Can you remember that number?"

Eddy nods and writes the number down and beside it writes 'Vote Yea'.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 13:09:41 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:24:36 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Matthew James Didier <matthew.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 17:05:05 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 10:28:28 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>Subject: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>I find it amazing how many ghost hunting groups there are out
>>there now and the tools they are using to actively seek out
>>ghosts. It seems like almost every town/city has at least one
>>such club/group/society.

>This is true... and not always for the better. Sadly, there is
>LESS peer review and control over what "some" groups do that
>refer to themselves (somewhat comically) as "ghost
>investigators" or "ghost researchers"... or worse yet, "ghost
>hunters".

Thanks for your insights into the ghost research area.

Yes, I knew most such researchers do not know too much about
what they were doing and are certainly not scientific.

<snip>

>Actually, about the license... which needless to say does not
>exist... this is the complaint... any twit who's read a book or
>less... more of them have simply seen a TV show... can call
>themselves a "ghost expert" and usually do.

>They see it as a "quick way to gain fame and fortune"... oh, to
>be on Oprah!

Really? I missed this motivation. Surely average folk cannot be
so dumb to believe this!

>Anyway, this leads to horrible so-called science by those who
>can't read, let alone write a scientific paper and leap to
>conclusions faster than a run-away Weight-Watcher's class leaps
>at the 2 for 1 Big Mac deal at the Golden Arches now and again.

Since you work more in that field, I guess you should know, but
it seems hard to believe that there is such a lack of sincerity,
conscience and soul in these average folk. Sure, I don't expect
them to be science minded and thus are highly unlikely to ever
generate any scientifically acceptable proof, but I did expect
them to be less avaricious and driven by cupidity/fame.

>snip<

>Trust me, if 'we' thought the government was doing any serious
>work on ghosts, we'd want to know.

But what about the governmental (well, local) requirements for
"disclosure" of a "haunted" house prior to selling such
property?

>>...average folk are
>>going out there to find the truth about ghosts.

>No, for the most part, this is what's happening:

>- Average bored weenies, in a desperate attempt for fame and popularity, attempt to proclaim that they have vast knowledge on a topic that is not policed and get a few thrills and social outings in the process.

>- Average thrill seekers, in a desperate attempt to prove how brave they are (they ain't 'fraid of no ghost!) wander around places acting very clinical when they haven't even got a clue that they are looking into something unproven, unknown, and even if they found evidence, they wouldn't know how to present it properly or put in place controls to actually do it within a scientific framework.

>- Average people, in a desperate attempt to prove that they, themselves, are "not average" proclaim their "psychical gift" and their ability to "summon forth" paranormality... they usually don't succeed and, again, couldn't present valid data even if they truly found it.

>- Average if not below average intelligence, in a desperate attempt to prove they are just "way smarter" than you or I, set up in the study of something that their hypothesis can be accepted as "fact" (don't argue with them now!) and smarmilly tell everyone what ghosts are, why they are, and show their "evidence" (uncontrolled data and untested hypothesis presented as fact) to the world to prove their intelligence.

This is very cynical (I thought I was pretty cynical. Sure I can see a small percentage of folk with the above 4 motivations but my opinion of humanity would go down extremely low (much lower than it is already) if a large percentage had these motivations.

What happened to people's basic desire to know whether there is an afterlife? What kind of animals have we (our society) turned into?

<snip>

>Now, here's the better question... How many of these "ghost people" know how to use the equipment, bother to take "mean" or controlled readings first, and even understand why they're using them?

>The answer is probably less than 5% of what you find do/know the above.

I can see this being so. But I'd rather think most folk have better motivations and lack education/scientific guidance/intelligence to do serious research. But at least the well motivated ones (seeking truth, not fame/money) are trying (albeit in clumsy ways).

>They use the tools because "Hollywood" told them that they should.

>Heck, can anyone find me anything that correlates (properly) ghostly activity and any notable change in the ambient EM fields of the "haunted" site?

>I can already answer that... no.

>Why do "ghost people" love there EMF detectors?

>Because they're cheap, and many years ago, a movie called The Legend of Hell House with Roddy McDowell showed a "parapsychologist" using an enormous machine to "blast" the house with EMF thereby clearing the home of ghosts.

>Before this movie, you are extremely hard pressed to find any of the "old tyme" ghost hunters (like Harry Price) even thinking about them.

EMF detectors make sense from the standpoint that someone has developed a theory that ghosts either are EMF phenomena or

interact with this world using EMF. I have not seen adequate data either showing an EMF correlation.

<snip>

>>Yes, I agree that they are somewhat unscientific and hamhanded
>>and inelegant, but they are learning because they are trying.

>No they're not! Most of them have made their minds up... they're
>just trying to show off their spectacular abilities.

This I think is unfair. Yes, they may have their minds made up and are seeking proof for themselves but I seriously doubt that most are in the ghost "research" field to show off their "abilities".

>Trust me on these points... hold your nose, take a couple of
>Gravols and read through the slop on the internet from those
>extreme bastions of knowledge and study known as the "ghost
>investigators/researchers/hunters".

Yes, the Internet often shows the worst in humanity and most with web pages are mainly interested in self aggrandizement. But I would not use that to paint all people in the ghost "research" field.

>>Is it because ghost sightings occur much more frequently than
>>UFO sightings????!!!

>Yes... and something more important... If "X" witness sees a UFO
>over "X" place, it's unlikely (although not unheard of) that
>there will be another sighting shortly thereafter and in
>perpetuity.

We need more facts before we can state that "X" place does not have frequent UFO passes. All we can state is that few witness reports occur at the same site but that it subject to many variables, particularly how often the sky is scrutinized (and weather/visibility).

>In a "haunted location", this is not the case... there will most
>likely be more sightings and more information... and it's a
>static location for the activity.

>Why, then, isn't there more good data on the subject?

>Simple...

>Look at "our" colleagues. Would you want the "Ghosts R Us" team
>in your home? Would you want them to pull up their pimped-out
>hearse and pull out a whackload of tripods for your new hardwood
>floors?

>Two words, "Property Value"...

Again you are painting the entire collective group of ghost researchers rather poorly. Sure, some are wack jobs and weirdos, but there is a percentage of sincere folk out there. Those with bad reps will get weeded out by word of mouth and not get new cases to research.

Also, most folk don't know how to do quality field research so you can't expect alot of good data out there.

Another thing you need to know is why should anyone want their property investigated at all? If they are having fears/problems due to the phenomenon, then that is a good class to research. Others who want a value-added ghost to their property are a less good class.

>That, and just like Ufology, you find a group/organisation who
>shows interest, and eventually someone on a "board" will kill
>the study... it's not because it's invalid or pointless, it's
>because "faith and belief" or the CSICOPian mentality (either-
>or) come into play.

I do not follow what you mean here.
Which kind of group/organization? You mean a prosaic group or the ghost related one?

<snip>

>>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

>Perhaps... but if you could promise the thrill seekers that they
>would definitely have a sighting at "X" place at "X" time, you'd
>see more of 'em out there... and they'd hurt you as much as they
>have hurt us.

I can see how its a nuisance having what amounts to bystanders
or rubber neckers show up. But also I can see how people want to
see these things. I can see how its a thrill... but not for the
thrill's sake only. Its what it means to have a thrill, namely
something we have not experienced before and affects our
perceptions and thoughts.

<snip>

>What if I "captured" a ghost? Would it be accepted? How do I
>know it is a ghost? What is the definition of a ghost? Is a
>poltergeist (the kind that make noise and move things only) the
>same as an apparition? Is a "historical repeater" (a ghost that
>seems to follow a historical path or set of movements without
>any acknowledgement of the "present" changes in environment) the
>same as a ghost that does acknowledge things here and now?

>Would my "captured ghost" answer most of people's questions?
>Probably not.

Its likely in the nature of the proof. For one thing, just as
with UFOs, you have to ask what are you trying to prove.

Most will agree that there is enough proof to say that UFOs
exist since all you are saying is that a large amount of data
exists that people have seen a UFO. No judgement is made on what
the UFO is and it could as easily be prosaic as it could be
alien.

For ghosts and other related paranormal manifestations, you have
proof that Unidentified Paranormal Phenomena (UPP) is happening,
but it can be numerous things from prosaic to ghosts.

If you are only trying to prove something (or its cause) to
yourself, then the standards can be much lower than if you
seek to prove something to others.

Thus, a photo of a UPP may be enough to one person to prove that
there is an afterlife, but in reality it does not do that.

I suspect that for UPP, one needs to gather stereo visible
light/infrared/ EMF images of the phenomena and/or perhaps
establish recordable documentable stereo audio(or whatever
wavelengths seem best) interactions with the UPP to determine
its source.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

UFOs The 'Truth' Is In Here

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:29:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:29:20 -0400
Subject: UFOs The 'Truth' Is In Here

Source: The Advertiser - Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/hzl8g>

09 May 06

UFOs: The 'Truth' Is In Here

Britain's defence intelligence chiefs have a detailed scientific explanation to solve the mystery of unidentified flying objects.

After a four-year inquiry, they have concluded that most UFO sightings can be explained by a little-understood atmospheric phenomenon.

Defence Intelligence scientists describe how glowing "plasmas" of gas are created by charges of electricity.

Airflows then sculpt the plasmas into aerodynamic shapes which appear to fly at extraordinary speeds 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:33:34 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:33:34 -0400
Subject: Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens

Source: WBWT-TV NewsWatch 50 - Watertown, New York, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/gn4vg>

08 May 2006

Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens

United Press International

Another UFO study, this by the British government, has concluded there is no proof that alien life forms exist.

The 400-page report - Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the U.K. - was kept secret for six years and was made public only through a Freedom of Information Act from Sheffield Hallam University.

The report's unidentified author or authors say they failed to find evidence to support the existence of unidentified flying objects, the BBC said Monday.

The report explains UFO sightings by people in Britain and around the world are the result of physical, electrical and magnetic phenomena in the atmosphere, mesosphere and ionosphere.

The report concludes: "The close proximity of plasma related fields can adversely affect a vehicle or person. Local fields of this type have been medically proven to cause responses in the temporal lobes of the human brain.

These result in the observer sustaining (and later describing and retaining) his or her own vivid, but mainly incorrect, description of what is experienced.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/08/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 14:08:55 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:35:21 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/08/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 55
May 8, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** CIVIL LIBERTIES AS AN ANTIDOTE TO VIOLENT EXTREMISM
** RETHINKING INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS
** SELECTED CRS REPORTS

CIVIL LIBERTIES AS AN ANTIDOTE TO VIOLENT EXTREMISM

It is often asserted or assumed that American traditions of open government and civil liberties place the United States at a disadvantage in confronting terrorism. But the opposite may be closer to the truth.

"In an open society like ours... it is impossible to protect against every threat," said President Bush in an August 24, 2005 speech. "That's a fact we have to deal with. In a free society it is impossible to protect against every possible threat," implying that it might be possible in a closed or unfree society.

Similarly, according to February 15 testimony by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, "terrorists and criminals... would exploit our open society to do us harm."

And "precious little can be done to prevent [terrorist attacks on soft targets] in a society like ours that rightly values personal liberty so highly," wrote Clark Kent Ervin, former Homeland Security Inspector General, in a Washington Post opinion piece on May 7.

But a distinctly different perspective was offered by John C. Gannon, former CIA Deputy Director for Intelligence, in testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee last week.

Among the reasons that there has not been another terrorist attack on U.S. soil since September 11, he proposed, are precisely the openness and freedom that some others view with anxiety.

"I believe that the hard-won Constitutional freedoms enjoyed by Americans, along with our unparalleled commitment to civil liberties embedded in law, work against the development of domestic terrorist networks that could be exploited by foreigners," testified Gannon, who is now a Vice President at BAE Systems Information Technology.

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_hr/050206gannon.html

Secrecy News asked Dr. Gannon to elaborate on this point.

"Americans have unparalleled Constitutional and legal protections to express grievances and to openly criticize government at all levels," he replied in a May 6 email message.

"This doesn't mean that terrorists wouldn't try to operate here. It means that the terrorists or other extremists would find less fertile ground to build networks in the US because local support would be harder to come by and because local opposition would be more certain."

"In this sense, our liberties are a powerful antidote to violent extremism."

"This is not an academic point for me. It is an observation from a career of watching the domestic consequences of repressive regimes elsewhere in the world--including US-friendly Islamic governments such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt," Gannon wrote.

The question of whether openness and civil liberties tend to enhance national security or to undermine it is not a theoretical one. Much depends on which one of the two perspectives prevails.

If openness and the rule of law are sources of vulnerability, or viewed as such, then they will be quickly surrendered in the name of security. Torture may be redefined to permit non-lethal abuses, habeas corpus may be suspended, statutes regulating domestic surveillance may be disregarded.

Conversely, if civil liberties and the rule of law are a source of strength, it follows that they should be bolstered and scrupulously upheld even in the conduct of vital security operations.

Secrecy News asked Dr. Gannon whether his views on civil liberties could be reconciled with intelligence programs such as warrantless domestic surveillance.

"The NSA warrantless surveillance program--the details of which are mired in secrecy--should not be seen as a tradeoff between security and civil liberties. But, for this to be true, the program must be bound by law and subject to both judicial review and competent Congressional oversight--the latter now in short supply," he explained.

"I believe our democracy has the instruments to advance security and protect civil liberties at the same time," he said.

RETHINKING INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS

A paper by Jeffrey R. Cooper on "Curing Analytical Pathologies" that was withheld from the CIA web site but posted on the Federation of American Scientists web site last week has now been downloaded tens of thousands of times, suggesting that there is widespread interest in a critical assessment of intelligence analysis.

One of the analytical techniques cited favorably by Cooper (at pp. 48-49) is called "Analysis of Competing Hypotheses" (ACH).

More information about this structured, methodologically rigorous approach to intelligence analysis was presented in a January 2000 paper by Air Force MSgt Robert D. Folker, Jr. that was published by the Joint Military Intelligence College. The author compared it with less formal approaches and found that it offered significant advantages.

"At the heart of this controversy is the question of whether intelligence analysis should be accepted as an art (depending largely on subjective, intuitive judgment) or a science (depending largely on structured, systematic analytic methods)."

"Resolving this question is necessary to provide direction and determine an efficient and effective approach to improve analysis," wrote MSgt. Folker.

"If qualitative intelligence analysis is an art, then efforts to improve it should focus on measuring the accuracy of one's intuition, selecting those analysts with the best track record,

and educating them to become experts in a given field."

"If, on the other hand, qualitative intelligence analysis is a science, then analysts should be trained to select the appropriate method for a given problem from a variety of scientific methodologies and exploit it to guide them through the analytical process," he wrote.

Based on empirical tests, the author found reasons to conclude that there is indeed a "scientific" dimension to intelligence analysis that has been neglected, and that intelligence analysis would benefit from more structured approaches.

See "Intelligence Analysis in Theater Joint Intelligence Centers: An Experiment in Applying Structured Methods" by MSgt Robert D. Folker, Jr. (USAF), Joint Military Intelligence College, January 2000:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/folker.pdf>

SELECTED CRS REPORTS

Some recent reports of the Congressional Research Service obtained by Secrecy News that are not otherwise readily available in the public domain include the following.

"Federal Habeas Corpus: A Brief Legal Overview," April 26, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL33391.pdf>

"Federal Habeas Corpus: An Abridged Sketch," April 28, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RS22432.pdf>

"High Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) and High Power Microwave (HPM) Devices: Threat Assessments," updated April 14, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/natsec/RL32544.pdf>

"Direct Assaults Against Presidents, Presidents-Elect, and Candidates," updated April 5, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RS20821.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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 12:00:23 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:38:24 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Olson

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:01:26 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>Nothing, however, validates conspiracy theories and lunatic talk
>of "Shadow Government," whatever that's supposed to be. It's
>even worse when these are tied to wildly speculative beliefs
>about a vast cover-up of ET visitation.

>I would hope that this thread soon fades into memory, and from
>there soon thereafter.

>This has not been one of the List's most edifying moments.

I find your and Dick's comments on this subject pretty puzzling.
Not sure what qualifies as a "vast cover-up," but you seem to be
suggesting that governments (most particularly, the USG) have
not regularly - if not consistently - suppressed information
pertaining to UFOs. So, is your position that governments
don't do this? That is, they have not suppressed information
about UFOs?

I find it hard to imagine that you would argue that position.
But once one grants that the USG and other governments have
suppressed information, then the question becomes: How routinely
and how systematically? Since this would be speculative, on what
basis would we quantify one speculation as "wild" and another as
"sedate"? In extreme cases this could be done, granted, but
there seems to be substantial latitude for speculating on the
degree of government suppression among reasonable people.

For myself, I see nothing wild or cynical or "anarchistic" about
believing that governments lie or indulge in conspiracies; on
the contrary, government conspiracies and lies abound
historically, so it's only hard-headed realism to appreciate
that possibility.

Certainly government agencies can tell the truth, but when their
statements appear logically inconsistent or obfuscatory, it
seems reasonable to suspect that relevant information is being
withheld.

Best ,
Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 12:42:15 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:41:12 -0400
Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Kasten

>From: Jean Waskiewicz <etjean.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 15:15:46 -0400
>Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

<snip>

>The NICAP site has this incident at:

><http://www.nicap.org/bigsurdir.htm>

>Jean Waskiewicz

I vote another failure of a "new" missile launch; with cover-up
- business as usual.

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 16:23:23 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 08:46:40 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Jeanne Sloane <info.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 5 May 2006 18:18:13 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>Could some of you put together a blueprint for such a detection
>and recording station?

I would think its design is up to each researcher according to what he/she is trying to prove. I would not presume to instruct anyone since indeed I have not pulled together such a station yet. But I have done some preliminary literature research so that I can try to get the most out of my limited funds.

>Maybe most of the equipment is already
>around from kits available from someplace like:

><http://sciencekit.com>

No.

You really need stuff that can be directly plugged into a computer for data collection/analysis.

Note that almost all of the items below are not "out of the box"... they require "assembly" and have various cost/complexity levels but at least it shows others have actually built/used these things. Also, it is not known what the minimum cost instrument set is for collecting 24/7 "quality" data.

Sure the cheapest method may be simply aiming a video camera up at the sky and record 24/7, but reviewing the thing is tedious and error prone.

It seems to me that two cameras (or two other sensor sources) are better than one, but how this affects cost vs quality is not known yet. Of course, ideally two somewhat separated stations would be nice for triangulating data. Even if there is no real time data link between the two, post processing should provide data when UFOs are observed (and it is needed to filter all the UFOs out).

Other instruments besides those listed below may be cheaper. You may be able to buy these items in commercial versions but at a very high premium.

For instance,

<http://www.vlf.it/>

<http://www.vlf.it/minimal/minimal.htm>

provides a number of links to homebuilt VLF EM detectors (some more complex than others).

<http://www.vlf.it/hessdalen/hessdalen.htm>

shows the gathering of Hessdalen data from VLF monitoring and

the need for obvious need for simultaneous optical data acquisition.

http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~ews2/RDF_project.html

tells how to make an antenna (how it can be augmented) and how the output can be connected to a computer sound card and shows a link to spectrum analysis software.

(Radio direction finding data is somewhat different from magnetometer data, but it is likely that for UFOs, emissions from both are present.)

<http://www.vlf.it/inductor/inductor.htm>

http://wavelab.homestead.com/vlf_elf.html

http://wavelab.homestead.com/ELF_recordings.html

shows how to construct a VLF magnetometer for connection to the computer sound card for 24/7 monitoring.

A video camera(s) with direct computer connection or with remote feeds (wireless) to a computer are needed. These are pretty common.

Software similar to UFOCapture is required

<http://sonotaco.sub.jp/en/index.html>

<http://sonotaco.jp/forum/viewforum.php?f=17>

Its not clear what pixel density is needed. Since its use is mainly to record the path/timing/speed from one station site, then lower resolutions should be adequate.

If higher resolution images are desired, the computer could be set up to take an image with another higher resolution camera when triggered by the UFOCapture like software.

>There are probably a number of people who would be willing to
>monitor their skies.

I would have thought so, but based on response from UFO UpDates postings (private and public) I would say the number is less than a handful.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 16:29:35 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:24:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>- we've got ultimate power" ...

As one who has been targeted by unceasing organized stalking
backed up by observed UFO-encounter-level technology for 26
years, I confirm they do have ultimate power.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 22:05:37 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:26:48 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Rimmer

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 17:18:40 +0100
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 10:00:52 -0400
>>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>>>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma

><snip>

>>>Scientists at the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) describe how
>>>glowing "plasmas" of gas are created by charges of electricity.
>>>Air flows then sculpt the plasmas into aerodynamic shapes which
>>>appear to fly at extraordinary speeds through the sky.

>>OK, I guess we can all stop worrying, accept this definitive
>>final solution to the mystery, and find other hobbies.

>Think we've been privileged to be present at the coining of
>another "swamp gas explanation" - dignified by a magic-sounding
>name - plasma.

>Plasma is in a candle-flame, in your light-bulb or neon tube,
>and behind a cartridge that's just been hit by a firing-pin.
>It's not magic, its behavior is ruled by temperature and,
>depending on the percentage of electron-movement (ionization),
>by any local electro-magnetic field.

><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma> (physics)

>Our Sun is plasma, and more extreme versions emerge from poles
>of neutron stars and, on even larger scale, from galactic cores
>when jetting.

>How's that sort of thing arriving, in a big way, at airfields or
>missile-bases?

Before American ufology has a collective panic attack over the
Project Condign report, might I again suggest that people wait
until they have had an opportunity to read the full document,
rather than misleading media coverage, before rushing to condemn
David Clarke, Joe McGonagle, Andy Roberts and Gary Anthony.

Bear in mind that they did not write this report themselves, nor
were they responsible for the rather silly headline in the
Sunday Times. Instead they went to a great deal of trouble and
undertook some very clever detective work to discover its
existence and have it released into the public domain. I would
have thought that this was cause for congratulation rather than
the childish name-calling we've seen here over the last day or

so.

I attended the press conference this morning at which Clarke and McGonagle presented the full report, and I had a chance to look at it in some detail before its Internet release.

It is a large and very detailed document, and definitely not a brush-off. It seems to be a genuine, serious attempt by the Defence Intelligence staff to examine the UFO/UAP phenomenon and assess their security implications (if any) to UK air defence.

It does not say that UFOs are intelligently controlled extraterrestrial spacecraft, so of course that immediately condemns it in the eyes of many contributors to UpDates, who will thus want to hear no more about it. For those with a more open mind there is a great deal to learn from it. I have to say that I am not totally convinced by the 'plasma' idea, and like many UFO research documents I think it errs in trying to find a single over-all explanation for the residue of unexplained cases.

However, there is a lot of valuable information in it, it is sympathetic to the idea that there may be an as-yet unknown phenomenon behind some UFO cases, and it certainly deserves more than knee-jerk derision as "a load of malarky" from people who have not read it.

In passing, I was amused to note a brief comment mentioning our UpDates chum Nick Pope, soi-disant "Head of the British Government's UFO Project". In a concluding section looking at the possibility that UAPs may have been responsible for some air near-misses, the writer touches on the unwillingness of air crews to report such incidents because:

"...they are concerned about their individual reputations as professionals and... the effect any publicity this might have on the airline business. The airline crews are concerned when airmiss reports remain unsolved. It is further noted that since Pope's book has been published airline crews are unlikely to wish to take the matter further with SEC(AS2) or with civilian UFO organisations."

-- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 19:43:38 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:28:22 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Maccabee

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 14:20:34 -0300
>Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

>>Source: BBC News - London, UK
>><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4981720.stm>
>>Sunday, 7 May 2006

>Condign Report? It was picked at random apparently.

Sounds suspiciously like "Condon Report"

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Two UFO Surprises

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 19:43:44 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:31:46 -0400
Subject: Two UFO Surprises

Two UFO surprises in one day. Is this too much to take?

First surprise:

As I was driving this afternoon and listening to the Rush Limbaugh show I heard him briefly reading and discussing various articles in newspapers and press reports. It was the usual stuff: democrats, CIA, government activities, etc. It was to my great astonishment and amusement, then, that I heard him switch to another topic: the recent British report that says there is nothing to UFOs. Limbaugh pointed out that the fact that it had been kept secret for 6 years before release was likely to make people suspicious of its conclusions. But then he asked a very poignant and pertinent question relative to reports of aliens. It was something like this:

"I wonder if the writer of this report ever saw James Carville?"

Note: it also made the Drudge Report web site (with a direct link to a news video).

Second surprise:

This second surprise is decidedly more surprising.

Every month the American Physical Society publishes a newspaper, the APS NEWS. It presents some articles on recent discoveries, conferences and so on. They also have a column in which they present public statements by members of the APS, called "Members in Media."

For example, as I was reading down the column of statements I found:

"What works? Science works. Geocentrism doesn't. End of story. I've learned over time that it's hard to convince people who believe otherwise, independent of evidence."

The person who made this statement was listed immediately below:

- Lawrence Krauss, Case Western Reserve University. On geocentrism, the Sun Herald (South Mississippi) March 28, 2006

There were 14 brief statements in this section of the paper and as I read down through all of them you can imagine my astonishment to read the follows (the last entry):

"Most people don't report their sighting. They're afraid of ridicule, but in reality the world is interested. It's ready."

and the person who made this statement?

- Stanton Friedman, on flying saucers, KOAA TV news, March 23, 2006.

Congratulations, Stan!

Amusing

The same section of the paper has Lawrence Krauss and Stanton Friedman (speaking on different subjects, but Krauss has taken on UFOs also). And the timing is also amusing, coming at about the same time as the British report.

And, speaking of the British "it's all natural phenomena and airplanes, etc." report, we will have to pay special attention to the explanations offered for individual sightings... if this report discusses individual sightings. Explanation is where the "rubber meets the road."

If all sightings could be convincingly explained then there would be no point in continuing investigation... at least for me.

Note: you may not be able to tell whether or not an explanation is correct (because of lack of information) but you can determine whether or not an explanation is convincing to yourself (and others). So, does this report offer convincing explanations? Or does it just make general statements such as appear in the news report?

Incidentally, the ghost of P.J. Klass may be laughing because 'finally' the plasma theory (from his first book in 1968) is being presented as an acceptable explanation. (It was stomped on by Dr. James MacDonald back in the late '60's.)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: ET Just a Puff of Plasma - Kimball

From: Paul Kimball <TheRobieShark.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 01:29:03 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:37:22 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just a Puff of Plasma - Kimball

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

><http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2168694,00.html>

>May 07, 2006

>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma
>Jack Grimston

Our main local paper, the Chronicle-Herald/Mail Star, ran Grimston's article on the front page today, under the headline Relax, It's Just Gas, Not A UFO.

My response, in a letter to the editor (who knows if they'll run it):

To the Editor:

With regard to the front page article "Relax, it's just gas, not a UFO" (Monday, May 8), a couple of critical points need to be made.

The first is that the MOD report states unequivocally "that UAP exist is indisputable... [they] clearly can exhibit aerodynamic characteristics well beyond those of any known aircraft or missile - either manned or unmanned." (note that UAP mean Unidentified Aerial Phenomena, a more scientific way of saying UFO).

The second is that while their explanations undoubtedly explain some UFO cases, which comes as no surprise to anyone familiar with the phenomenon and the evidence, they do not explain all UFO cases. I am working on a documentary for Space right now, titled Best Evidence: The Top 10 UFO Cases, and I can guarantee you that "plasma" does not explain the top 10 cases (which does not mean, of course, that they are alien spacecraft).

Most important, however, is the fact that the report indicates that there is something "up there" which is worthy of serious scientific study "down here". Some people think UFOs are alien spacecraft, others think they are extra-dimensional travelers, and others think that they are unknown or not completely understood atmospheric phenomena.

Regardless, the message to science should be to take the subject seriously, and to begin legitimate, sustained study of the phenomenon.

As a scientific review panel chaired by renowned Stanford physicist Dr. Peter Sturrock

Bio at: <http://www.stanford.edu/group/Sturrock/Peter/>

stated in 1997, "The UFO problem is not a simple one, and it is unlikely that there is any simple universal answer. Whenever there are unexplained observations, there is the possibility that scientists will learn something new by studying those observations."

Ref: <http://tinyurl.com/z7k85>

The UK MOD report merely confirms the panel's conclusion.

Best regards,

Paul Kimball
Redstar Films Limited
www.redstarfilms.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 10:10:53 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:38:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Allan

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 23:51:09 +0100
>Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>>From: Joe McGonagle <Joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:11:50 +0100
>>Subject: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

>>In view of the earlier-than-expected media coverage,

>It's quite entertaining to see the level of hysteria which is
>being generated amongst our transatlantic brethren by the
>media's rather brief summary of a lengthy report.

>I suppose the idea of waiting to see the full details before
>responding has gone completely out of fashion.

I agree. Also, if the study was done without the knowledge or approval of the Secretary of State for Defence (as it was) then we can surely say the study was unofficial. It was done, it seems, by a small group of interested persons within the MOD. This would in no way make it an official study, any more than the infamous 'Estimate of the Situation' of 1948 was an official Air Force study in the USA.

But our ETH friends from the US often claim this great 'Estimate' provides official proof of ETH. Following their logic, we Brits could now claim the Condign Report 'proves' UFOs (as alien spacecraft) don't exist.

We should all wait to see the full report, even if it runs to 400 pages, before commenting. The press journalists will have based their columns on a short summary. I find it very hard to accept that most UFO reports are due to plasmas, if that is indeed what the study found. This flies completely against all earlier US studies, which concluded that most (perhaps 90-95 per cent) were due to aircraft, balloons, kites, astronomical objects, birds, satellites, false radar returns, etc. This leaves only some 5 per cent (at the very most) as due to other things like plasmas.

How then can the MOD Condign report claim that 'most' of the sightings are due to this? Do they mean 'most' of the total number of UFO reports, or do they mean 'most' of the remaining 5 per cent? I assume our press journalists have simply read a brief summary and written a 'summary of the summary', and made a cock-up in the process.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Humanity's Place In The Cosmic Garden

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:44:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 09:44:20 -0400
Subject: Humanity's Place In The Cosmic Garden

Source: Science & Theology News - Quincy, Massachusetts, USA

<http://www.stnews.org/news-2817.htm>

May 8, 2006

Humanity's Place In The Cosmic Garden

Natural philosopher Marcelo Gleiser ponders the implications of intelligent life on other planets

By Marcelo Gleiser

William Herschel liked to think of the heavens as a luxurious garden, filled with the most extravagant creations. By the time of his death in 1822, he had discovered a new planet (Uranus), amassed a catalog with the positions of more than 2,500 objects he called planetary nebulae and globular clusters, and pioneered the study of stellar astronomy. This tremendous revolution in astronomical knowledge had taken less than 300 years to unfold.

In 1543, Copernicus moved the sun to where it belonged all along =97 the center of all planetary orbits. The timid Pole couldn't have fancied what a crowded and busy place the cosmic garden was to become. I try to imagine how Herschel and his contemporaries dealt with the existence of another planet, a new celestial luminary no one had ever seen before, orbiting the sun twice as far as Saturn. Were there more? How many? Was Italian philosopher Giordano Bruno correct when he speculated that "innumerable suns exist; innumerable earths revolve around those suns"? Could astronomers decide if there was a boundary to creation or if the universe was infinite? Could humans ever hope to determine their place in such vastness?

The truth is this revolution in astronomical knowledge has never ended. It might go through more turbulent periods when whole worldviews are questioned and demolished, or it might lie dormant for a while during others. But as long as people ask questions about the cosmos, it rumbles along.

A new revolution

Right now this revolution is again flaring up with tremendous energy, like a proud peacock spreading open its tail of a thousand eyes. We explore exotic worlds in our solar neighborhood and discover new ones circling distant stars =97 how Bruno would rejoice! Powerful telescopes have revealed stars being born and others dying, giant black holes sitting aloof at the center of our galaxy and others.

Ours is a universe that began some 13.8 billion years ago out of a hot, chaotic soup of primal matter and energy and that seems to be expanding at a much faster clip than ever anticipated. And all through this lively storm of discovery =97 so intense even the practicing astronomer must struggle to stay afloat =97 the same age-old questions that Herschel and his friends pondered keep

echoing in our minds: If there are other worlds out there, where do we fit in all of this? Are we the sole conscious beings drifting about in this vast darkness, or are there others asking similar questions trying to find us? Can we even hope to know? And what if we do?

We look up at the night sky and cannot but be filled with the deepest sense of awe, a sense of longing for the stars, for all that may be out there hidden and unknown. The eyes that peer into the night sky are searching for answers, for meaning. These are our eyes, the eyes of curious humans, bewildered, excited. Herschel's image of a cosmic garden seems more and more adequate as technology lets us peer ever deeper and with ever more precision into the countless bodies that do indeed exist out there.

Our solar system has grown. Neptune has been discovered orbiting even further away than Uranus. After it comes Pluto. For variety, astronomers have also found rocky asteroids pressed between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter, and other belts of countless balls of ice pushed beyond the planets =97 4.6 billion-year-old remains of our nascent solar garden, fossils of our origins.

Even more spectacular, all these "other Earths," as Bruno would have called them, harbor the promise of untold wonders. Could matter in some of them be pushed into exotic configurations, perhaps to the point of generating life in some form? Other worlds are not merely a distant curiosity. We study them because through them we study ourselves.

Our solar garden

Two recent books about planets illustrate my point. Although both are aimed at general audiences, they are quite different in style and scope. One is *Lonely Planets* by David Grinspoon, a professor of planetary science at the University of Colorado in Boulder and a research associate at the university's Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics. The other is *The Planets*, a short book by award-winning science writer Dava Sobel, organized as a collection of essays, each dedicated to a planet, to the sun or moon.

Sobel writes with her usual lyrical flair, combining cutting-edge planetary science with historical and cultural material in well-crafted prose. She offers the reader a descriptive tour of the solar system from the inside out, starting with Mercury and ending beyond Pluto.

Her fascination with planets started early in life. She calls it a "fetish," as each offered wondrous possibilities of what a world could be. This fascination is alive still, as her closing lines show:

I confess that none of the truly staggering data I have been privileged to share here has altered the planets' fundamental appeal to me as an assortment of magic beans or precious gems in a little private cabinet of wonder [her grade school diorama of the solar system] - portable, evocative, and swirled in beauty.

Although I greatly admire Sobel's writing, these lines deeply bothered me. They seem to demonstrate a surprising disregard toward science and its discoveries, as if the primal fascination we have with planets and the cosmos runs along a different parallel road of wonder that science can't nourish.

Perhaps, as a scientist, I felt a bit offended because I believe precisely the opposite. That is, that science as it unveils hidden worlds and cosmic wonders, can only contribute to our sense of awe towards nature. Knowing Sobel and her obvious admiration for science =97 she is, after all, a science writer for a reason =97 the most plausible explanation is that her lines meant that her pure and innocent child's fascination with the planets and their beauty remains untouched by all the wonderfully precise and revealing discoveries of recent planetary science. If this is what she meant, it just didn't come across right.

Nonetheless, Sobel's tour through the solar garden offers many precious flowers. One is her wonderful discussion connecting the elegance of Saturn and its rings with the history behind the

notion of the music of the spheres and Gustav Holst's symphonic poem "The Planets." Another starts with Galileo's discovery of Jupiter's moons and ends with NASA's recent Galileo mission and its exploration of Jupiter's atmosphere and properties.

It was amusing to hear that someone made an astrological chart of the satellite, which, not surprisingly, agreed well with its intrepid performance. Sobel never made her position on astrology clear in the book, although it was mentioned only as a historical influence on the development of astronomy. I finished the book wanting to know more, somewhat frustrated that the bigger questions related to planetary exploration and alien life were not explored in more depth.

Intelligent life

Grinspoon's research is on "comparative planetology," or the study of how different properties of planets =97 such as mass, size, atmosphere and distance from parent star =97 can help us understand the planets in our solar neighborhood as well as the more distant ones. Grinspoon's focus in *Lonely Planets* is not so much on the planets but on the possibility that they may host alien life. In fact, he subtitled his work "The Natural Philosophy of Alien Life," perhaps to establish his debt to past thinkers on the possibility of life elsewhere and to position astrobiology as a still-nascent science. The book, written in a straightforward, humorous style, abounds with big questions =97 a manifesto from someone who really wants aliens to be out there.

There are two key points to Grinspoon's argument: First, intelligent life is not our unique privilege. Second, he writes, "We are the very beginning, locally, of a phenomenon integral to the conscious awakening of the universe." And, a bit later, "Mankind is not just another species, but an important evolutionary phenomenon - the precursor of the psychozoic age."

Let's look at each of these two points. Of course, we don't know for sure if there is any kind of life elsewhere, even with the simplicity of an amoeba. However, a decade ago, it would have been much harder to make the argument that alien life is more common than we think. But thanks to a couple of recent discoveries, we can now support this belief with more than just plain faith in life's creativity. One is that life on Earth is remarkably resilient, existing and even thriving under conditions of extreme cold and heat, in total darkness or complete lack of oxygen. If this is true here, it is then fair to say that life could exist in places we previously have declared to be out of bounds, such as deep-frozen Martian glaciers.

Another discovery is the existence of planets circling other stars. Still, we don't know whether any of these exoplanets will look anything like Earth. Of the 150 or so discovered so far, none comes close. But this may simply reflect a selection bias: With present planet-hunting techniques, those that are easier to spot are big ones orbiting close to their stars.

If we could mimic this setup in our own solar system, it would mean having Jupiter circling the sun in Mercury's orbit. In fact, if aliens at about 50 light-years from the sun used our present-day techniques to find us, they would fail miserably as we would be invisible to them. As Carl Sagan liked to say, "The absence of evidence is not evidence of absence."

The great beyond

Astronomers believe our solar system is not an anomaly. Other Earths exist. And, if they do, life probably would have flourished there. At this point, we are unable to predict what these life forms would be like. Even worse, we may not even be able to recognize them as life if we found them.

But life is not intelligent life. There seems to be a split between what astronomers and biologists think. Astronomers follow the law of large numbers. Surely, in such a vast cosmos with hundreds of billions of stars in our galaxy alone, some planets have the right environment for life to flourish and, through the creative marriage of evolution and natural selection, intelligent life has succeeded. According to this view, all intelligent life needs is time and evolutionary strife.

"Not so fast," say the biologists. "Look at the only example we have - our own. There is no gradual improvement of life, as if evolution had a plan."

There is a history of accidents, some powerful enough to wipe most life forms from the planet. Life's history, in all its variations, is deeply linked to this history of accidents. Dinosaurs ruled for 150 million years until the destructive force of an asteroid impact 65 million years ago rendered them extinct. They certainly weren't very smart, at least not to the point of being called conscious. That same cataclysmic event triggered the explosive growth in the mammal population that eventually led to our primate ancestors about 3 million years ago. Are astronomers telling us that this sequence of events can be easily repeated elsewhere?

"Not this exact sequence," my astronomer answers in this hypothetical conversation. "But surely, the numbers are such that variations occur, and some of them may lead to life and intelligent life."

Who is right? We don't know. The only way to find out is to discover life elsewhere. Although =97 barring a surprise visit from our cosmic brethren or an impromptu alien message captured by a radio-antenna =97 this is difficult. UFOs and abduction stories aside, we have absolutely no evidence that aliens are among us now or have ever been here

A 'psychozoic age'

But let's follow Grinspoon and see where his arguments lead. Let us assume we are not the only intelligent species in the cosmos and that intelligence is actually a necessary evolutionary step toward some kind of universal enlightenment, the dawn of a "psychozoic age."

What does "psychozoic age" mean? Since Grinspoon provides less detail than I would have hoped for, I link this novel evolutionary role of an elevated form of human being to his definition of an intelligent species: a species capable of conscious self-preservation, and of preserving its planetary home. This age may already have started long ago somewhere in our galaxy or in some of the other hundreds of billions of galaxies out there. From his definition, it follows that a truly intelligent species can exist for billions of years. As such, we are merely babies in the grand scheme of cosmic intelligence.

Actually, it's too early to know if we humans qualify. Let's see if humanity can survive another million years or so before we call ourselves truly intelligent.

If Grinspoon is right, other super-smart aliens exist with super-smart technology. In fact, judging from our first trembling steps toward genetic engineering and nanotechnology, we can even imagine that these super-smart aliens developed ways to become immortal. Yes, immortal. All you have to do is keep cloning your body and feeding your accumulated memories and life experiences into your clones. Alternatively, an antidote to cellular aging may be invented. These immortals, with their ultra-sophisticated technology, would be capable of things we may presently call miraculous. Indeed, from our perspective, they would be godlike.

They could even have created us.

This argument raises interesting questions: Are these immortals simply the scientific version of our need to believe in something bigger than ourselves? If intelligent life is rare - perhaps unique to this planet - does that mean we have the responsibility not only to preserve ourselves but also to spread life and intelligent life throughout the cosmos? Do we have a "cosmic" moral obligation to spread the light of reason and compassion throughout the universe? This is a beautiful notion, which will, let's hope, not be lost but amplified if and when we find other intelligences out there.

Marcelo Gleiser is Appleton Professor of Natural Philosophy and a professor of physics and astronomy at Dartmouth College in

Hanover, N.H. He is author of the award-winning books The Dancing Universe and The Prophet and the Astronomer.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 9](#)

Classified MoD Report Reveals The Secrets Behind

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 10:00:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 09 May 2006 10:00:27 -0400
Subject: Classified MoD Report Reveals The Secrets Behind

Source: PhysOrg.Com - Tilberg, The Netherlands

<http://www.physorg.com/news66281961.html>

May 08, 2006

Classified MoD Report Reveals The Secrets Behind UFOs

Experts have uncovered a secret Ministry of Defence (MoD) report asserting that UFOs exist, explaining the phenomena and assessing the security threat they may pose to the UK. The report was unearthed by academics at Sheffield Hallam University using the Freedom of Information Act.

The four year study, codenamed Project Condign, says that unexplained UFO sightings are caused by 'plasmas', which create false memories of alien experiences and burn the skin. The report says these plasmas are rare and are created by 'more than one set of weather and electrically charged conditions'. Another of the causes may be 'by meteor re-entry, the meteors neither burning up completely nor impacting as meteorites but forming buoyant plasmas'

The report states that plasmas have been proven to cause responses in the temporal lobe of the human brain, and claims that this may cause observers to suffer extended memory retention and repeat experience which may be 'a key factor in influencing the more extreme reports... [which] are clearly believed by the 'victims'.' It also says that radiated effects from these plasmas can in rare instances be enough to scorch the skin.

The report refers to UFOs as Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAPs) and asserts that they pose little or no danger to aircraft unless violent manoeuvres are undertaken to either chase or avoid them. However, it does say that they have caused fatalities in other countries where aircraft have deliberately chased the UAP.

The report states 'that UAP exist is indisputable... [they] clearly can exhibit aerodynamic characteristics well beyond those of any known aircraft or missile - either manned or unmanned'.

The report's official title is Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAPs) in the UK Air Defence Region and it was classified as Secret. It was written by a mysterious, un-named Defence Intelligence expert between 1996 and 2000 and was unearthed by Dr David Clarke from Sheffield Hallam University. Dr Clarke and colleague Gary Anthony used the Freedom of Information Act to gain access to the document.

Dr Clarke said: "This is another example of the establishment's obsession with secrecy and how the Freedom of Information Act can chip away at this culture of silence.

This report clears up many of the rumours surrounding UFOs and there is no reason it couldn't have been made public earlier. For example, it reveals that there has been no collaboration between the UK and other countries on UFOs, which rules out the conspiracy theories of worldwide UFO cover-ups. The report also confirms that there have never been any artefacts from a UFO found in the UK.

The fact remains that people are fascinated by the subject of UFOs and the MoD should have learned that 50 years of silence on the subject hasn't made it go away. People continue to see UFOs and some of the most impressive sightings have been made by RAF and civil aviation pilots.

The lack of any proper official study of what these things are has simply added to speculation and claims about conspiracies and cover-ups."

Source: Sheffield Hallam University

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 10](#)

Maccabee West Coast MUFON UFO Lectures

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 19:32:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 10:12:45 -0400
Subject: Maccabee West Coast MUFON UFO Lectures

For those of you in the L.A. area I will be speaking to Orange County MUFON the evening of May 17 and to L. A. MUFON th evening of May 18.

You can find out the locations and times at the respective web sites:

www.mufonoc.org

www.mufonla.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 10](#)

First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO

From: Robert Morningstar <robert_morningstar.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 18:24:38 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 22:16:50 -0400
Subject: First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO

First On The Moon, The Untold Story - The Apollo 11 UFO

Tonight (May 9th, 2006) on The Science Channel at 8 p.m. (NYC), NASA and The Science Channel released close-up film taken by Apollo 11 astronauts of the UFO that tracked them on Way to Moon. The film taken by the astronauts was shown for several seconds at a time as Buzz Aldrin told the story of their close encounter and NASA's attempt to identify the object with the Saturn 5 booster rocket which was actually 6,000 miles away.

The film gave a clear view at times of a dual sectioned object comprised of a spherical rear section attached (or towed) by a conical or triangular forward section that glistened brightly. The conical section bore definite signs of technological manufacture: brightly polished metal, with many rings of bolt-like structures spaced circularly and evenly apart from the nose of the craft to the base of the conical section. The spherical section shown in the Apollo film appeared to be of similar construction and manufacture.

The nose section of the UFO was somewhat similar to the shape of the Apollo Command Module. To this observer, the construction was reminiscent of Soviet-style "nut & bolts" heavy metal design, engineering and construction work (if one wishes to find a terrestrial candidate for its manufacture, design and assembly). For many years, rumors have persisted that the Russians attempted to rush a Moon flight and landing in the hopes of beating the US to the Moon fearing that America's arrival on the Moon first would result in a huge loss of prestige and worldwide propaganda advantages for the U.S.

No official comment has ever been made either way on the rumor. The film shown tonight by The Science Channel could reopen the question of a failed Soviet Lunar mission at that time.

The UFO followed a track parallel to the trajectory of the Apollo 11 Lunar Command Ship and Lunar Lander, which permitted close up filming of the object. The construction and shape of the forward structure was somewhat reminiscent of eyewitnesses' descriptions of the construction of "acorn" shape and structure of the UFO observed at the time of the Kecksburg UFO crash in 1965. The forward section appeared to be more conical or triangular than "acorn" shaped but the similarity to the Kecksburg report came to mind.

Upon returning to Earth, Aldrin reported the UFO to NASA officially. It was reported by a former NASA engineer that NASA feared ridicule if the public were to learn of the UFO and the public perception that NASA "believed in UFOs" (even with their film as supporting evidence) was not acceptable.

As a result, the Astronauts were sworn to secrecy and agreed never to speak of their "UFO Close Encounter" ever again.

The program, "First on the Moon, The Untold Story" will be repeated tonight at 11 p.m. on the Science Channel.

"Heads Up!"

Robert M*

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 10](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 02:03:55 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 22:19:21 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 21:58:35 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 12:12:17 -0300
>>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>>Whenever David Clarke and Andy Roberts and Joe McGonagle
>>>come rushing out, breathlessly, with the latest UK government
>>>regulations/revelations we should all know better.

>>Then it takes an act implemented by government to force
>>freedom of information, then it's only to be reased to
>>debunkers in England who have coyly previewed this as "UFO"
>>information, when it's just more of the same nonsense.

>>And where's the science, that's been hidden from a public that
>>would naturally be terrified by this new "natural phenomenon"
>>that's more sinister than tornadoes and tsunamis and lightning
>>and hurricanes?

>>Are these scientists saying that they now believe in the oft
>>recycled ball lightning>

>It's early days to be commenting on this but to be fair to Joe,
>he has just been sat on UK TV saying he doesn't agree with all
>of it. Gary Anthony has acknowledged there are inconsistencies
>in it. And Dave Clark has been "forced" to sit there on UK TV
>and admit that there are such things as UFOs.

Hi Stuart,

Good for Joe. He got confused by me with John Harney, who of
course is not part of the Saucery team. Don't know why, but I've
made that mistake before. My apologies to Joe.

And Dave Clarke admitted to UFOs. My, my.

Let's see how it goes with the report on the 15th. Looking
forward to some interesting reports.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 10](#)

UK Court Approves McKinnon Extradition

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 22:22:25 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 22:22:25 -0400
Subject: UK Court Approves McKinnon Extradition

Source: MacWorld UK

<http://tinyurl.com/z9nrd>

Wednesday - May 10, 2006

UFO Hacker Faces Extradition To US

By Jeremy Kirk

A UK court has approved a US request to extradite an unemployed systems administrator who allegedly caused \$700,000 in damage by hacking into US military and government computers.

The hacker claims he was simply looking for data about UFO sightings.

Gary McKinnon, 40, of London, is accused of deleting data and illegally accessing information on US government computers between February 2001 and March 2002. Prosecutors allege McKinnon significantly disrupted government computers, causing damage that threatened US military networks.

British investigators seized McKinnon's computers in March 2002. McKinnon admitted to installing remote-access software on computers he targeted in the US.

The US filed an extradition request after British officials decided not to prosecute McKinnon because the alleged crimes occurred within the US.

McKinnon's attorneys fought extradition, fearing that he could be classed as an enemy combatant and be held indefinitely, awaiting trial by a military court.

UK Trial judge Nicholas Evans rejected arguments that McKinnon could be subjected to torture and inhuman treatment in the US. The US says McKinnon will not be held as an enemy combatant.

Evans referred the case to the UK Secretary of State to decide whether McKinnon will be extradited.

McKinnon will appeal the verdict and remains free on bail. Before leaving the court, he hugged friends and relatives attending the hearing.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 10](#)

UK MoD BS

From: **Stephen Bassett** <ParadigmRG.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 15:11:27 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 22:26:14 -0400
Subject: UK MoD BS

The contrast between the recently disgorged UK MOD UFO report and the 2000 French COMETA report is notable. The COMETA Report raised important points as to the validity of UFO phenomena and challenged the US to act.

The US press wanted nothing to do with the COMETA Report, made no effort to translate it, when it was translated and presented, wouldn't cover it. The exception was freelance journalist Leslie Kean - to her everlasting credit.

The MOD report is all over the US media.

That the American press went from being a formidable force for understanding the world and challenging questionable government policy circa 1970-75 to a pathetic collection of overpaid useful idiots is one of the saddest and most dangerous political realities of the 20th Century.

SB

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 10](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/10/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 16:47:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 22:28:11 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/10/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 56
May 10, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** NRC RECONSIDERS SECRECY OF NUCLEAR FUEL EXPORTS
** "UNPRECEDENTED" AIPAC PROSECUTION DRAWS GROWING ATTENTION
** IN PRINT
** DNI REPORT VIEWS PROLIFERATION, CIRCA 2004

NRC RECONSIDERS SECRECY OF NUCLEAR FUEL EXPORTS

In response to a request from a public interest group, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) agreed to disclose the amounts of highly enriched uranium (HEU) fuel sought for export by two foreign countries. But the NRC said it reserved the right to withhold similar information in the future.

The Nuclear Control Institute (NCI) had argued last February that NRC secrecy regarding HEU exports was impeding public deliberation on the subject, and that such deliberation had in the past contributed to a reduction in international traffic in the weapons-grade material (SN, 02/15/06).

NRC chairman Nils J. Diaz agreed in part.

"With respect to the two pending applications for export of HEU, the NRC has decided that the total quantity of material requested in the particular export applications may be released," he wrote to NCI President Paul Leventhal and analyst Alan Kuperman in a letter dated April 26 and disclosed this week.

Chairman Diaz revealed that Belgium had applied for export of 85.5 kilograms of HEU reactor fuel, and that Canada was seeking 15.5 kilograms of HEU.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/05/nrc042606.pdf>

Unfortunately, the utility of the new disclosures for public deliberation over nuclear exports was undercut by the fact that Belgium's application has already been approved. A copy of the May 3 export license, with the amount of fuel to be sent to Belgium still blacked out, is here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/05/nrc-belg.pdf>

"This new NRC policy of considering disclosure of requested export amounts upon request is an improvement over the blanket redaction policy," said NCI's Alan Kuperman, who is also an assistant professor at the University of Texas at Austin.

"But it will not restore a meaningful opportunity for public comment unless in each case the public promptly requests and the NRC promptly grants disclosure of the amount of the export license request, well in advance of the commission's decision on that license request," he told Secrecy News.

Kuperman praised outgoing NRC chairman Diaz for his constructive response, but he said that "we'll be appealing for the routine release of these numbers."

"UNPRECEDENTED" AIPAC PROSECUTION DRAWS GROWING ATTENTION

The prosecution of two former officials of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) for allegedly mishandling classified information is attracting growing attention as the momentous character of the case and its implications for American civil liberties become clear. (AIPAC itself is not a defendant and is not accused of wrongdoing.)

"When we say that this is an unprecedented case, we're not saying it hyperbolically the way people use 'unprecedented'," said defense attorney Abbe Lowell, according to the newly disclosed transcript of an April 21 court hearing. "We literally mean it's unprecedented. There is not a case like it."

Never before has the Espionage Act of 1917 been used to prosecute uncleared, non-governmental persons who are engaged in protected First Amendment activities (not espionage) for receiving and transmitting national defense information.

If these defendants are guilty of a crime, then so are many other advocates, reporters, congressional staff and so forth.

"I think Mr. Lowell is absolutely right," Judge T.S. Ellis, III said at the April 21 hearing. "It is an unprecedented, it's a novel case."

Prosecuting attorney Kevin DiGregory argued that the defendants had conspired to improperly gather and disseminate classified information and therefore "they stand in the shoes of a thief."

But the court rejected that assertion.

"You're not going to attempt to prove, and it isn't alleged in the indictment, that these defendants in some way conspired to steal [the information]," said Judge Ellis. "I don't think you gain much from an analogy that doesn't fit."

"I find this a very, very hard problem," he said. "I'm exquisitely sensitive to the [defendants'] motion to dismiss that I'm continuing to consider," he said.

Assuming the case is not dismissed, the trial will begin August 7.

A copy of the transcript of the April 21 hearing on the matter was obtained by Secrecy News and is available here:

<http://www.fas.org/scg/jud/rosen042106.html>

The AIPAC case may be a prelude to the establishment of an American version of the British Official Secrets Act, wrote civil libertarian Nat Hentoff. See "Chilling Free Speech" by Nat Hentoff, Washington Times, May 8:

<http://washingtontimes.com/op-ed/20060507-094116-3382r.htm>

The case could "change the nature of how news is gathered in Washington and how lobbyists and academics interact with the government," wrote author David Wise. See "Read the News, Go to Jail," by David Wise, Los Angeles Times, April 30:

<http://tinyurl.com/lgl8o>

Both articles were entered into the Congressional Record yesterday by Rep. Jim McDermott (D-WA). See "The Big Chill in Washington, DC," May 9:

<http://www.fas.org/scg/congress/2006/bigchill.html>

IN PRINT

The new Journal of National Security Law & Policy has recently published its second issue featuring several meaty articles on interrogation, torture and the rule of law. The full contents of the issue, along with subscription information, are available online here:

<http://www.mcgeorge.edu/jnslp/>

The case of Sam Adams, the intelligence analyst who challenged official assessments of the size of Viet Cong forces during the Vietnam War, is revisited in a new book.

"It's the first complete narrative of the intelligence war at the heart of what went wrong in Vietnam, and it also happens to be highly relevant to what's happening today in Iraq," suggests the publisher.

See "Who the Hell Are We Fighting? The Story of Sam Adams and the Vietnam Intelligence Wars," by C. Michael Hiam, Steerforth Press, published April 25, 2006:

<http://www.steerforth.com/books/display.pperl?isbn=97815864210>

45

DNI REPORT VIEWS PROLIFERATION, CIRCA 2004

"We remain concerned that Tehran may have a clandestine nuclear weapons program," according to a new but rather anticlimactic U.S. intelligence report to Congress.

The new report on foreign acquisition of weapons of mass destruction during 2004 was released by the Deputy Director of National Intelligence this week.

Such a report is required by statute to be prepared and delivered every six months. The last report, for the second half of 2003, was released in November 2004.

See "Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions, 1 January Through 31 December 2004," Unclassified DDNI Report to Congress, May 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/wmd-acq.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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

UFOs Do Exist Insists Watcher

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:36:52 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:36:52 -0400
Subject: UFOs Do Exist Insists Watcher

Source: The Oxford Mail - Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/p2zuf>

11 May 2006

UFOs Do Exist Insists Watcher

He claims to have seen spaceships soaring across the city's skies and crop circles 300ft-wide, so it will take more than an official report to convince this Oxford UFO expert aliens don't exist.

A confidential four-year study by the Ministry of Defence, made public under the Freedom of Information Act, concluded there is no proof of alien life forms.

But Michael Soper, pictured, a member of the Contact International UFO research group, has spent decades of his life studying unidentified flying objects and believes the MoD's report does not throw any doubt on his findings.

Mr Soper, of Ouseley Close, New Marston, who says he first saw a UFO in 1959 over the Malvern Hills in Worcestershire, said: "Obviously, the MoD can't admit aliens exist.

"Even if they knew they did, they could not admit to it. This is the only kind of report they could produce. I don't agree with most of it."

The report, undertaken by the Defence Intelligence Staff, part of the MoD, concludes that sightings of UFOs can be rationally explained and that meteors and their "well-known effects" are responsible for "some unidentified aerial phenomena".

But Mr Soper insisted this could only explain about five per cent of the cases he had encountered.

[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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

More Greer Guff

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:42:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:42:37 -0400
Subject: More Greer Guff

Source: Mountain Xpress - Asheville, North Carolina, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/m8q8gq>

May 10, 2006 / vol 12 iss 41

Look Homeward, ET

Steven Greer and the search for extraterrestrial intelligence

by Cecil Bothwell

It's no news that Asheville is a tourist destination. But maybe the Chamber of Commerce and the Tourism Development Authority haven't set their sights high enough.

Dr. Steven Greer, a former Biltmore Forest resident who worked as an emergency-room physician here years ago, is utterly convinced that off-worlders have been racking up frequent-flier miles (or parsecs =96 a measure of interstellar distance equal to 1.918 x 10¹³ miles, or 3.258 light-years) while visiting Earth =96 perhaps for centuries.

Greer is returning to Asheville as part of a national tour promoting his latest book, Hidden Truth, Forbidden Knowledge: It is Time for You to Know (self-published, 2006). He'll give a talk Wednesday, May 17, in UNCA's Lipinsky Hall at 7:30 p.m.

Like many UFO enthusiasts, Greer believes an alien craft crashed in Roswell, N.M., in 1947 and was recovered by the U.S. government, and that there have been enough such recoveries that scientists in secret laboratories have duplicated flying-saucer technology. But a black-box cabal of powerful greed-heads is keeping the information about essentially free energy from the rest of us in order to control the earth (and preserve oil profits), he says. John Kennedy was killed because he planned to expose the whole plot, and G.H.W. Bush is in on the deal. Whew.

Hidden Truth cover

Greer also asserts that he's been for a ride in a flying saucer, can levitate groups of automobiles by meditating, and is in regular communication with the interplanetary tourist crowd.

Through the nonprofit Center for the Study of Extraterrestrial Intelligence, which Greer founded in 1990, he leads trips to Crestone, Colo., and Mount Shasta, Calif., where participants are instructed in the protocols he says he's developed for making contact with extraterrestrials. Another Greer project, Space Energy Access Systems, was founded in 2001 to explore "zero-point energy" devices, which he says "use the energy in the space around them."

A tale of two ufologists

Scientist, writer, mystic and showman Carl Sagan, who died in

1996, was also a devout ET believer. But Sagan, widely known as both a serious astronomer and a science popularizer, felt that intergalactic travel =96 whether by extraterrestrials or humans =96 would inevitably entail an expenditure of time and energy that couldn't possibly be justified by any potential benefits. Time and again, Sagan would explain in articles or on his Cosmos television series that there are billions of galaxies, each containing billions of stars, in an apparently expanding universe. And while we call this "the universe," there's no way of knowing if it is, in fact, the only such.

Sagan also argued that given the propensity of matter to coalesce and self-organize as life, there must be billions of inhabited planets out there somewhere. So there's no way that anybody clever enough to invent space travel would choose to waste their time visiting every inhabited planet to check out local culture. Repeat visits would be out of the question, Sagan argued.

Greer, however, takes a contrary view. An articulate spokesman, he spins a seamless tale of intrigue and skullduggery =96 backed up, he says, by the thousands of photographs of unexplained phenomena and thousands of pages of testimony from fellow believers that he's compiled. But try to pin down specifics and you run into trouble.

In what the author calls the "nuts and bolts" chapters of his manuscript (which were forwarded to this writer for review), for example, he cites an impressive list of insiders on his team: Laurance Rockefeller, former Ambassador Maxwell Rabb, astronaut Gordon Cooper and former Nevada Sen. Richard H. Bryan. But UFOs aside, one thing all these people have in common is that all of them are dead. Meanwhile, a whole host of generals, CIA operatives, aides to congressional reps and presidents, and corporate movers and shakers on which so much of Greer's tale rests are identified only by initials or titles.

Asked about this, Greer told Xpress that despite his book's title, it's really a memoir, rather than a source of specific information about ETs, UFOs and so forth. Accordingly, he referred this reporter to an earlier book of his, Disclosure (self-published, 2001), which contains upward of 550 pages of anecdotal testimony from people who have seen things.

Asked if any witnesses had offered tangible proof =96 UFO parts or even blueprints =96 Greer affirmed that there are plans reproduced in Disclosure. Asked if the plans had been evaluated by independent engineers who might testify to their feasibility, Greer said: "They aren't that kind of blueprints. They aren't actual plans."

Monica, Monica

This reporter last interviewed Greer before an earlier Lipinsky Hall appearance ("Hey Mr. Spaceman," Nov. 23, 1994 Xpress). At the time, he maintained that the Clinton administration was on the verge of going public with the news that the U.S. was in touch with beings from beyond. This, Greer declared, would definitely be revealed within the next 12-18 months.

Asked what happened in that case, Greer said flatly, "Clinton lost his nerve."

In Hidden Truth, Greer suggests that Presidents Eisenhower, Carter and Clinton were all made to feel such fear for their lives that they refused to divulge what they knew to be true. Reagan, says Greer, was simply oblivious, and both Nixon and Bush Sr. were complicit in the evil cartel that holds the goods.

"In the case of Bill Clinton," Greer writes, "he very much wanted to see this happen but didn't have the courage to do it. His legacy was basically lost, because it was his responsibility, as the first full-term president after the close of the Cold War era, to have done this. He didn't rise to the challenge."

A "major New York paper," says Greer, was set to run a story about his own "briefings for the White House and CIA director on UFOs." But fate intervened. "The very day they were going to run that story, Linda Tripp emerged with her stories about Monica Lewinsky. This was not an accident or a coincidence."

Invasion of the body snatchers?

The plot, says Greer, transcends national borders. United Nations Secretaries-General Javier P=erez de Cu=ellar and Boutros Boutros-Ghali were both ousted from that post because they planned to spill the beans, and de Cu=ellar was the subject of a fake alien abduction orchestrated by members of the secret government that is running the world.

The U.N. head honchos are not alone in that regard, notes Greer: Many, if not most of the notorious body snatchings/probings/diddlings regularly reported in the tabloid news are actually the work of that cabal.

ETs aside, Greer claims to have spent time with some pretty high fliers right here on Earth. He reports a several-hour t=Eate==E0-t=Eate with former CIA Director James Woolsey, whom Greer says tried to get Clinton to go public. More recently, Woolsey was a member of the influential =96 and controversial =96 Project for the New American Century.

Greer also mentions meetings with "a senior general at the Pentagon," "Sen. Byrd's chief investigator," "someone who had been tied into these projects in the military in Arizona," "a former head of Army intelligence," and "some very good friends of Prince Charles and Prince Philip." Clearly, this is one busy guy.

As a former physician, however, Greer must be aware of what a messy business assassination can be, and he seems to believe he's putting himself on the line. "Some of the people working with us would sell out to a cell within the Shadow Government that interfaces with the civilian UFO community that's headed up by Col. M.K., Gen. T.E., W.B. (a very wealthy Nevada businessman) and others," Greer writes.

Like most conspiracy theories, this one seems likely to attract its share of supporters and debunkers =96 and unlikely to be rationally resolved anytime soon. Still and all, as Sagan wrote about extraterrestrial intelligence at the end of his novel, Contact:

"The universe was made on purpose, the circle said. In whatever galaxy you happen to find yourself, you take the circumference of a circle, divide it by its diameter, measure closely enough, and uncover a miracle =96 another circle, drawn kilometers downstream of the decimal point. It doesn't matter what you look like, or what you're made of, or where you come from. As long as you live in this universe, and have a modest talent for mathematics, sooner or later you'll find it. It's already here. It's inside everything. You don't have to leave your planet to find it."

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Watson

From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 13:36:43 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:51:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - Watson

My report about Project Condign appears today on the Wired website at:

<http://tinyurl.com/lhh3w>

I refer to the Alien Autopsy footage as a hoax, yet someone has already informed me it is not a hoax but a 're-creation' of the original footage. I would rather believe in plasma balls.

Regards

Nigel

www.talkingpix.co.uk

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 13:48:31 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:52:43 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 12:00:23 -0700
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:01:26 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>Nothing, however, validates conspiracy theories and lunatic talk
>>of "Shadow Government," whatever that's supposed to be. It's
>>even worse when these are tied to wildly speculative beliefs
>>about a vast cover-up of ET visitation.

>>I would hope that this thread soon fades into memory, and from
>>there soon thereafter.

>>This has not been one of the List's most edifying moments.

>I find your and Dick's comments on this subject pretty puzzling.
>Not sure what qualifies as a "vast cover-up," but you seem to be
>suggesting that governments (most particularly, the USG) have
>not regularly - if not consistently - suppressed information
>pertaining to UFOs. So, is your position that governments
>*don't* do this? That is, they have not suppressed information
>about UFOs?

>I find it hard to imagine that you would argue that position.
>But once one grants that the USG and other governments have
>suppressed information, then the question becomes: How routinely
>and how systematically? Since this would be speculative, on what
>basis would we quantify one speculation as "wild" and another as
>"sedate"? In extreme cases this could be done, granted, but
>there seems to be substantial latitude for speculating on the
>degree of government suppression among reasonable people.

>For myself, I see nothing wild or cynical or "anarchistic" about
>believing that governments lie or indulge in conspiracies; on
>the contrary, government conspiracies and lies abound
>historically, so it's only hard-headed realism to appreciate
>that possibility.

>Certainly government agencies can tell the truth, but when their
>statements appear logically inconsistent or obfuscatory, it
>seems reasonable to suspect that relevant information is being
>withheld.

Jeff,

Then we don't need dark, sinister hints about "who's behind it
all" do we, as if there were some evil cabal responsible? Of
course governments cover things up, but not necessarily for evil

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall

reasons. More often it is due to stupidity, fear, doubt, uncertainty, CYA, and other very human reasons.

You would do well to read my book "Uninvited Guests" in this regard. It is available cheap in used editions, probably \$5 to \$8.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Re: Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens -

From: Viktor Golubik <Peetkin.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:08:14 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:59:44 -0400
Subject: Re: Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens -

ufoupdates.nul writes:

>Source: WBWT-TV NewsWatch 50 - Watertown, New York, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/gn4vg>

>08 May 2006

>Another UFO Study Still No Sign of Aliens

>United Press International

<snip>

The Central Question of those doing evaluations on what exactly constitutes proof of Unconventional Flying Objects should be on what types of evidence satisfy various levels of proof. What are those levels? What constitutes proof at each level? What is the investigative method being used?

A hierarchy of evidence should be outlined on what evaluated method they've adopted on which they are making and classifying evidence. These are the questions that should be posed to any scientific endeavor or evaluation-based report. Absence of such a scheme leaves room for great latitude of implied judgment and shows lack of centralized thinking.

UFOs can't always be placed in boxes and examined in a straightforward manner as are many scientific endeavors.

Therefore, why is the study of UFOs any different?

The strategies of investigation have to be outlined. The list of required evidence revealed. Only in this way can proof be sought that fits within the framework of their (Our) thought process.

Further, evidence and the strategies being used can be examined and debated within a consistent framework. This is the only type of report worthy of matured debate. Asking for such reports is the only angle we currently have. Without it, we are slipping on a sand dune and shoving away dirt under us that might otherwise be gold upon closer and more purposeful examination.

Viktor Golubik

(name slightly modified to avoid showing up in Google searches
k's = c's)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Re: First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <Peetkin.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 10:32:07 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 11:03:14 -0400
Subject: Re: First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO - Golubik

>From: Robert Morningstar <robert_morningstar.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 18:24:38 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: First Clear Film of Apollo 11 UFO

>First On The Moon, The Untold Story - The Apollo 11 UFO

>Tonight (May 9th, 2006) on The Science Channel at 8 p.m. (NYC),
>NASA and The Science Channel released close-up film taken by
>Apollo 11 astronauts of the UFO that tracked them on Way to
>Moon. The film taken by the astronauts was shown for several
>seconds at a time as Buzz Aldrin told the story of their close
>encounter and NASA's attempt to identify the object with the
>Saturn 5 booster rocket which was actually 6,000 miles away.

<snip>

On the 25th anniversary of the Moon Walk, Buzz Aldrin came on
the Johnny Carson Show and talked openly about this incident for
the first time that I could remember.

Amazing!

Earlier in the day, Neil Armstrong gave his mysterious, "There
are places to go beyond belief... unless we remove truth's
protective layers" speech... both interesting - yet both went
under the radar, for the most part?

Viktor Golubik

(spelling slight modified to avoid showing up on Google searches,
k's = c's)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 11:08:19 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 11:16:00 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

>From: Stephen Bassett <ParadigmRG.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 15:11:27 EDT
>Subject: UK MOD BS

>The contrast between the recently disgorged UK MOD UFO report
>and the 2000 French COMETA report is notable. The COMETA Report
>raised important points as to the validity of UFO phenomena and
>challenged the US to act.

>The US press wanted nothing to do with the COMETA Report, made
>no effort to translate it, when it was translated and presented,
>wouldn't cover it. The exception was freelance journalist Leslie
>Kean - to her everlasting credit.

>The MOD report is all over the US media.

>That the American press went from being a formidable force for
>understanding the world and challenging questionable government
>policy circa 1970-75 to a pathetic collection of overpaid useful
>idiots is one of the saddest and most dangerous political
>realities of the 20th Century.

Stephen,

It's probably a mistake to compare the two reports, as COMETA was a private effort, while the other was an "official" Government study. We also know the background and who authored the COMETA report, while the CONDIGN report has less scientific provenance with the alleged destruction of the research database.

You also seem to have the American Press all figured out, but I have to admit I didn't see a single line on the CONDIGN release in the American press, so I'm not sure what you've seen. The British press picked it up, as the American press might pick up a newly released CIA report on UFOs, but I'm not sure they really saw it as a valuable study. Did you see a lot of press reports in support of CONDIGN's conclusions?

The researchers that I tend to pay attention to have held back their criticism and would like to see what the full report says, rather than base their reactions on a perhaps flawed summary. The Condon report Summary didn't really tell the story of what the full Condon Report contained, and I suspect the same is true for the CONDIGN report. But that will be determined over time and not in reading a few posts from those who've skimmed it.

I think it's important to keep in mind that neither COMETA nor CONDIGN really involved new research, but a re-examination of existing cases.

You are certainly correct in that the press is a different animal when compared to the major network news organizations prior to 1985. It was around that time that CBS closed their remote news bureaus and CNN took over as the pool news agency around the world, which limits "live" coverage to a single

(visual) perspective. I guess the next time you send a press release to that "pathetic collection of overpaid useful idiots", you'll have to hope they've not seen your critique of their abilities..... <g>

Just four days until we can actually see what we're discussing here, and hopefully there won't be too much blood-letting before then.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 13:36:17 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 20:01:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:01:26 -0500
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>>>>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

>>>>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>>>>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>>>>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>>>>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>>>>- we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a
>>>>jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

>>>>That the sort of thing you mean?

>>>>What "mysterious officials and intimidators?" Yes, in a
>>>>handful of cases we have some evidence of someone trying to
>>>>intimidate witnesses (I know of a few of these cases myself),
>>>>but as expressed here implying vast coordinated forces at work,
>>>>nonsense! Who really believes that the "evil government" is
>>>>really that organized and efficient? I don't.

>>>>And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
>>>>evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and
>>>>anti-government raving. What simplistic nonsense!

>>>>Let me second Dick Hall's sentiments. This is pretty dumb.

>>>>There's plenty of bad governance in the world. Official
>>>>malfeasance, too. No shortage of wrong-doing and dangerous
>>>>stupidity and arrogance. Just ask any American who lives in >the
>>>>first decade of the 21st Century.

>>>>There are, in short, plenty of real things to engage one's
>>>>concern.

>>>>Nothing, however, validates conspiracy theories and lunatic talk
>>>>of "Shadow Government," whatever that's supposed to be. It's
>>>>even worse when these are tied to wildly speculative beliefs
>>>>about a vast cover-up of ET visitation.

>>>>I would hope that this thread soon fades into memory, and from

>there soon thereafter.

>This has not been one of the List's most edifying moments.

>Jerry Clark

Dumb? Lunatic? Coming from a guy who put out something called the UFO Encyclopedia?

Maybe you missed the last note on my post which read:

"Generalizations notwithstanding, just a tickle and a giggle question often popping up in UFO debates with the public round here."

Figures.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 13:39:56 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 20:03:41 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Boone

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 16:56:02 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 6 May 2006 17:54:08 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>I have a theory on these mysterious officials and intimidators
>>>but it's far too scary and more than the public can deal with.

>>Don't know if it's relevant, but body-language of suits & some
>>uniforms, of 'leaders' on TV and face-to-face on the street
>>(have had a few run-ins myself - maybe ongoing), too often
>>reverts to... "we dont have to care what you say or how you vote
>>- we've got ultimate power" - somewhat like 'trusties' in a
>>jail, or maybe more like janitors in a vivisection lab.

>>That the sort of thing you mean?

>This is one of the most paranoid and off-putting threads in a
>long time. "Who is behind it all?" I'll tell you who is behind
>it, just as Pogo told us a long time ago: "We have met the enemy
>and he is us."

>What "mysterious officials and intimidators?" Yes, in a handful
>of cases we have some evidence of someone trying to intimidate
>witnesses (I know of a few of these cases myself), but as
>expressed here implying vast coordinated forces at work,
>nonsense! Who really believes that the "evil government" is
>really that organized and efficient? I don't.

>And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
>evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and anti-
>government raving. What simplistic nonsense!

>- Dick

Maybe you missed the last note on my post which read:

"Generalizations notwithstanding, just a tickle and a giggle
question often popping up in UFO debates with the public round
here."

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 11](#)

Project Condign - MOD Announcement

From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 18:59:29 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 20:06:02 -0400
Subject: Project Condign - MOD Announcement

The MOD has confirmed that the Project Condign report will be published on 15 May. Here's the announcement from the MOD website:

<http://tinyurl.com/nwwap>

This is where it will appear:

<http://tinyurl.com/p3euz>

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 14:02:10 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 10:55:55 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 11:08:19 -0400
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Stephen Bassett <ParadigmRG.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 15:11:27 EDT
>>Subject: UK MOD BS

>>The contrast between the recently disgorged UK MOD UFO report
>>and the 2000 French COMETA report is notable. The COMETA Report
>>raised important points as to the validity of UFO phenomena and
>>challenged the US to act.

>>The US press wanted nothing to do with the COMETA Report, made
>>no effort to translate it, when it was translated and presented,
>>wouldn't cover it. The exception was freelance journalist Leslie
>>Kean - to her everlasting credit.

>>The MOD report is all over the US media.

>>That the American press went from being a formidable force for
>>understanding the world and challenging questionable government
>>policy circa 1970-75 to a pathetic collection of overpaid useful
>>idiots is one of the saddest and most dangerous political
>>realities of the 20th Century.

>Stephen,

>It's probably a mistake to compare the two reports, as COMETA
>was a private effort, while the other was an "official"
>Government study. We also know the background and who authored
>the COMETA report, while the CONDIGN report has less scientific
>provenance with the alleged destruction of the research
>database.

>You also seem to have the American Press all figured out, but I
>have to admit I didn't see a single line on the CONDIGN release
>in the American press, so I'm not sure what you've seen. The
>British press picked it up, as the American press might pick up
>a newly released CIA report on UFOs, but I'm not sure they
>really saw it as a valuable study. Did you see a lot of press
>reports in support of CONDIGN's conclusions?

It was in the New York Times, Steve. The same BS as was reported
by the UK press and the Candian Press and the Oz press. UFOs are
just plasma balls.

>The researchers that I tend to pay attention to have held back
>their criticism

More like fiddling while Rome burns, if you ask me. But whatever
works for you.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Bassett

From: **Stephen Bassett** <SGBList2.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 15:29:19 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 10:58:52 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Bassett

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 11:08:19 -0400
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Stephen Bassett <ParadigmRG.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 15:11:27 EDT
>>Subject: UK MOD BS

>>The contrast between the recently disgorged UK MOD UFO report
>>and the 2000 French COMETA report is notable. The COMETA Report
>>raised important points as to the validity of UFO phenomena and
>>challenged the US to act.

>>The US press wanted nothing to do with the COMETA Report, made
>>no effort to translate it, when it was translated and presented,
>>wouldn't cover it. The exception was freelance journalist Leslie
>>Kean - to her everlasting credit.

>>The MOD report is all over the US media.

>>That the American press went from being a formidable force for
>understanding the world and challenging questionable government
>>policy circa 1970-75 to a pathetic collection of overpaid useful
>>idiots is one of the saddest and most dangerous political
>>realities of the 20th Century.

>Stephen,

>It's probably a mistake to compare the two reports, as COMETA
>was a private effort, while the other was an "official"
>Government study. We also know the background and who authored
>the COMETA report, while the CONDIGN report has less scientific
>provenance with the alleged destruction of the research
>database.

A review of the COMETA committee shows it to be full of former
members of the French military and government agencies. This
groups is as close to being "government" without being "formal"
government as you can get.

>You also seem to have the American Press all figured out, but I
>have to admit I didn't see a single line on the CONDIGN release
>in the American press, so I'm not sure what you've seen. The
>British press picked it up, as the American press might pick up
>a newly released CIA report on UFOs, but I'm not sure they
>really saw it as a valuable study. Did you see a lot of press
>reports in support of CONDIGN's conclusions?

Yes, it has been on Fox News, MSNBC where it was featured by
Keith Olbermann and many newspapers and is still in play. More
importantly, it is being treated as "confirming" the absence of
an ET reality - another "case closed" mentality.

>The researchers that I tend to pay attention to have held back
>their criticism and would like to see what the full report says,
>rather than base their reactions on a perhaps flawed summary.
>The Condon report Summary didn't really tell the story of what

>the full Condon Report contained, and I suspect the same is true
>for the CONDIGN report. But that will be determined over time
>and not in reading a few posts from those who've skimmed it.

I await the details of the report. More importantly I await the dissection of the report by researchers who are learned in the results of the 49 years of research that preceded the UK MOD report.

>I think it's important to keep in mind that neither COMETA nor
>CONDIGN really involved new research, but a re-examination of
>existing cases.

>You are certainly correct in that the press is a different
>animal when compared to the major network news organizations
>prior to 1985. It was around that time that CBS closed their
>remote news bureaus and CNN took over as the pool news agency
>around the world, which limits "live" coverage to a single
>(visual) perspective. I guess the next time you send a press
>release to that "pathetic collection of overpaid useful idiots",
>you'll have to hope they've not seen your critique of their
>abilities..... <g>

I would prefer to appeal to journalist's sense of professional responsibility rather than to whatever degree of internalized shame they have accumulated over the years as their profession has disintegrated around them - but the former option becomes less available with time.

>Just four days until we can actually see what we're discussing
>here, and hopefully there won't be too much blood-letting before
>then.

I have a suspicion the UK MOD report was shelved and not released because when it was finished more than a few government insiders knew it was a piece of crap. But let's wait to see what profound new take they have on our issue.

In particular, I am sure we will be referred to volumes of gun camera footage from UK military chase planes sent up to engage UFOs sighted in UK air space. Since that has been going on for 50 years, there will be ample such footage. It will be wonderful to finally have that kind of powerful evidence finally available to the general public. So, everyone get ready for the UK military chase plane gun camera footage.

You know, government propaganda would be rather entertaining were not for the fact it kills so many women, children and other innocent civilians.

SB

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 15:33:53 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 11:01:18 -0400
Subject: Re: First Clear Film Of Apollo 11 UFO - Balaskas

>From: Robert Morningstar <robert_morningstar.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 18:24:38 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: First Clear Film of Apollo 11 UFO

>First On The Moon, The Untold Story - The Apollo 11 UFO

>Tonight (May 9th, 2006) on The Science Channel at 8 p.m. (NYC),
>NASA and The Science Channel released close-up film taken by
>Apollo 11 astronauts of the UFO that tracked them on Way to
>Moon. The film taken by the astronauts was shown for several
>seconds at a time as Buzz Aldrin told the story of their close
>encounter and NASA's attempt to identify the object with the
>Saturn 5 booster rocket which was actually 6,000 miles away.

<snip>

>For many years, rumors have persisted that the
>Russians attempted to rush a Moon flight and landing in the
>hopes of beating the US to the Moon fearing that America's
>arrival on the Moon first would result in a huge loss of
>prestige and worldwide propaganda advantages for the U.S.

<snip>

>As a result, the Astronauts were sworn to secrecy and agreed
>never to speak of their "UFO Close Encounter" ever again.

<snip>

Hi Everyone!

It is only very recently that Apollo 11 astronaut Buzz Aldrin has finally spoken publicly on the UFO he and his two fellow astronauts saw on their historic flight to the Moon on July 1969.

To the surprise and concern of NASA at the time, an unmanned Soviet lunar lander, Luna 15, was launched on July 13. It was already in orbit around the Moon when Apollo 11 was launched a few days later. The purpose of Luna 15 was to land on the Moon and allow the Soviets to be the first to collect and return lunar soil back to Earth. Apparently Luna 15 crashed on landing and failed to achieve its goal (later Soviet unmanned lunar landers did bring back small amounts of lunar soil).

From the launch dates of Luna 15 and Apollo 11, it is not possible that what the UFO the astronauts saw and mentioned during their debriefing back on Earth was this Soviet secret lunar lander. That said, to my knowledge, it has not been ruled out that the UFO the Apollo 11 astronauts saw in space between the Earth and the Moon was the upper stage of the slower moving Soviet rocket booster for the Luna 15 space mission.

Recall that after shutdown, the SIVB, the upper stage of NASA's Saturn V rocket that boosted all Apollo spacecraft towards the Moon, would continue to coast in space and eventually reach the vicinity of the Moon days later. From the descriptions of the UFO by the Apollo 11 astronauts at their now public debriefings,

they seem to accurately describe what could very well have been the upper stage of the Soviet rocket that propelled the Luna 15 lander to the Moon.

Can anyone verify that what the Apollo 11 astronauts saw was indeed the Soviet upper stage rocket for Luna 15?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 17:14:34 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 11:07:25 -0400
Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma - Ledger

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 22:05:37 +0100
>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 17:18:40 +0100
>>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 10:00:52 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 09:35:33 -0400
>>>>Subject: ET Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>>>Sorry ET, You're Just A Puff Of Plasma

>>>><snip>

>>>>Scientists at the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) describe how
>>>>glowing "plasmas" of gas are created by charges of electricity.
>>>>Air flows then sculpt the plasmas into aerodynamic shapes which
>>>>appear to fly at extraordinary speeds through the sky.

>>>OK, I guess we can all stop worrying, accept this definitive
>>>final solution to the mystery, and find other hobbies.

>>Think we've been privileged to be present at the coining of
>>another "swamp gas explanation" - dignified by a magic-sounding
>>name - plasma.

>>Plasma is in a candle-flame, in your light-bulb or neon tube,
>>and behind a cartridge that's just been hit by a firing-pin.
>>It's not magic, its behavior is ruled by temperature and,
>>depending on the percentage of electron-movement (ionization),
>>by any local electro-magnetic field.

>><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma> (physics)

>>Our Sun is plasma, and more extreme versions emerge from poles
>>of neutron stars and, on even larger scale, from galactic cores
>>when jetting.

>>How's that sort of thing arriving, in a big way, at airfields or
>>missile-bases?

>>Before American ufology has a collective panic attack over the
>>Project Condign report, might I again suggest that people wait
>>until they have had an opportunity to read the full document,
>>rather than misleading media coverage, before rushing to condemn
>>David Clarke, Joe McGonagle, Andy Roberts and Gary Anthony.

I'm not condemning anyone. But They went to press with it 8 days
before it was meant to be released by the MoD. They called the

press conference-not the press. Dave constantly berated me with how rushed he was between getting the reports, Gary getting the website up and how little time they had before the press conference. But he called the press conference. He shared the summary and the rest of it with them, and "them" just happened to release it sooner than he had anticipated. So we learn about it through the press, then from Flying Saucery but without them having had enough time to put a short statement on the site expressing any misgivings he and the others might have had as UFO researchers about some of the theories put forward in the Condign Report.

He obviously could not share this report summary with the UFO field, before hand, because then it likely would have been leaked somehow. No one would expect them to do that. It would have lessened the coup of Gary and Davids finding the report.

>Bear in mind that they did not write this report themselves,
>nor were they responsible for the rather silly headline in the
>Sunday Times.

<snip>

Personally I'd like to see a copy of the press release. I've emailed Gary about this. How that was spun will determine where the media went with it-if I can get a copy.

BTW - John, using "childish" is name calling as well.

>I attended the press conference this morning at which Clarke and McGonagle presented the full report, and I had a chance to look at it in some detail before its Internet release.

>It is a large and very detailed document, and definitely not a
>brush-off. It seems to be a genuine, serious attempt by the
>Defence Intelligence staff to examine the UFO/UAP phenomenon and
>assess their security implications (if any) to UK air defence.

Dave in Nature magazine thought it was just one person and possibly an ex-RAF pilot [retired] and then in another email to another list says that he had a lead that this fellow was retired from the RAF and likely someone who had his own experience.

>It does not say that UFOs are intelligently controlled
>extraterrestrial spacecraft, so of course that immediately
>condemns it in the eyes of many contributors to UpDates, who
>will thus want to hear no more about it.

That's just blather, John. Who's taunting now? And when have you not?

I'm more excited about the number of reports that will come out. We are big boys and girls, John. We can eliminate what we think is nonsense and what not. We don't need the UK clique to shepherd us through it. Sorry.

>For those with a more open mind there is a great deal to learn
>from it. I have to say that I am not totally convinced by the
>'plasma' idea, and like many UFO research documents I think it
>errs in trying to find a single over-all explanation for the
>residue of unexplained cases.

Well, we agree on something.

>However, there is a lot of valuable information in it, it is
>sympathetic to the idea that there may be an as-yet unknown
>phenomenon behind some UFO cases, and it certainly deserves more
>than knee-jerk derision as "a load of malarky" from people who
>have not read it.

What's new about plasma? Its been around for a long time, though it's been tainted by Phil Klass.

Then we have this statement in Nature Magazine during the interview with David and Ian Ridpath et al, including Martin Fullekrug of the University of Bath, UK, who researches these electrical events..

"What about the mind-mangling electric fields?"

At 20 kilometres altitude, Fullekrug thinks it highly doubtful that these transient plasmas could have much effect. On the ground, the similar phenomenon of 'ball lightning' has been described, but is little understood. Whatever these are made of, such earthly plasmas are likely to have such a weak electromagnetic field that they are pretty unlikely to register on scientific equipment, let alone the human brain, says F=Clllekrug."

>In passing, I was amused to note a brief comment mentioning our
>UpDates chum Nick Pope, soi-disant "Head of the British
>Government's UFO Project".

Good lord, you guys and your paranoia about Nick Pope. Andy has about three [so far] nicknames for him.

>In a concluding section looking at the possibility that UAPs
>may have been responsible for some air >near-misses, the writer
>touches on the unwillingness of air crews to report such
>incidents because:

>"...they are concerned about their individual reputations as
>professionals and... the effect any publicity this might have on
>the airline business. The airline crews are concerned when
>airmiss reports remain unsolved. It is further noted that since
>Pope's book has been published airline crews are unlikely to
>wish to take the matter further with SEC(AS2) or with civilian
>UFO organisations."

That's not news John. It's fact. Why would they want to expose themselves to the ridicule that debunkers heap on them without any experience or knowledge of their trade and their work and their skills.

If I get an answer re the press release-maybe you have one all ready, John - I'll seek permission to send it out, though it's a public statement in any event.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 18:50:22 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 11:12:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
>evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and anti-
>government raving. What simplistic nonsense!

It's not nonsense that many people go to government complaining of vicious rumour and harassment campaigns by organized citizen stalkers, coupled with equipment (provable exists and not even classified) which can destroy one's life at home through walls, silently, leaving no trace evidence, one sleep deprivation capable device of which has been around for half a century.

In spite of the U.S. Department of Justice Inspector General acknowledging over 700 such complaints in one 6 month period recently, our benevolent government, all levels, deny "ever having heard of" organized stalking or electronic harassment.

I asked the local Communications Canada area superintendent for assistance with this, and he looked at his feet and shuffled a little bit and in a muffled voice told he he had never heard of electronic harassment. His body language clearly showed otherwise.

Police almost always ask a complainant "Are you taking your medication?" Yet, we have encountered, privately, about half a dozen officers who tell us yes, absolutely organized stalking and electronic harassment is happening but they are under orders to ignore such complaints.

A survey we took in 2002 was visited by 12,000 people, about 120 of whom wrote in saying they had some or all the symptoms. I know, because we are not statisticians we can't say that survey "means anything" but that's one person out of 100. Let's say that survey was 100 times above the real level. That's one person in 10,000. When you divide 300 million North Americans by 10,000, that's still 30,000 North Americans having every facet of their lives ruined by a bunch of self-righteous neighbours believing some of the most vicious lies imaginable. Precisely because government is covering up for the perpetrators. And government has done things very much like this, to wit, MKULTRA and COINTELPRO, so they are not off the hook by any means.

To kick the very people, in their time of need, who are paying your salary, and to whom you have sworn to work to the benefit of, if not "evil", is damn close to it, government!

So to believe government isn't likely to be covering up UFO-related secrets, with an evil agenda, is childishly naive, in my view.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 10:24:46 +0200
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 11:18:10 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Bourdais

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 13:48:31 +0000
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 12:00:23 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 08:01:26 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>I find it hard to imagine that you would argue that position.
>>But once one grants that the USG and other governments have
>>suppressed information, then the question becomes: How routinely
>>and how systematically? Since this would be speculative, on what
>>basis would we quantify one speculation as "wild" and another as
>>"sedate"? In extreme cases this could be done, granted, but
>>there seems to be substantial latitude for speculating on the
>>degree of government suppression among reasonable people.

>>For myself, I see nothing wild or cynical or "anarchistic" about
>>believing that governments lie or indulge in conspiracies; on
>>the contrary, government conspiracies and lies abound
>>historically, so it's only hard-headed realism to appreciate
>>that possibility.

>>Certainly government agencies can tell the truth, but when their
>>statements appear logically inconsistent or obfuscatory, it
>>seems reasonable to suspect that relevant information is being
>>withheld.

>Then we don't need dark, sinister hints about "who's behind it
>all" do we, as if there were some evil cabal responsible? Of
>course governments cover things up, but not necessarily for evil
>reasons. More often it is due to stupidity, fear, doubt,
>uncertainty, CYA, and other very human reasons.

>You would do well to read my book "Uninvited Guests" in this
>regard. It is available cheap in used editions, probably \$5 to
>\$8.

Dick, and List,

A few months ago I was invited to the French national radio
"France Inter". We discussed briefly the question of secrecy, and
I expressed the view that it may be maintained for a very good
reason: the risk of an enormous cultural shock.

In that perspective, the only sensible line of conduct would be
a policy of gradual lifting of secrecy.

It is still my opinion.

But that should not deter we ufologists from searching for the

truth - on the contrary! That's our part of the task, I suppose.

Do you agree with that?

And thank you for your good books, that every serious ufologist should have.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: UK Court Approves McKinnon Extradition - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 01:50:52 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 11:20:07 -0400
Subject: Re: UK Court Approves McKinnon Extradition - Hatch

To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
Date: Wednesday, May 10, 2006 7:22 PM
Subject: UFO UpDate: UK Court Approves McKinnon Extradition

>Source: MacWorld UK
><http://tinyurl.com/z9nrd>
>Wednesday - May 10, 2006

>UFO Hacker Faces Extradition To US
>By Jeremy Kirk

>A UK court has approved a US request to extradite an unemployed
>systems administrator who allegedly caused \$700,000 in damage by
>hacking into US military and government computers.

>The hacker claims he was simply looking for data about UFO
>sitings. (sic)

<snip>

UFO 'sitings'? The journalists can't even spell it properly any
more.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: Clarke & Rutkowski On CBC Radio 1 - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 12:11:52 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 11:23:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Clarke & Rutkowski On CBC Radio 1 - Friedman

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -" <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Sent: Friday, May 12, 2006 11:50 AM
>Subject: Clarke & Rutkowski On CBC Radio 1

>[List Only]

>CBC Radio 1's The Current interviewed both David Clarke and
>Chris Rutkowski on The Condrign Report this morning.

>The .mp3 of that interview is available for List subscribers
>_only_ please... I don't need to bog the server down again.

>The file is 19 minutes long and is a shade over 18 MBs and
>is downloadable here:

<snip>

I heard the program. Dave and Chris were each on separately and the host was reasonably friendly and there were really no contentious issues. It was in the first segment of the program.

It turns out that I was on CBC radio in Fredericton for about 10 minutes with the host of the morning show at 7:40 a.m. I stressed that the plasma explanation is very old hat what with Phil Klass' silly explanations along these lines in his 1968 book "UFOs: Identified".

I had dug out Jim McDonald's outstanding 40 page paper "UFOs: An International Scientific Problem" which had been presented at the Canadian Aeronautics and Space Science Institute Astronautics Symposium in Montreal on March 12, 1968.

Jim, in a quantitative scientific fashion, destroyed Klass' pseudo-scientific explanations. I don't think Klass ever brought them up seriously again, though he did strongly attack Jim.

The paper also deals with some of Menzel's atmospheric UFO explanations which were equally unscientific.

Jim's paper is noted on the web, but I couldn't find a complete copy posted... It is included in a collection of McDonald Papers published by FUFOR several years ago with an intro by Richard Hall...

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Hale

From: Roy Hale <roy.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 04:46:23 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 11:32:39 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Hale

>From: Stephen Bassett <ParadigmRG.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 10 May 2006 15:11:27 EDT
>Subject: UK MOD BS

>The contrast between the recently disgorged UK MOD UFO report
>and the 2000 French COMETA report is notable. The COMETA Report
>raised important points as to the validity of UFO phenomena and
>challenged the US to act.

Hi,

A few questions I have based on the 'Plasma Gas' answer.

Were the filmed UFO Sightings of Anthony Woods all Plasma Gas balls?

I submit two interesting Links below to ponder on.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/southampton/features/ufo/ufo.shtml>

<http://www.rense.com/general45/woodsnew1.htm>

Does this explanation cover the Bentwaters UFO Case?

In future, will all military personnel who have observed a UFO whilst on duty, have no need to report such an incident, as they have already been given an official answer as to what has caused such a sighting?

Wasn't the department of Defence Intelligence, the department that appeared on the UK UFO program Riddle Of The Skies in which they were shown a piece of UFO footage from the UK, and the Plasma answer was not one of their answers to what the object may have been?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 12](#)

Nick Redfern's E-mail?

From: **Bill Chalker** <bill_c.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 13:37:24 +1000
Fwd Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 12:14:51 -0400
Subject: Nick Redfern's E-mail?

Does anyone know Nick Redfern's current e-mail address as his previous sbcglobal address keeps coming back at me as "addressee unknown" error.

Regards,

Bill Chalker
bill_c.nul
<http://theozfiles.blogspot.com>
www.theozfiles.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Skeptics Confounded

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:35:13 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:35:13 -0400
Subject: Skeptics Confounded

Source: Fate Magazine

April 2006 Issue

pages 52 - 56

Smart People See Ghosts

Higher Education Supports Belief In The Paranormal

by Brad Steiger

Believe it or not, Robert Roy Britt writes in the January 20, 2006, issue of LiveScience, "according to a new higher education is linked to a greater tendency to believe in ghosts and other paranormal phenomena."

Though researchers Bryan Farha at Oklahoma City University and Gary Steward of the University of Central Oklahoma expected to find contrary results, their poll of college students revealed that seniors and graduate students were more likely to believe in haunted houses, ghosts, telepathy, spirit channeling, and other paranormal phenomena than were freshmen.

Skeptics Confounded

Although the results of the survey are not surprising to long-time study researchers in the metaphysical and psychic fields, what is startling is the fact that the poll analysis is published in the January-February issue of The Skeptical Inquirer, the journal of true unbelievers. While the poll may have been conducted with expectations of demonstrating that as students became more educated, they dropped questionable beliefs in favor of more skeptical attitudes, The Skeptical Inquirer must be congratulated for publishing results that they really did not wish to find.

Farha's and Steward's survey was based on a nationwide Gallup Poll in 2001 that found younger Americans more likely to believe in the paranormal than older respondents. The results of the Farha/Steward poll discovered that gaining more education was not a guarantee of skepticism or disbelief toward the paranormal.

While only 23 percent of the freshman quizzed professed a belief toward paranormal concepts, the figures rose to 31 percent for college seniors and 34 percent for graduate students. The complete results of the survey may be found in the January-February issue of The Skeptical Inquirer. The percentages are rounded, and I have indicated the Gallup Poll 2001 figures in parentheses:

Belief in psychic/spiritual healing: 56 (54)
Belief in ESP: 28 (50)
Haunted houses: 40 (42)
Demonic possession: 40 (41)

Ghosts/spirits of the dead: 39 (38)
Telepathy: 24 (36)
Extraterrestrials visited Earth in the past: 17 (33)
Clairvoyance and prophecy: 24 (32)
Communication with the dead: 16 (28)
Astrology: 17 (28)
Witches: 26 (26)
Reincarnation: 14 (25)
Channeling: 10 (15)

It is in the "Not Sure" column that the researchers found that the higher the education level achieved, the more likelihood there was of believing in paranormal dimensions and the possibilities of a broader spectrum of reality.

Belief in psychic/spiritual healing: 26 (191)
Belief in ESP: 39 (20)
Haunted houses: 25 (116)
Demonic possession: 28 (16)
Ghosts/spirits of the dead: 27 (17)
Telepathy: 34 (26)
Extraterrestrials visited Earth in the past: 34 (27)
Clairvoyance and prophecy: 33 (23)
Communication with the dead: 29 (26)
Astrology: 26 (18)
Witches: 19 (15)
Reincarnation: 28 (20)
Channeling: 29 (21)

Why Disbelieve?

Why do skeptics find it so difficult to believe that individuals who achieve a higher education may still maintain a belief in the paranormal?

The world of the paranormal is one where effect often precedes cause, where mind often influences matter, where individuals communicate over great distances without physical aids, and where the spiritual essence of those deceased may be seen. Why, especially in an age of new theories embracing quantum physics and other dimensions, should skeptics find it difficult to believe in a world that lies beyond the five senses and the present reach of science?

For those of us who have been researching and writing in the paranormal, UFO, and spiritual fields for many years, the repeated allegation that we and our readers must be undereducated and unaware of the science and technology of our contemporary culture becomes very annoying. As early as 1965, when I was researching LW: Your Sixth Sense =97 which, in addition to becoming a popular book has been used as a college and high school text, complete with workbook and study guide - the pioneering work of Dr. Gardner Murphy, Dr. Montague Ullman, Dr. Stanley Krippner, Dr. Henry Margenau, and many others had already demonstrated that contrary to common assumption, intelligence has little connection to paranormal abilities or beliefs. Neither is it the "odd" or poorly adjusted members of society who most often demonstrate high degrees of psychic ability. Quite the contrary appears to be true. Those individuals who are well-adjusted socially and who are possessed of an extroverted rather than an introverted personality are the ones who score consistently higher in ESP tests.

The January 12, 1994, issue of USA Today carried the results of a survey conducted by Jeffrey S. Levin, associate professor at Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, which stated that more than two-thirds of the U.S. population has had at least one mystical experience. Furthermore, Levin said, although only five percent of the population have such experiences often (that's around 15 million people), such mystical encounters "seem to be getting more common with each successive generation." And very interestingly, Levin added, individuals active in mainstream churches or synagogues report fewer mystical experiences than the general population.

The November 1993 issue of the Journal of Abnormal Psychology announced the findings of psychologists at Carleton University of Ottawa, that people who report seeing a UFO or an alien are not any less intelligent or psychologically healthy than other people. Their findings clearly contradicted the previously held

notions that people who have bizarre experiences, such as missing time and communicating with aliens, have "wild imaginations and are easily swayed into believing the unbelievable?"

Dr. Nicholas P. Spanos, who led the study and administered a battery of psychological tests to a large number of UFO experiencers, said that such individuals were not at all "off the wall?" On the contrary, he stated, "They tend to be white-collar, relatively well-educated representatives of the middle class?"

Becoming More Common Psychiatrists Cohn Ross and Shaun Joshi have affirmed that paranormal experiences have become so common in the general population that "no theory of normal psychology which does not take them into account can be comprehensive?" It may well be that we are turning into a nation of mystics regardless of the frustration of organized science or organized religion. And we might add, a nation of intelligent mystics.

The October 27, 2004, issue of USA Today declared that "a spiritually inclined student is a happier student." According to a national study of students conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California - Los Angeles, being spiritual contributes to one's sense of psychological well-being.

"A high degree of spirituality correlates with high self-esteem and feeling good about the way life is headed," Sarah Hofius wrote of the study that took place at 46 wide ranging universities and colleges, encompassing 3,680 third-year students. "The study defines spirituality as desiring to integrate spirituality into one's life, believing that we are all spiritual beings, believing in the sacredness of life and having spiritual experiences?"

Another survey that should have offered an enormous amount of proof that one can achieve a higher education and still believe in the paranormal was released on December 20, 2004, revealing that 74 percent of medical doctors believe that miracles have occurred in the past and 73 percent believe that miracles can occur today. Sixty-seven percent of the doctors encouraged their patients to pray; 59 percent admitted that they prayed for their patients.

The national survey, conducted by HCD Research and the Louis Finkelstein Institute for Religious and Social Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary, polled 1,100 physicians throughout the United States. According to Dr. Alan Mittleman, Director of the Finkelstein Institute, doctors "although presumably more highly educated than their average patient, are not necessarily more secular or radically different in religious outlook?" Perhaps because of their frequent involvement with matters of life and death, medical doctors do not lose their belief in the miraculous as their level of education increases.

A Believing Skeptic

In 2002, the National Science Foundation found that 60 percent of adults in the United States agreed or strongly agreed that some people possessed psychic powers or extrasensory perception (ESP). In June 2002, the Consumer Analysis Group conducted the most extensive survey ever done in the United Kingdom and revealed that 67 percent of adults believed in psychic powers and that two out of three surveyed believed in an afterlife.

Michael Shermer, the ubiquitous talking head who represents the skeptical view in dozens of television documentaries each year, author of *Why People Believe Weird Things* (2002) and editor of the aforementioned *Skeptical Inquirer*, was among those who deplored the findings that such a high percentage of Americans accepted the reality of ESP. In Shermer's analysis, such statistics posed a serious problem for science educators. Complaining that people too readily accepted the claims of pseudo-science, Shermer concluded his regular column for *Scientific American* (August 12, 2002) by stating that "for those lacking a fundamental comprehension of how science works, the siren song of pseudo-science becomes too alluring to resist, no matter how smart you are?"

Shermer must have been somewhat surprised years earlier when he interviewed Martin Gardner, the prolific science writer, author of the classic Fads and Fallacies in the Name of Science and the founder of the modern skeptical movement, who told him that he believed in God, that he sometimes prayed and worshipped, and that he hoped for life after death. Gardner explained (Skeptic, Vol. 5 No.2, 1997) that he called himself a "philosophical theist, or sometimes a fideist, who believes something on the basis of emotional reasons, rather than intellectual reasons!"=92

Gardner also identified himself as a "mysterian" explaining that "there are certain things I regard as ultimate mysteries. Free will is one of those. Another is time... Time and space are the ultimate mysteries. Free will is bound up in the mysteries of time about which we can never understand, at least at this stage of evolutionary history."

In my opinion, humankind=92s one truly essential factor is its spirituality. The artificial concepts to which we have given the designation of sciences are no truer in the ultimate sense than dreams, visions, and inspirations. The quest for absolute proof or objective truth may always be un-attainable when it seeks to define and limit the soul. And I believe that one can achieve a high level of education while maintaining a firm belief in the unseen world.

Brad Steiger is a professional writer who deals with the strange and unknown. He lives in Forest City, Iowa.

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

40th Anniversary Of eaver County UFO Sighting

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:41:51 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:41:51 -0400
Subject: 40th Anniversary Of eaver County UFO Sighting

Source: The Beaver County Times - Beaver, Pennsylvania

<http://tinyurl.com/zdfgu>

May 12 06

[Audio at site]

40th Anniversary Of eaver County UFO Sighting

Sally Maxson
The Times

As far as the federal government is concerned, the incident is over and done.

"The case was closed and never reopened," said Brian Seese, a paranormal researcher from Hopewell Township, who includes the incident in his new book, "Unexplained Events in Beaver County."

In late 1966, Weitzel, the NICAP investigator assigned to the case, delivered his final report to his Washington, D.C., supervisor, Richard Hall.

"I personally hand-carried a copy of Weitzel's very thick and extremely well-documented report to Dr. Edward Condon," Hall recalled last month.

Condon, a scientist, was in charge of a UFO study conducted by the University of Colorado under the sponsorship of the Air Force.

"Years later, I learned to my astonishment that he never turned over the case to his staff, and it gathered dust in his personal files," Hall said.

And so when the Air Force turned the Colorado report over to Congress, the Ohio-to-Conway incident wasn't mentioned.

"Maj. Hector Quintanilla tried to pass it off as a sighting of the planet Venus and an earth satellite, which was quite preposterous," said Hall, who wrote "The UFO Evidence, Vol. II; A Thirty-Year Report," published in 2001. "I think he may have changed it to an unexplained case later on."

According to the files of a leading UFO researcher, Brad Sparks, the Air Force ultimately did categorize the case as "unexplained" and probably left it at that, Hall said.

Project Blue Book files would show the final status of the incident, Hall said.

But trying to get someone to share Project Blue Book details isn't easy.

The feds closed Project Blue Book in 1972, ending at least

publicly the Air Force's role as a UFO investigation agency.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Filmmaker Kimball Invited To UFO Conference

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:46:07 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:46:07 -0400
Subject: Filmmaker Kimball Invited To UFO Conference

Source: The Chronicle-Herald - Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

<http://thechronicleherald.ca/Entertainment/502807.html>

May 12 2006

Filmmaker Kimball Invited To UFO Conference

Halifax filmmaker Paul Kimball will be a guest speaker at UFO Review Magazine's conference on Ufology and the Paranormal in June in Cheshire, England.

Kimball has made a number of documentaries on UFOs and as a fellow Canadian has taken a special interest in Wilbert Smith's career. Smith became interested in the UFO phenomenon while in his influential position within the Canadian government. It led him to make a proposal to the department of transportation to establish Project Magnet to officially investigate UFOs.

Kimball will be looking over Smith's career in some detail in a talk called The Wilbert Smith Story: Separating Fact From Fiction Of A Ufological Icon.

In an e-mail Kimball tells the Tattler: "I'll also be over there picking up some footage and interviews for Best Evidence: Top 10 UFO Cases, a documentary I'm working on at the moment for Space - we leave for the US for a 11 day shoot on May 16."

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Movies Serve As Previews For Area's Own UFO

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:48:59 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:48:59 -0400
Subject: Movies Serve As Previews For Area's Own UFO

Source: The Columbian - Clark County, Washington, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/h5m3b>

Thursday, May 11, 2006

Movies Serve As Previews For Area's Own UFO Festival
Columbian staff writer

California may have a reputation for celebrating the offbeat, but it doesn't have a monopoly on showcasing the otherworldly.

Clark County and Portland-area residents can investigate the paranormal in their home orbit, in two Portland preview events for the 7th Annual UFO Festival in McMinnville, Ore.

At 7 p.m. Wednesday, the Bagdad Theater will host a screening of Paul Davids' "The Sci-Fi Boys," which premiered in April at New York's Tribeca Film Festival. Tickets are \$5; audience members must be at least 21. A question-and-answer session with writer-director-producer Davids will follow the film. The theater is at 3702 S.E. Hawthorne Blvd.

On May 18, the McMenamins Kennedy School will screen Showtime's 1994 television movie "Roswell." The show begins at 7:30 p.m. at 5736 N.E. 33rd Ave. Again, the film is open only to ages 21 and older. Cost is \$5. Afterwards, Jesse Marcel Jr. author of "Roswell: It Really Happened" will appear in a question-and-answer session.

Marcel also will be the May 19 speaker at the UFO Festival taking place 7 to 10 p.m. May 19 and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. May 20 at McMenamins Hotel Oregon, 310 N.E. Evans St., McMinnville. Other festival activities include live music, shopping in an outdoor tent, an alien costume parade and Alien Costume Ball. Some events have admission prices, while others are free. For more information, call 888-472-8427 or visit www.ufofest.com.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

UFO Cannot Believe It!

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:53:04 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:53:04 -0400
Subject: UFO Cannot Believe It!

Source: The Reading Evening Post - Berkshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/znezh>

12/5/2006

UFO Cannot Believe It!

A space odyssey of UFO sightings has been zooming across our radar courtesy of eagle-eyed readers.

Your calls flooded in after Pip Neal spotted a mysterious green ball in the sky over Southcote on Friday, April 7, and Vicky Chapman saw a glowing red orb over Basingstoke Road on Good Friday (Post, Wednesdays, April 19 and 26, respectively).

It's not the first time Mr Neal has seen unexplained things in the sky. He also told us that he saw a triangle of light in the skies over Lincoln two decades ago.

Gloria Fisher, a carer from Meadow Road, Earley, called to say she and husband, Roy, a window-maker, spotted the same phenomenon, also 20 years ago, while camping in Wittering, Sussex.

She said: "We looked up in the sky and saw a triangle of white light as though joined but you could see through the middle. It was in complete formation but whether it was a Government experiment, you just don't know.

"We haven't really mentioned it too much to people.

"My husband, if you do see things, says it's probably clouds or aeroplanes and the last thing you think about is UFOs but you do think: 'Ooh, I wonder'."

Peter Brake, 77, revealed his experiences after reading about the Good Friday sighting in the Post.

"The first one was mind-boggling, like a world just going along," he said of his sighting of a multicoloured globe while in his Whitley Wood garden some years ago. "It wasn't smooth, it was like in a square pattern and lit up. I didn't know quite what to make of it.

"When it got level with me it was there one second and suddenly went away from me within two seconds."

Then last September the retired forestry worker spied a deep red star-like object moving slowly over his Falmouth Road garden.

But perhaps the most exciting phenomenon has been by former coffee shop worker Janet Cryer, from Woodley who witnessed a bright, whooshing light roaring past her first-floor window.

She couldn't sleep at around lam on Tuesday, April 18, when

suddenly she heard a noise "like an underground train, a roar and a whoosh at the same time" before a greeny-coloured light flew past her open-curtained window.

"Immediately I thought it was a meteorite and I was waiting for a bang," said the 58-year-old.

"It was faster than a helicopter and nothing like an aircraft. The day after that I saw all those stories in the paper."

Mrs Cryer, of Hanwood Close, added: "My late husband used to long to see a UFO, he used to keep all the clippings."

Have you seen any strange aerial objects or inexplicable sights worthy of the X Files? Call the Evening Post's extra terrestrial reporter on (0118) 918 3009.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 12:28:46 -0300
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:55:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Friedman

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 18:50:22 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 22:13:21 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

><snip>

>>And furthermore, I don't believe that government is inherently
>>evil. Some of you apparently prefer total chaos and anti-
>>government raving. What simplistic nonsense!

>It's not nonsense that many people go to government complaining
>of vicious rumour and harassment campaigns by organized citizen
>stalkers, coupled with equipment (provable exists and not even
>classified) which can destroy one's life at home through walls,
>silently, leaving no trace evidence, one sleep deprivation
>capable device of which has been around for half a century.

>In spite of the U.S. Department of Justice Inspector General
>acknowledging over 700 such complaints in one 6 month period
>recently, our benevolent government, all levels, deny "ever
>having heard of" organized stalking or electronic harassment.

>I asked the local Communications Canada area superintendent for
>assistance with this, and he looked at his feet and shuffled a
>little bit and in a muffled voice told he he had never heard of
>electronic harassment. His body language clearly showed
>otherwise.

>Police almost always ask a complainant "Are you taking your
>medication?" Yet, we have encountered, privately, about half a
>dozen officers who tell us yes, absolutely organized stalking
>and electronic harassment is happening but they are under orders
>to ignore such complaints.

>A survey we took in 2002 was visited by 12,000 people, about 120
>of whom wrote in saying they had some or all the symptoms. I
>know, because we are not statisticians we can't say that survey
>"means anything" but that's one person out of 100. Let's say
>that survey was 100 times above the real level. That's one
>person in 10,000. When you divide 300 million North Americans by
>10,000, that's still 30,000 North Americans having every facet
>of their lives ruined by a bunch of self-righteous neighbours
>believing some of the most vicious lies imaginable. Precisely
>because government is covering up for the perpetrators. And
>government has done things very much like this, to wit,
>MKULTRA and COINTELPRO, so they are not off the hook by any
>means.

>To kick the very people, in their time of need, who are paying
>your salary, and to whom you have sworn to work to the benefit
>of, if not "evil", is damn close to it, government!

>So to believe government isn't likely to be covering up

>UFO-related secrets, with an evil agenda, is childishly naive,
>in my view.

Just for the record the population of Mexico is about 107
Million; of Canada is about 33 Million, and of the US is about
297 million. So the total for North America is about 437 Million
not 300 million.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 12:04:48 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 10:59:49 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 14:02:10 -0400
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

>>You also seem to have the American Press all figured out, but
>>I have to admit I didn't see a single line on the CONDIGN
>>release in the American press, so I'm not sure what you've seen.
>>The British press picked it up, as the American press might pick
>>up a newly released CIA report on UFOs, but I'm not sure they
>>really saw it as a valuable study. Did you see a lot of press
>>reports in support of CONDIGN's conclusions?

>It was in the New York Times, Steve. The same BS as was
>reported by the UK press and the Candian Press and the Oz press.
>UFOs are just plasma balls.

>>The researchers that I tend to pay attention to have held back
their criticism

>More like fiddling while Rome burns, if you ask me. But
>whatever works for you.

Hi Don,

I haven't been critical on the List, but I believe that everyone jumped on this the way they jumped on the AA 'film' in 1995 and have helped to create the myth that they purport to want to clear up.

The story did not appear in the Washington Post and I'm not convinced that it got a lot of play in the US. This has been an Internet story for the most part (IMO), with the exception of coverage in Great Britian where it's National news. Of course, we'll see several documentaries on this in the next year or so on various cable channels.

But does this really deserve a direct assault to prevent it from tainting the public's perception of UFOs? The "plasma" explanation is a flawed one and it would interesting perhaps to see what logic they use to support it. But unless they can, the report does (allegedly) indicate that "unknowns" are real and have caused damage and injury. So in some sense it may lend official support to further investigation of "unknowns".

The problem is that the only information we have to work with (so far) is the Summary and the statements of four researchers who've skimmed the full report. Couple that with the media demand to be first with the story, and you have a number of people playing a game of trying to better one another. And in this case, I believe the most sensational story wins. Wire services, meanwhile, pick up the story and it gets spread around the world using their perspective. I suspect the NY Times story is a wire story and not a feature story.

Leadership from MUFON, CUFOS and the Fund are all aware of this

report and I've forwarded some List-posts to them when I know they probably hadn't seen them. I believe they would rather read the report and then comment, rather than get into an ongoing debate over beliefs and suspicions. Some may disagree, but it seems to muddy the waters quite a bit.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 18:12:42 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 11:01:26 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Hall

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 10:24:46 +0200
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 13:48:31 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 12:00:23 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>>I find it hard to imagine that you would argue that position.
>>>But once one grants that the USG and other governments have
>>>suppressed information, then the question becomes: How routinely
>>>and how systematically? Since this would be speculative, on what
>>>basis would we quantify one speculation as "wild" and another as
>>>"sedate"? In extreme cases this could be done, granted, but
>>>there seems to be substantial latitude for speculating on the
>>>degree of government suppression among reasonable people.

<snip>

>>>Certainly government agencies can tell the truth, but when their
>>>statements appear logically inconsistent or obfuscatory, it
>>>seems reasonable to suspect that relevant information is being
>>>withheld.

Hall said:

>>Then we don't need dark, sinister hints about "who's behind it
>>all" do we, as if there were some evil cabal responsible? Of
>>course governments cover things up, but not necessarily for evil
>>reasons. More often it is due to stupidity, fear, doubt,
>>uncertainty, CYA, and other very human reasons.

>>You would do well to read my book "Uninvited Guests" in this
>>regard. It is available cheap in used editions, probably \$5 to
>>\$8.

>Dick, and List,

>A few months ago I was invited to the French national radio
>"France Inter". We discussed briefly the question of secrecy, and
>I expressed the view that it may be maintained for a very good
>reason: the risk of an enormous cultural shock.

>In that perspective, the only sensible line of conduct would be
>a policy of gradual lifting of secrecy.

>It is still my opinion.

>But that should not deter we ufologists from searching for the
>truth - on the contrary! That's our part of the task, I suppose.

>Do you agree with that?

I do agree that cultural shock fears is a definite possibility (among others) and that we should continue to fight for the truth.

>And thank you for your good books, that every serious ufologist
>should have.

In Uninvited Guests I lay out several different possible scenarios as to the reasons for secrecy, from having absolute proof and not knowing how to deal with it to self-cover-up through inability to digest what is going on and therefore going into denial.

All too often we give governments too much credit for being all-knowing and clever, and in the case of UFOs there is a lot of evidence of the U.S. government being blind and stupid and unable to cope with the reports. No doubt there also are many excellent reports that have been kept secret. Very possibly the truth is a mixture of cover-up and foul-up.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Re: Project Condign - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 19:56:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 11:07:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Project Condign - McGonagle

Hello Nick, List,

I am working through a 5-day backlog of emails, and will eventually respond where appropriate, but I felt I ought to address Nick's post first.....

>From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 May 2006 20:37:32 +0100
>Subject: Project Condign

>Further to recent media reports about the MOD's formerly-classified UFO study, 'Project Condign', I should clarify:

>Although I was involved in the 1993/1994 discussions that led to the commissioning of the study, I had left the MOD's UFO Project by the time it began.

Indeed 1993 there was some discussion between DI55 and Sec(AS)2a. DI55 wrote on June 1st:

"You may be interested to hear that at long last I have had some funds allocated for serious UFO research. The study will include a review of our data, the construction of a data base, a detailed review of specified incidents and recommendations for the future. Needless to say we do not want this broadcast and it is for your information only".

It appears however, that by October 1993, no progress had been made. In a minute dated 18th October 1993, DI55 wrote again to Sec(AS)2, saying that they couldn't spare any desk officers for the task, but that they would seek to employ a contractor on the strength of an existing contract. The minute concluded with:

"Although this study will be undertaken by the DIS, with due account of the sensitivities, I believe that I should seek your support for this limited study".

Nick forwarded the minute to his superior, with the following comments:

"The attached note from DI55c seems fine. AD DI55c came over to discuss this some time ago, and I advised him that I saw no difficulties, although I asked him to write to us setting out their proposals, their money, their business.

As our policy already commits us to looking at all reports to ensure there is no threat to the defence of the UK, we are not in any way going outside our remit, as this study is no more than a review of data.

As you can see, the term 'UFO' is being dropped, as it is rather a loaded term.

Coincidentally, this week we have received a new report of a huge triangular object flying over the UK mainland.

I have attached a short draft reply to DI55."

The reply basically says that there are no objections from Sec(AS)2, and requests that they be kept informed of progress. It also contained the following passage:

"It has become clear that not all those organisations charged with submitting UFO reports when contacted by the public are actually doing so, and we may need to tighten up the existing system. Whether we do this immediately, so as to gather more data for the study, or whether we wait to see what recommendations arise from the study, is a point for consideration."

In another document written by Sec(AS)2 in August 1995, were the following relevant paragraphs:

"...for some years DI55 have been under general remit to advise on "UAPs" but due to lack of resources they have not been able to study the reports we send over to them, and the reports were merely glanced at and placed on file."

"...we have heard nothing more about this proposed review of data [since October 1994 - Joe] and as far as I am aware nothing further has been done about it".

"...we don't do research into the phenomena; we haven't done any; we only would if there were some good reason for doing do - ie evidence of a threat. It remains that case that no threat has been discerned which has been attributed to an unidentified flying object".

The last paragraph above doesn't sit well with the comments at your site:

www.nickpope.net

where you state:

"Welcome to the official website for Nick Pope, the Ministry of Defence official who was responsible for researching and investigating UFOs, alien abductions, crop circles, cattle mutilations and other strange phenomena.."

So, was the author that wrote "we don't do research into the phenomena" lying to his colleagues?

The next document was written in January 1997 by DI55 in reponse to an enquiry from Sec(AS)2 and contained the following paragraph:

"...Historically, it is perhaps useful for you to know that, during 1995, subsequent to the unsuccessful 1993 initiative, the Department again attempted both in June and October to get approval for funding. The timing eventually clashed with the onset of Defence Study 18 and the requests were shelved."

I have had to be selective with the quotes as some of the documents were too long to transcribe in the short time I have, and they form part of a number of documents which will be used in a forthcoming article. No doubt, someone will try to run a "spoiler" on the article based on the short extracts that I have provided, but this will not ultimately devalue the article that I have in mind.

>I am not the author of the report.

It was perfectly clear that it was written by DI55, Sec(AS) and their later equivalents were not even aware that the study had

been carried out until the request by Dave Clarke revealed it - they had no "need to know", it would seem. The press may not know the difference between Sec(AS) and DI55, but I am sure that the majority of people on this List will have realised that you couldn't possibly have been the author.

>It would be inappropriate for me to criticise the report, but I
>do not agree with some of its conclusions, particularly where
>they relate to subjects such as electrically-charged atmospheric
>plasmas, or temporal lobe disorders, where there is no
>scientific consensus.

When the main body of the report is published I am sure that the contents will be ably picked apart by those of us able to recognise it's weaknesses, but I also hope that some will recognise the significance of the report on several levels:

1. Sec(AS) and it's descendant DAS were not told about it - they had no "need to know".

2. Regardless of whether or not anyone agrees with it's content or conclusions, it was a serious attempt by DI55 to carry out an appraisal of the phenomena.

3. It was never intended to reach the public (at least in advance of the statutory conditions set out in the Public Records Act). This is significant, because there are comments within the report which show that there has been no "Global cover-up", that the British are unaware of any US efforts, and the US were unaware of DI55's activity in respect of Project Condign. (Incidentally Nick, what was the name of the "UFO Project" that you were "in charge of"?). There are other revelatory comments included in the Condign documents which will make good grist for the ufological mill.

4. In spite of the document's multiple failings there is information in it of a useful nature to ufology.

5. Precisely because of the weakness of the document, we in the UK now have more ammunition to argue for a better evaluation by the MoD. I like to compare the intelligence value of this document with the intelligence used to show that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction - both examples were intrinsically flawed.

>The release of this report is part of an ongoing series of
>releases under the Freedom of Information Act. The MOD is
>committed to releasing as much UFO material as possible,
>proactively, under the FOIA 'Publication Scheme'.

Nick, your "clarification" neglects to mention that if Dave Clarke or Gary Anthony (or someone else) hadn't have made requests leading to the release of the documents, DAS would still be blissfully unaware of the existence of Condign and therefore unable to make any such "routine" release. Please give credit where it is due.

>The full report will be posted on the MOD's website on 15 May.

Yes, this was a generous act by the MoD. Initially, they intended to release it simultaneously with the despatch of the documents to Clarke and Anthony, but agreed to delay the release to allow us to digest the contents in advance, particularly since we had been given several missed deadlines for the release through no fault of our own.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 16:54:13 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 11:10:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 10:24:46 +0200
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>... the only sensible line of conduct would be a policy of
>gradual lifting of secrecy.

>It is still my opinion.

Well, it's been 59 years since the "modern" UFO age began,
right?

In that 59 years, we have had zero lifting of secrecy.

So bring on the "gradual lifting." Haven't seen even that, yet.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 13](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: **Matthew James Didier** <matthew.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 19:06:43 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 13:45:28 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 13:09:41 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>Actually, about the license... which needless to say does not
>>exist... this is the complaint... any twit who's read a book or
>>less... more of them have simply seen a TV show... can call
>>themselves a "ghost expert" and usually do.

>>They see it as a "quick way to gain fame and fortune"... oh, to
>>be on Oprah!

>Really? I missed this motivation. Surely average folk cannot be
>so dumb to believe this!

Sadly, yes... many love the limelight... If you surf about to
many 'ghost websites' and those of groups reportedly looking
into ghosts and hauntings, you'll usually find a "media" link
ahead of any actual work... or, at least, prominently figuring
into the website and/or documents released by said group.

>Since you work more in that field, I guess you should know, but
>it seems hard to believe that there is such a lack of sincerity,
>conscience and soul in these average folk. Sure, I don't expect
>them to be science minded and thus are highly unlikely to ever
>generate any scientifically acceptable proof, but I did expect
>them to be less avaricious and driven by cupidity/fame.

The intrinsic problem is that most people already "know" what a
ghost is... which is interesting as there's been no hard,
empirical evidence to even say that ghosts exist.

Are ghosts the 'spirits of the dead'? It's not a given... yet
most people assume it is 'absolute'. Many assume it isn't.

Where do the beliefs in 'Angels and Demons' end and "Ghosts"
begin? Who can show the evidence for either... or evidence that
they are not one and the same? Why are certain areas more likely
to have almost elemental "ghosts" as opposed to others that have
the standard "lost soul" ghost vs. the areas that have headless
or worse ghosts?

Most 'groups' and whatnot have already decided.

As for the fame, count the number of groups willing to work
together or even establish some sort of guidelines to follow...
yet how many bicker about being 'The Most Popular' or 'The Most
Visited' ghost group online...

Then there's some groups and whatnot that rest entirely on their
TV shows or newspaper articles.

And again, how many of these groups question what they find
out? How many deviate from a single hypothesis? How many won't
even entertain another hypothesis about the phenomena they look
into?

>>Trust me, if 'we' thought the government was doing any serious

>>work on ghosts, we'd want to know.

>But what about the governmental (well, local) requirements for
>"disclosure" of a "haunted" house prior to selling such
>property?

It's not a governmental 'thing'. Basically, it's a real-estate law in most areas. If a house is sold because of a "negative" (like a nasty murder in it or, yes, the belief it's haunted,) it's considered "stigmatized" and it behooves the agent to disclose the stigmatization to a new buyer... not the government, but the new buyer.

>What happened to people's basic desire to know whether there is
>an afterlife? What kind of animals have we (our society) turned
>into?

I agree... How about the simple need to understand what's happening around them?

Most people - sheeple - are quite content to rest on their absolute knowledge on what's happening around them to the point of using the "supernatural" to write-off occurrences without much exploration into the causation of that event(s).

90% (if not more) ghost investigators/researchers feel they already have the answers... so why bother? They simply show what THEY have found.

I would liken what most of the "ghost groups" out there do to a Ufologist who simple jammed up a website with "weird pictures from the sky" proclaiming them all to be jenn-you-whine spaceships from other planets... and not listening to the inconvenient facts that may prove this not to be the case... or even listening to secondary hypothesis as to what they've photographed. They know what it is, and how dare us question it... even if our thoughts are not to debunk them.

>>Now, here's the better question... How many of these "ghost
>>people" know how to use the equipment, bother to take "mean" or
>>controlled readings first, and even understand why they're using
>>them?

>>The answer is probably less than 5% of what you find do/know the
>>above.

>I can see this being so. But I'd rather think most folk have
>better motivations and lack education/scientific guidance/
>intelligence to do serious research. But at least the well
>motivated ones (seeking truth, not fame/money) are trying
>(albeit in clumsy ways).

I'll say this... 'we' know of maybe four groups of 'ghost investigators/researchers' that seem to be willing to find the truth as opposed to simply present what they know and 'proclaim' what they find... that's four in thousands.

Then there's the Society for Psychical Research, The American Society for Psychical Research, The Scottish Society for Psychical Research, Britain's Ghost Club, what's left functioning at the Rhine Institute, and perhaps a small handful of university and college groups... after that, you get the thrill seekers, the fame seekers, the preachers of a particular faith, and of course, the preachers of non-faith known as CSICOP/CFI... which, with the latter, considering they have a very overt secular humanist agenda and certain members have been known to "fudge numbers", I wouldn't accept data as "gospel" from them.

Other than that, as you stated, there are thousands and thousands of "little" ghost groups all labouring for not-so-much answers, but to prove their own worth and to bolster their own hypothesis as fact.

>>Why do "ghost people" love there EMF detectors?

>>Because they're cheap, and many years ago, a movie called The
>>Legend of Hell House with Roddy McDowell showed a
>>"parapsychologist" using an enormous machine to "blast" the
>>house with EMF thereby clearing the home of ghosts.

>>Before this movie, you are extremely hard pressed to find any of
>>the "old tyme" ghost hunters (like Harry Price) even thinking
>>about them.

>EMF detectors make sense from the standpoint that someone has
>developed a theory that ghosts either are EMF phenomena or
>interact with this world using EMF. I have not seen adequate
>data either showing an EMF correlation.

Can someone show me this original theory? Aside from the
movie, I've not seen the original paper.

Worse yet, after watching for twenty-plus years of people waving
EMF meters like they're ghost detectors, I've not seen any solid
data... In fact, thousands of would-be ghost investigators seem
to prove that, indeed, ghosts do not leave a trail of slug-like
EM fields... nor do they cause any notable changes therein where
they are located. EMF and ghosts do not seem to correlate at
all.

Unless you count Michael Persinger's work combined with Dick
Wiseman's efforts on temporal lobe hallucinations when humans
are exposed to high EM fields for prolonged times.

Now, considering Wiseman's 'fudging numbers' past and the fact
that Uppsala and Lund universities in Sweden have called
Persinger's efforts into question, I wouldn't take them as
perfect.

>>>Yes, I agree that they are somewhat unscientific and hamhanded
>>>and inelegant, but they are learning because they are trying.

>>No they're not! Most of them have made their minds up... they're
>>just trying to show off their spectacular abilities.

>This I think is unfair. Yes, they may have their minds made up
>and are seeking proof for themselves but I seriously doubt that
>most are in the ghost "research" field to show off their
>"abilities".

I didn't say all... just most of 'em. As I stated in my original
missive.....

>>Trust me on these points... hold your nose, take a couple of
>>Gravols and read through the slop on the internet from those
>>extreme bastions of knowledge and study known as the "ghost
>>investigators/researchers/hunters".

To which, you've responded:

>Yes, the Internet often shows the worst in humanity and most
>with web pages are mainly interested in self aggrandizement. But
>I would not use that to paint all people in the ghost "research"
>field.

>Again you are painting the entire collective group of ghost
>researchers rather poorly. Sure, some are wack jobs and weirdos,
>but there is a percentage of sincere folk out there. Those with
>bad reps will get weeded out by word of mouth and not get new
>cases to research.

Herein lies the problem... the worst do not get weeded out...
there is no peer review. The worst simply continue to recruit
believers in their faith and bolster their lines of defence
against those of us evil "questioners".

The worst of the worst are also fueled by the media love
affair with them... the media loves the 'spooky-boo' aspect
and group like the SPRs and ourselves won't play those cards...
Ergo: The worst hams continue to get media attention and
therefore more followers.

I entreat you to study this... and show me how 'wrong' I am...

I've been doing this, online, for almost a decade and I have yet
to see anything else... with extremely rare exceptions.

>Also, most folk don't know how to do quality field research so
>you can't expect alot of good data out there.

If someone is going to invest hundreds or even thousands of

dollars into equipment, fly up online to build a website, proclaim themselves to be "experts" or even "knowledgeable", then I reserve the right to expect more and to question their findings.

Also, like Ufology, one bad apple can spoil it for all...

In certain cases, haphazard 'techniques' and whatnot taint certain sites for those of us who are more "professional" (as in acting/behaving professionally, not earning a living,) by being silly... running around and generally playing up the spooky stuff which irritates the site owners/managers who then paint everyone in the study with a much harsher/broader paintbrush... and for what?

>Another thing you need to know is why should anyone want their
>property investigated at all? If they are having fears/problems
>due to the phenomenon, then that is a good class to research.
>Others who want a value-added ghost to their property are a less
>good class.

That's one thing. Some people want explanations, other's want validation, other's (yes,) are hoping to capitalize on their ghost.

>>That, and just like Ufology, you find a group/organisation who
>>shows interest, and eventually someone on a "board" will kill
>>the study... it's not because it's invalid or pointless, it's
>>because "faith and belief" or the CSICOPian mentality (either-
>>or) come into play.

>I do not follow what you mean here.

>Which kind of group/organization? You mean a prosaic
>group or the ghost related one?

Any.

Basically, it only take one person on a board to say, "Isn't that the study of weird/goofy stuff?" and unless you've brought a whackload of cash to the table, you're quickly on the outside looking in.

What I mean is, one member of the historical board... one member of the University board... one member of the College's board... you get the idea.

I could also mention that certain religious groups, such as the Seventh Day Adventists, view all forms of paranormal activity and the study of that as "Satanic".....

>>>My guess is that the average person doesn't waste time
>>>determining the truth about UFOs because they think its not that
>>>important a question. Its nothing you can really use in your
>>>life to try to make it better. I think the reality of ghosts may
>>>offer many average people a great deal of hope or solace. UFO
>>>research, on the other hand, is left to a relatively small
>>>clique of folk, frustrated at the lack of progress.

I'd say that's true in some case... and there are people who look into survival of bodily death for that reason, but once you go from "survival of bodily death studies" - (which include ghosts, spirits, death bed visions, NDEs, and the like - into strictly 'ghosts and hauntings', you've crossed an important line... and with the latter, you get a lot of cretins.

>>Perhaps... but if you could promise the thrill seekers that they
>>would definitely have a sighting at "X" place at "X" time, you'd
>>see more of 'em out there... and they'd hurt you as much as they
>>have hurt us.

>I can see how its a nuisance having what amounts to bystanders
>or rubber neckers show up. But also I can see how people want to
>see these things. I can see how its a thrill... but not for the
>thrill's sake only. Its what it means to have a thrill, namely
>something we have not experienced before and affects our
>perceptions and thoughts.

I would honestly estimate, based on my experience on ghost tours and visiting haunted locations for investigations, that perhaps 10% of the people that show up are more interested in

the experience/knowledge... and 90% go to these things to get the [blank] scared out of 'em, or to "get a picture of a recording of a ghost"... The latter is usually not to expand the understanding of the scientific community or even society in general, like many UFO hoaxers, it's to profit from selling it or to "impress" their friends.

>>Would my "captured ghost" answer most of people's questions?
>>Probably not.

>Its likely in the nature of the proof. For one thing, just as >with UFOs, you have to ask what are you trying to prove.

>Most will agree that there is enough proof to say that UFOs >exist since all you are saying is that a large amount of data >exists that people have seen a UFO. No judgement is made on what >the UFO is and it could as easily be prosaic as it could be >alien.

I don't know a single person who would deny that UFOs exist... and I pal about with the local sceptics organisations!

The issue is, what is the origin of most UFOs? That's the argument(s)!

If a 'standard-saucer' - forgive the generalization, but it's necessary in this context - crashed or landed within eye sight of the masses and was too big/whatever to be "covered up" and it's occupants, or lack thereof, came forward, voila!

I'm not going to be able to bring about this, but this would answer the burning questions if possible.

But, what about my concept of "capturing a ghost", which would be the only absolute proof/evidence that would be, supposedly, accepted by the hard-core non-believers? As I stated, if I did 'capture' one, would it fly with them? Probably not.

>I suspect that for UPP, one needs to gather stereo visible >light/infrared/ EMF images of the phenomena and/or perhaps >establish recordable documentable stereo audio(or whatever >wavelengths seem best) interactions with the UPP to determine >its source.

And would that be enough?

The best you could do with that is be able to say, "I took a picture of something that was undeniably there."

But, to get back to where we were, the real thing is that very few ghost-groups even bother to take multiple "normal" photos of anything - for controls - and any mean readings of any sort to detect any legitimate variance.

In other words, their efforts, scientifically, are for not.

They only seem to be interested in making themselves feel "good" about what they are doing... which, in some cases, is fine... but it doesn't advance the study an iota.

Matthew

- The Great Unwashed

Matthew James Didier - Founder and Director
The Toronto Ghosts and Hauntings Research Society

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Unusual Encounters

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:38:04 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:38:04 -0400
Subject: Unusual Encounters

Source: The Daily Mining Gazette - Marquette, Michigan, USA

<http://www.mininggazette.com/stories/articles.asp?articleID=3D1940>

Saturday, May 13, 2006

Unusual Encounters

By Kelly Fosness, Gazette Writer

JACOBSVILLE =97 Just before Lisa Shiel left her Jacobsville home for a morning walk last Friday, she gathered a small, handful of twigs and placed them in a pile beside her driveway gate. When she returned 15 minutes later, they had been moved. For Lisa, it was no surprise.

"They were in a 'T' formation," she explained, citing this has happened on more than one occasion, most commonly at night. "First I thought they were marking trails, but now I think it's part of some kind of communication."

For the past five years, Shiel has been intensively studying two profound phenomena, Bigfoot and UFOs. Scouring libraries, sifting through old publications and prodding researchers, Shiel obtained as much knowledge as she could. Based on her research, evidence and several personal encounters, Shiel wrote two non-fiction novels, and her latest, Backyard Bigfoot: The True Story Of Stick Signs, UFOs, And The Sasquatch, published by Slipdown Mountain Publications LLC, reveals her findings.

"I just outline all of the evidence that I have discovered and share my personal experiences with my own UFO sightings and strange calls that I've heard in the night and all the photos I have of bizarre things," she said. "So the main part of it is my own personal experiences that I'm sharing and offering up the evidence for people to make up their own minds."

Although Shiel hasn't encountered Bigfoot herself, she has had several personal encounters near her home.

"I usually hear sounds when I'm laying in bed at night," she said, recalling an incident one miserably hot evening. "I heard a very low yoop sound echoing off the trees. It was very bizarre and very deep. Something only someone with a very large chest could make."

Discussing several findings in her novel, Shiel said one of the main bits of advice she highlights is to pay close attention to the environment.

"I think a lot of people don't look around at the ground when they're walking around," she explained, "and you have to walk the same area every day to know what belongs there and what doesn't. That's the only way you'll know when something's different."

Known as Michigan's Bigfoot expert and certified Mutual UFO Network field investigator, Shiel said she's currently focusing her research on further evidence possibly linked to Bigfoot.

"When I was living in Texas, I noticed one morning that my horses had braids in their hair," she explained. "But they weren't traditional braids. They were very intricate, very complex, almost impossible for a human to do."

Initially, Shiel brushed off the unusual mane braiding, which mysteriously occurred overnight. But when the incidents continued on occasion, Shiel thought it could have possibly been traced to Bigfoot.

And in the past year, she said, it's happened more than 30 times.

"It didn't happen right away when I moved up here a year and a half ago," she said of the mane braiding incidents. "It took a little while."

"People tell me all the time that they followed me here," she added. "But it could be that I'm just paying attention, just because I saw this in Texas. I'm kind of in tune with it. I'm looking for it. Who knows, sometimes it seems like certain things in your life happen because they're supposed to."

Shiel said people ask her all the time, "Do you think that you were directed to move here?"

"I did see five rainbows when I was driving up here to look at the house that I now live in," she said of a drive from her aunt's house in Boyne City, Mich. "So things like that, you can't help but think, 'Is this some sort of sign?' So who knows. There are a lot of things in the universe that are very strange and unexplainable."

Shiel has recently founded the Michigan Upper Peninsula Bigfoot Organization, MUPBO, to probe sightings in the region and provide U.P residents with a source for information.

For more information visit www.upbigfoot.com.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Man Says Photo Shows UFOs Over Santa Isabel

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:42:25 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:42:25 -0400
Subject: Man Says Photo Shows UFOs Over Santa Isabel

Source: KFMB-TV - SAN DIEGO, California, USA

http://www.kfmb.com/features/special_assignment/story.php?id=49878

05-11-06

[Images@ <http://www.orreman7.com/BestUFOphotoever.html>]

Man Says Photo Shows UFOs Over Santa Isabel

A San Diego man says he has photographic evidence of UFOs flying over the East County. He shot a photo showing 10 objects in the sky while on a hike near Santa Isabel. The man claims his picture... Is the best UFO photo ever taken.

It was in the hills above Santa Isabel In July of 1990 that Mike Orrell snapped a photograph that changed his life forever.

"The sun was setting to the west, at about 3:30 or 4 in the afternoon," he explained.

Mike was hiking near the Inaja Memorial Picnic Grounds.

"It was on this block that I set my Canon camera -- I put it on maximum zoom lens," he said.

Mike snapped a single photo of the landscape. When he got the prints back, he noticed something strange.

"Soon as I saw the four-by-six picture, I saw the dots."

Ten dots in the sky. But they were so small, it was hard to make them out.

"Even at this distance I could not see the objects until the photograph was enlarged," Mike said.

Mike had the photo blown up -- again and again -- until the small dots were clearly visible.

There were nine objects on the left, and one on the right. They looked like they were flying, but they did not appear to have wings.

"Unlike birds or planes that would have wings or appendages, these objects were uniform in density and size," Mike said.

The objects were acorn shaped and triangular, and similar to other UFO photos taken around the world, that Mike has posted on his Web site.

"I have labeled this the best UFO photo ever taken, and there are other people who believe it is because the pattern I found in one of the objects is duplicated in three other separate UFO photographs," he said.

Could it be? Flying saucers over San Diego's East County?

News 8 took Mike Orrell's original negative to the experts at Chrome Photo in Sorrento Mesa, and asked for their opinion.

"They're irregularly shaped, though, sort of triangular," one staff member said.

The Chrome Photo staff took a close look at the negative. They were able to rule out dust on the lens damage to the negative, or mechanical defects with the camera.

"The negative itself was intact," staff member Dennis Reiter said. "There was no damage, no machine type damage in the process."

Next, they put the negative through a high-resolution scanner, and blew it up on a computer screen.

So, are they UFO's?

"I would agree with him -- they are flying objects and they are unidentified," Reiter said.

The objects were actually in the sky that day, but the experts could not say for sure what they were.

"If you're asking me if they're alien space craft, there's absolutely no indication they are alien space craft," he added.

If you're still skeptical about Mike Orrell and his UFO photo, his story doesn't end there.

"I had no idea the day I was here, that right behind us is an alien rock face," he said.

That's right. Two weeks after Mike took his UFO photo, he returned to the same spot only to find a rock formation in the shape of an alien face 15 feet from the spot where he took his photo.

Mike says he knows it's a natural rock formation, and not made by aliens. On the other hand... his relationship with that rock is a bit unsettling.

Mike says he's never seen another UFO since his close encounter 16 years ago. But he's still waiting for that day when the UFOs will come again.

Orrell also has discovered other rock formations in the shape of human faces. One on El Capitan Mountain near Lakeside, and in La Jolla Cove.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Yaldhurst NZ UFO

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:47:49 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:47:49 -0400
Subject: Yaldhurst NZ UFO

Source: The Press - Christchurch, New Zealand

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/thepress/0,2106,2410813a7574,00.html>

Dairy Thursday May 11

[Image here: <http://tinyurl.com/o6un7>]

Yaldhurst UFO

Here it is folks, a world exclusive. Following Juliet's sighting of what has been dubbed the "Yaldhurst UFO" other reports have been flooding in, including this picture from real estate agent Grant.

Grant reports hearing a bang the same afternoon and then took this picture which, to Peeps's eye at least, looks remarkably like a Zyborg V Intergalactic Shuttle containing 1200 shapeshifters from the Seventeenth Dimension.

Grant, who says he is "not into UFOs or anything", is nevertheless at a loss to explain what it is.

Meanwhile, Barb of Bishopdale sent in this eyewitness account.

"I was driving round the back of Harewood, on Friday afternoon, and saw a black line in the sky which gradually grew longer and then formed into a circle, which was growing in size. As I was approaching Ruapuna it started to do a dance - I gather the wind had got stronger up there - and then it disappeared behind some very thick, black clouds.

There was a plane coming in to land as this was happening. I wonder if the passengers saw anything.

I didn't see anything driving home; I was thankful to read Juliet's letter, because I was beginning to think I must have been seeing things."

Curiosa and curiosa, as a Burwood pensioner might have said.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Pictures From Retro UFO Conference In Landers

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:56:54 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:56:54 -0400
Subject: Pictures From Retro UFO Conference In Landers

Source: Bill Hamilton's AstroSciences.Info Site

<http://www.astrosciences.info/gallery.html>

Pictures From Retro UFO Conference Landers, California
April 29, 2006

And other images...

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Hypothesis to Explain Atmospheric Methane Findings

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 12:02:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 12:02:20 -0400
Subject: Hypothesis to Explain Atmospheric Methane Findings

Source: Biz.Yahoo.com

<http://tinyurl.com/k82q2>

Friday May 12

Hypothesis to Explain Atmospheric Methane Findings on Mars
Presented in Astrobiology Journal

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--May 12, 2006--A provocative hypothesis to explain the recent detection of trace amounts of methane (CH₄) in the martian atmosphere is based on measurements of underground water samples in South Africa and is presented in the most recent (Volume 6, Number 2) issue of Astrobiology, a peer-reviewed journal published by Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.

The paper is available free online at:

www.liebertpub.com/ast

T.C. Onstott, D. McGown, J. Kessler, B. Sherwood Lollar, K.K. Lehmann, and S.M. Clifford from Princeton University, the NASA Astrobiology Institute at Indiana University (Bloomington), the University of Toronto (Canada), and the Lunar Planetary Institute in Houston, Texas, in their paper entitled "Martian CH₄: Sources, Flux, and Detection" propose that:

a non-biological (abiogenic) process is responsible for the methane recently detected in the atmosphere of Mars by way of recent satellite and ground based observations.

A radiolytic source of hydrogen (H₂), when biologically or abiologically reacted with dissolved CO₂ in pore water, could form subsurface methane and explain the presence of trace amounts of this gas on Mars today. Radiolytic hydrogen forms when radiation from the decay of naturally occurring radioactive elements strikes water molecules, turning them into hydrogen and oxygen.

"Along with their hypothesis, the authors propose an instrument that could fly on future missions and, with measurements over time, distinguish mechanisms for methane emissions on Mars," says journal Editor-in-Chief, Sherry L. Cady, Ph.D., Associate Professor in the Department of Geology at Portland State University.

The authors propose using a cavity ring-down spectrometer, an instrument capable of guiding a rover to the location of methane emissions and performing experiments that could detect a biotic methane source.

"Measurements of the ratio of methane to helium, hydrogen, and ethane and the isotopic composition of carbon and hydrogen in methane and ethane over diurnal and seasonal changes could help discriminate between non-biological and biological sources for methane," reports Hypothesis Paper Editor Norman H. Sleep, Ph.D., Professor of Geophysics, Stanford University. The

author's hypothesis was developed by studying the source of methane in the crust of the Witwatersrand Basin in South Africa, which contains gold-bearing sedimentary rocks that are 2.9 billion years old.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Light Travels Backwards?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:44:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:44:27 -0400
Subject: Light Travels Backwards?

Source: PhysOrg.Com - Tilburg, The Nethewr lands

<http://www.physorg.com/news66582110.html>

May 11, 2006

Light's Most Exotic Trick Yet: So Fast It Goes... Backwards?
by Jonathan Sherwood
University of Rochester, New York

In the past few years, scientists have found ways to make light go both faster and slower than its usual speed limit, but now researchers at the University of Rochester have published a paper today in Science on how they've gone one step further: pushing light into reverse. As if to defy common sense, the backward-moving pulse of light travels faster than light. Confused? You're not alone.

"I've had some of the world's experts scratching their heads over this one," says Robert Boyd, the M. Parker Givens Professor of Optics at the University of Rochester. "Theory predicted that we could send light backwards, but nobody knew if the theory would hold up or even if it could be observed in laboratory conditions."

Boyd recently showed how he can slow down a pulse of light to slower than an airplane, or speed it up faster than its breakneck pace, using exotic techniques and materials. But he's now taken what was once just a mathematical oddity=97negative speed=97and shown it working in the real world.

"It's weird stuff," says Boyd. "We sent a pulse through an optical fiber, and before its peak even entered the fiber, it was exiting the other end. Through experiments we were able to see that the pulse inside the fiber was actually moving backward, linking the input and output pulses."

So, wouldn't Einstein shake a finger at all these strange goings-on? After all, this seems to violate Einstein's sacred tenet that nothing can travel faster than the speed of light.

"Einstein said information can't travel faster than light, and in this case, as with all fast-light experiments, no information is truly moving faster than light," says Boyd. "The pulse of light is shaped like a hump with a peak and long leading and trailing edges. The leading edge carries with it all the information about the pulse and enters the fiber first. By the time the peak enters the fiber, the leading edge is already well ahead, exiting. From the information in that leading edge, the fiber essentially 'reconstructs' the pulse at the far end, sending one version out the fiber, and another backward toward the beginning of the fiber."

Boyd is already working on ways to see what will happen if he can design a pulse without a leading edge. Einstein says the entire faster-than-light and reverse-light phenomena will

disappear. Boyd is eager to put Einstein to the test.

So How Does Light Go Backwards?

Boyd, along with Rochester graduate students George M. Gehring and Aaron Schweinsberg, and undergraduates Christopher Barsi of Manhattan College and Natalie Kostinski of the University of Michigan, sent a burst of laser light through an optical fiber that had been laced with the element erbium. As the pulse exited the laser, it was split into two. One pulse went into the erbium fiber and the second traveled along undisturbed as a reference. The peak of the pulse emerged from the other end of the fiber before the peak entered the front of the fiber, and well ahead of the peak of the reference pulse.

But to find out if the pulse was truly traveling backward within the fiber, Boyd and his students had to cut back the fiber every few inches and re-measure the pulse peaks when they exited each pared-back section of the fiber. By arranging that data and playing it back in a time sequence, Boyd was able to depict, for the first time, that the pulse of light was moving backward within the fiber.

To understand how light's speed can be manipulated, think of a funhouse mirror that makes you look fatter. As you first walk by the mirror, you look normal, but as you pass the curved portion in the center, your reflection stretches, with the far edge seeming to leap ahead of you (the reference walker) for a moment. In the same way, a pulse of light fired through special materials moves at normal speed until it hits the substance, where it is stretched out to reach and exit the material's other side [See "fast light" animation].

Conversely, if the funhouse mirror were the kind that made you look skinny, your reflection would appear to suddenly squish together, with the leading edge of your reflection slowing as you passed the curved section. Similarly, a light pulse can be made to contract and slow inside a material, exiting the other side much later than it naturally would [See "slow light" animation].

To visualize Boyd's reverse-traveling light pulse, replace the mirror with a big-screen TV and video camera. As you may have noticed when passing such a display in an electronics store window, as you walk past the camera, your on-screen image appears on the far side of the TV. It walks toward you, passes you in the middle, and continues moving in the opposite direction until it exits the other side of the screen.

A negative-speed pulse of light acts much the same way. As the pulse enters the material, a second pulse appears on the far end of the fiber and flows backward. The reversed pulse not only propagates backward, but it releases a forward pulse out the far end of the fiber. In this way, the pulse that enters the front of the fiber appears out the end almost instantly, apparently traveling faster than the regular speed of light. To use the TV analogy again=97it's as if you walked by the shop window, saw your image stepping toward you from the opposite edge of the TV screen, and that TV image of you created a clone at that far edge, walking in the same direction as you, several paces ahead [See "backward light" animation].

"I know this all sounds weird, but this is the way the world works," says Boyd.

[Thanks to Greg Boone 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Deardorff

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 09:29:11 -0700
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:47:22 -0400
Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Deardorff

>From: Robert Jacobs <jacobs.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>,
>Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 10:59:53 -0500
>Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 21:22:19 -0400
>>Subject: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

>>Does anyone know if that military report of a test missile
>>warhead, fired out over the Pacific some years ago and got
>>circled in flight and 'beamed' by a UFO "tumbled into the
>>ocean," or simply continued on its trajectory with the
>>electronics disabled?

<snip>

>My name is Bob Jacobs. I'm the one who, as a lieutenant in the
>U.S. Air Force was in charge of the tracking site at Big Sur,
>California.

>I wrote the piece about this incident for the MUFON Journal. I
>have subsequently written a rebuttal to "the debunkers" claims.

>The fact is that the dummy warhead in question did not hit its
>target at Eniwetok Atoll.

>The story as I wrote it is absolutely true. It was verified
>multiple times in letters from the late, retired USAF Major
>Florenz J. Mansmann in whose office at Vandenberg Air Force Base
>in California, I viewed the film.

Hello Bob,

As I recall, there have been some questions in the past on this
List about the event. The main question, I think, is, how well
did missiles fired to the West from the Vandenberg Base show up
on film taken from the special telescope at Big Sur?

If a missile and/or its fiery jet could be discerned well from
that distance, a UFO many meters in diameter should show up
better still, especially if emitting its own light of some kind.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 18:10:14 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:51:53 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Dickenson

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 12:04:48 -0400
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>I haven't been critical on the List, but I believe that
>everyone jumped on this the way they jumped on the AA 'film' in
>1995 and have helped to create the myth that they purport to
>want to clear up.

<snip>

Hi Steven,

When assessing releases, especially 'drip-by-drip' pre-releases
(or apparent leaks), it seems there are three possible
'political' reasons -

- a) to determine (strong) public opinion - officialdom can then
amend its position;
- b) to draw out opposition, by concealing key facts which are
then used to discredit;
- c) to create convincing cover - see below.

In The Spy And His Masters, Chris Felix (OSS - CIA?) laid out
the rules for releasing cover stories:

"To be too precise in a cover story qualitatively increases the
chances of repudiation of the story; to be too detailed
increases those chances quantitatively. To speak out too fast is
to show your hand before you know all you can about what your
opponent is holding in his; and to tell all in one breath
eliminates your chances to improvise as the situation develops"

He went on to compare the failure of the U2 cover story with
MI6's successful deception (of UK public) over the Buster Crabbe
affair.

<http://www.answers.com/topic/lionel-crabb>

(First Crabbe was 'on leave', then 'other duties', then 'a known
motorcyclist', then 'in accident elsewhere' - then silence.
Felix commented admiringly - "following their single protest,
the Russians dropped the matter" - presumably because UK public
opinion had been thoroughly defused by the deception.)

As you see, that's the opposite of scientific method of
presenting evidence.

reference- 'The Spy and His Masters' (1963) by C. Felix,
pp. 71 & 72

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 11:15:25 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:55:26 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Kasten

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 16:54:13 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 10:24:46 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

><snip>

>>... the only sensible line of conduct would be a policy of
>>gradual lifting of secrecy.

>>It is still my opinion.

>Well, it's been 59 years since the "modern" UFO age began,
>right?

>In that 59 years, we have had zero lifting of secrecy.

>So bring on the "gradual lifting." Haven't seen even that,
>yet.

I have always ignore the mantra that "soon the government will
be lifting the secrecy surrounding_____ - fill in the
blank.

Any information regarding parapolitical events must be wrested
from any agency/private corporation involved. Anyone thinking
that soon all will be revealed is truly naive and really needs
to get over it, get on with prying whatever documentation is
still left out of the hands of_____ - fill in another
blank).

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 19:08:35 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:59:39 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 12:04:48 -0400
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 14:02:10 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

><snip>

>>>You also seem to have the American Press all figured out, but
>>>I have to admit I didn't see a single line on the CONDIGN
>>>release in the American press, so I'm not sure what you've seen.
>>>The British press picked it up, as the American press might pick
>>>up a newly released CIA report on UFOs, but I'm not sure they
>>>really saw it as a valuable study. Did you see a lot of press
>>>reports in support of CONDIGN's conclusions?

>>It was in the New York Times, Steve. The same BS as was
>>reported by the UK press and the Candian Press and the Oz press.
>>UFOs are just plasma balls.

>>>The researchers that I tend to pay attention to have held
>>>back their criticism

>>More like fiddling while Rome burns, if you ask me. But
>>whatever works for you.

>Hi Don,

>I haven't been critical on the List, but I believe that
>everyone jumped on this the way they jumped on the AA 'film' in
>1995 and have helped to create the myth that they purport to
>>want to clear up.

>The story did not appear in the Washington Post and I'm not
>convinced that it got a lot of play in the US. This has been an
>Internet story for the most part (IMO), with the exception of
>coverage in Great Britain where it's National news. Of course,
>we'll see several documentaries on this in the next year or so
>on various cable channels.

>But does this really deserve a direct assault to prevent it
>from tainting the public's perception of UFOs? The "plasma"
>explanation is a flawed one and it would interesting perhaps to
>see what logic they use to support it. But unless they can, the
>report does (allegedly) indicate that "unknowns" are real and
>have caused damage and injury. So in some sense it may lend
>official support to further investigation of "unknowns".

>The problem is that the only information we have to work with
(so far) is the Summary and the statements of four researchers
who've skimmed the full report. Couple that with the media
demand to be first with the story, and you have a number of
people playing a game of trying to better one another. And in
this case, I believe the most sensational story wins. Wire
services, meanwhile, pick up the story and it gets spread around

the world using their perspective. I suspect the NY Times story is a wire story and not a feature story.

>Leadership from MUFON, CUFOS and the Fund are all aware of this report and I've forwarded some List-posts to them when I know they probably hadn't seen them. I believe they would rather read the report and then comment, rather than get into an ongoing debate over beliefs and suspicions. Some may disagree, but it seems to muddy the waters quite a bit.

Steve,

When the MoD Condign report comes out it won't matter didly squat what it says, the damage is done. Regardless how ridiculous the "scientific evidence" is in the report, that won't make it into the press. But the original reaction by the press will linger and will be what is remembered.

I have a copy of the NEW YORK Times report, it's just lifted out of the Sunday Times paper. There's a chance it wouldn't have travelled far in the United states but it went across the country in Canada and was reported in the Australian media.

I have to wonder what the probative value of the Condign report will be as compared to the media's temporary blitz.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 17:13:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:03:52 -0400
Subject: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

Letters Under Our Door

A review of Robert Nichol's Star Dreams, a revealing new Crop Circle Documentary.

By Alfred Lehmborg
www.alienview.net

What about the fakes?

Isn't it true that these strange constructions in our cereal crops are of human construction? Don't they have to be entirely of human construction for the skeptic's position to have the required validity? Just ONE 'genuine' circle, consider, and the game afoot's altogether new!

<more>

<http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2005/09/letters-under-our-door.html>

Robert Nichol's, "StarDreams" creator is in SDI tonight May 13, 2006... Check Listing or Podcast, in the next few days at:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/> ...

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Valuable UK UFO Project

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 23:58:42 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:06:51 -0400
Subject: Valuable UK UFO Project

The British Ministry of Defence ("the MOD") has indicated that on Monday 15 May 2006 it will be releasing the full text of a report entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air Defence Region, ("the Condign Report") on its website. [1]

On Thursday 11 May 2006, I was kindly given an opportunity by Joe McGonagle to have a sneak preview of a copy of the bulk (but not the entirety) of the Condign Report.

The Condign Report had been obtained from the Ministry of Defence following various requests by Dr Clarke and Gary Anthony under the Freedom Of Information Act ("FOIA"). The executive summary of the Condign Report was made available to the media and public on Sunday 7 May 2006 by Dr Dave Clarke and Messrs Gary Anthony, Joe McGonagle and Andy Roberts. Those individuals have a website at the link at:

<http://www.uk-ufo.org/>

That website includes biographical details of the relevant individuals and an informative article about the trail they followed to obtain the document. The relevant four individuals have not adopted a collective name for themselves. Giving them the name (suggested by Joe McGonagle) of "the Condign Team" could cause some people to mistakenly believe that those individuals wrote the Condign Report. I shall therefore instead refer to them as the "Enterprising Members of the Public Team" (or "EMP Team" for short). The reasons for this title will be familiar to many British ufologists, and too tedious to explain to everyone else.

Although work and family commitments (not to mention eating, sleeping, and watching too much television) have limited the amount of time available in the last 48 hours for me to study the report and consult relevant books/articles, I thought it worth putting a fair bit of effort into drafting a few preliminary thoughts by today, Saturday 13 May 2006. I wanted to make them available for consideration by anyone that wishes to read them prior to any further interviews that may be conducted by the media in the event of renewed interest on Monday 15 May 2006. I hope that any mistakes or omissions are looked upon sympathetically in these circumstances.

As detailed below, I consider the Condign Report to be a very useful and valuable document. The report is valuable as a case study of the risks inherent in scientific research being conducted in secrecy, including the risks of inefficiency and ineffectiveness.

The Condign Report appears to have been compiled by a single individual:

- (a) without involving any consultation with scientists in the relevant fields, and
- (b) without involving any consultation with ufologists to

determine what previous consideration of the relevant theories had occurred (including to discover if any reasons had been advanced for rejecting the relevant theory or whether there was any data inconsistent with it).

These factors are at the core of the most significant problems with this severely flawed report.

In short, the Condign Report reinvents the wheel. The theory that UFO sightings are caused by plasma has been considered previously by various ufologists, scientists and engineers. The Condign Report advances this theory without reference to much of that previous consideration (or apparent awareness of the relevant material), or any reference to the various arguments opposing that theory.

The severe flaws in the Condign Report highlighted below do not mean that the plasma theory (or any other theory) is necessarily wrong, and they certainly do not mean that the claims that extraterrestrials are visiting Earth are true. Publications of such sloppy quality give skepticism a bad name.

The Condign Report consists of 3 numbered volumes plus an Executive Summary. These volumes can be briefly outlined as follows:

- (a) The Executive Summary: This seeks to briefly summarize the material in the other volumes (particularly the conclusion from Volume 1). It is rather rambling, disorganized and unclear.
- (b) "Volume 1" : This contains the main report. It contains the conclusions reached, and outlines the methodology adopted.
- (c) "Volume 2" : This volume comprises 25 "Working Papers" (also referred to as "Point Papers") on various topics, ranging from relevant scientific issues to details of various objects which are common causes of UFO reports.
- (d) "Volume 3" : This relatively brief volume discusses various miscellaneous matters, including an assessment of UAP as potential hazards to aircraft. The issues it addresses are relatively discreet and I will not attempt to comment on this Volume at present. I will merely note that the Condign Report deals with UAP as potential hazards to aircraft without discussing a book by Jenny Randles devoted to this very subject. Her book "Something in the Air", also published as "UFO! Danger in the Air", was published in 1998)

The "Executive Summary"

The Terms of Reference for the Condign Report are provided at Volume 1, Annex A. They indicate that the author of the report had been instructed that the aim of his task was "to determine the potential value, if any, of UAP sighting reports to defence intelligence" (Volume 1, Annex A, para 1). The Terms of Reference also specify the method by which this objective is to be fulfilled : "A limited analysis based on an electronic relational database containing data extracted from UAP sighting reports, over a period to the present date." (Volume 1, Annex A, para 2).

(The Condign Report uses the term "UAP" to refer to "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena" [Executive Summary page 3, first para], "popularly known as UFOs" [Executive Summary page 3, Para 1].)

Those wishing to defend the honour of the MOD and/or the author of the Condign Report may seek to suggest that the severe flaws in the Condign Report arise from the limited aims of the study. However, the Condign Report purports to have the aim of making "a rational scientific examination of the phenomena - based only on the raw material - UKADR incident reports" (Volume 1, Preface, penultimate para) and claims to be the "first UK detailed and authoritative report [on UAPs] which has been produced since the late 1950s" (Volume 1, Chapter 1, page 2, page 2). In any event, regardless of the aims of the report, if an analysis is to be performed then it should be performed

competently.

The Executive Summary of the Condign Report includes the following:

Para 1: "That UAP exist is indisputable... and [they] clearly can exhibit aerodynamic characteristics well beyond those of any known aircraft or missile - either manned or unmanned"

Para 2 : "The topic has, hitherto, defied credible description as to its actual cause."

Para 11: "Aerial phenomena of the type consistent with those reported as UAP, and with exceptional characteristics, certainly exist - but the available evidence suggests that apart from those which can be more easily and satisfactorily explained, they are comprised of several types of rarely encountered natural events within the atmosphere and ionosphere. Some of these are still barely understood ."

Para 12: "Considerable evidence exists to support the thesis that the events are almost certainly attributable to physical, electrical and magnetic phenomena in the atmosphere, mesosphere and ionosphere. They appear to originate due to more than one set of weather and electrically-charged conditions and are observed so infrequently as to make them unique to the majority of observers."

Para 13: "The close proximity of plasma related fields can adversely affect a vehicle or person. For this to occur the UAP must be encountered at very close ranges. A probable modulated magnetic, electric or electromagnetic (or even unknown field) appears to emanate from some of the buoyant charged masses. Local fields of this type . have been medically proven to cause responses in the temporal lobes of the human brain. These result in the observer sustaining (and later describing and retaining) his or her own vivid, but mainly incorrect, description of what is experienced. . This is suggested to be a key factor in influencing the more extreme reports found in the media and are clearly believed by the 'victims'".

Para 17 : "There is no evidence that any UAP, seen in the UKADR, are incursions by air objects of any intelligent (extra-terrestrial or foreign) origin, or that they represent any hostile intent."

Para 18: "Key Recommendation: . It should no longer be a requirement for DI55 to monitor UAP reports as they do not demonstrably provide information useful to Defence Intelligence".

The basis for several of these comments is addressed below.

Preliminary points - seeing the silver lining

As a preliminary (and fairly significant) point, it should be noted that even if every word of the Condign Report is accepted at face value then many positive points may be made by ufologists. Individuals on various Internet forums that have dismissed the report (based on press reports about its contents) as merely "disinformation" or part of a "cover-up" miss out on an opportunity to make arguments based on the contents of the report.

The first and most obvious of such positive points that could be made by such individuals is as follows: If UFO reports are indeed caused by a previously unrecognized form of atmospheric plasma, then there are several reasonably strong arguments in favour of at least limited funding for a scientific investigation of such reports.

Apart from a desire to understand the unexplained, there reasons include a desire to exclude any danger to air traffic, possible military applications of the relevant knowledge and the possibility of knowledge useful to developing fusion power sources. In 1989, a scientific article entitled "Ball lightning as a route to fusion energy" reviewed properties of ball lightning which commended it to the attention of the fusion community. [52] A similar commendation may be made in relation

UAPs.

Thus, the conclusion in the Condign Report provides reasons for an investigation of UFO reports by scientists. Such an investigation is, after all, exactly what many of the more restrained ufologists have been seeking for the last few decades.

Furthermore, this may have an effect upon the "giggle factor" which hampers study in this area. The Washington Post ran an article on 29 June 1998 which reported on a report on UFOs and stated that "a sampling of scientists ... expressed surprise that a topic with such a high 'giggle factor' might be reincarnated for serious study, possibly further blurring the lines between legitimate research and the 'lunatic fringe. Some said they would never comment on the touchy topic..." [58].

A reduction in the "giggle factor" surrounding ufology would be welcomed by me personally. As I have explained before, I use a pseudonym when writing about issues relating to UFOs since, as a barrister in England, I have no wish for my clients or colleagues to know about my interest in any such matters.

It is also worth noting as a preliminary point that it is possible to find a very considerable number of statements in the Condign Report that may be seen as supporting, or at least being consistent with, a more exotic explanation for UFO reports. The author of the Condign Report clearly accepted many of the claims made regarding sightings of at least certain types of UFO (without really addressing the types of UFO which were inconsistent with the plasma-UFO theory) and many of the alleged effects of UFOs on the human body and other objects. The author certainly has not rejected all relevant evidence out of hand. (However, one of most serious of the many severe flaws in the report is that the basis on which he accepts some evidence and rejects other evidence is not apparent from the content of the report. His judgments appear rather arbitrary, with assertions being made without reference to evidence or any form of logic.)

A complete list of the relevant statements would be rather extensive, but the following are fairly typical of the points I have in mind:

(a) "Objects close to reported UAP sightings have been subject to ... permanent magnetism (fences, flag poles) ... radio interference ... interference with magnetic compasses" (Volume 2, Working Paper 1, Annex D, para 2).

(b) "Many of the event are reported by trained observers, often members of the Armed Forces (both by Air and Ground Crew), Police or Coastguards or Civil Airline Pilots" (Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 2, para 5).

(c) "unless some unprecedented intelligence gaps have existed over many years, the possibility that the study finding would show that the presence of the unexplained proportion of UAP sightings is due entirely to man-made phenomenon, while not totally impossible, was clearly very unlikely" (Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 4, para 8)

(d) "it is clear that some [CE3 and CE4] reports, from different parts of the world, seem to have similarities beyond the normal expectation of coincidence" (Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 7, para 16)

"Volume 1"

This contains the main report.

It contains the conclusions reached, and outlines the methodology adopted.

Although the Executive Summary stresses the plasma-UFO theory (and this was picked up by the media in its coverage of the release of the report), the content of Volume 1 actually makes it clear that the author considers that "simply man-made airborne objects such as aircraft, para-wings or balloons are often the explanation. The range of options then progresses through a set of other relatively easily explainable man-made,

atmospheric and natural and unusual, propagation and atmospheric phenomena (some of which are still not fully understood)" (Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 2, para 2).

Volume 1 begins with an introduction which sets out the historical background to the Condign Report. That background consists of two paragraphs (Volume 1, Chapter 1, page 1, paras 1 and 2). Despite the brevity of that account and the very limited number of matters discussed, it still manages to get extremely basic facts incorrect.

The first of the relevant paragraphs refers to the "Flying Saucer Working Party" set up in August 1950 (Volume 1, Chapter 1, page 1, para 1). The Condign Report refers to some of the documentation relating to a report generated by that "Working Party" but states that "The Department does not possess a copy of this report .". Since that remark was written, however, the MOD has in fact made a copy of that report available to the public (following requests by two members of the EMP Team - Dave Clarke and Andy Roberts) and it can be seen on the MOD website. [47]

The second of the relevant paragraphs briefly refers to the Condon report, the highly controversial study headed by Edward Condon under a contract with the US Air Force, and which cost over \$500,000. The Condon study was performed by a team at the University of Colorado, and involved multi-disciplinary teams going into the field to investigate reports, and considering data with the assistance of various scientists, together with (at least for part of the study) with the assistance of the members of a UFO group and seminars from leading ufologists. A list of references to discussion of the Condon Report in approximately 215 books is included in Koi Chrono Core at 1969.0109 [9].

The brief reference to the Condon Report in the Condign Report manages to get the date of the Condon wrong. It states that "by 1966 the USA's CONDON Report had studied and reported .". In fact the report was completed in late 1968 and released to the public shortly thereafter, on 8 January 1969. Although this mistake may simply be a typographical error, it seems probable to me that the author of the Condign Report was confused by reference to the Condon study having commenced in 1996 [51].

A more substantial misstatement in the same paragraph of the Condign report in relation to the Condon Report is that "Great Britain took no part in this USAF study, and there is no record of the Air Ministry requesting or receiving this report within the Department" (Volume 1, Chapter 1, page 2, para 2). However, the Ministry of Defence has released documents (stored at the National Archives at Kew, London) which clearly show that in fact there was liaison between members of the Condon study team and British officials. Several documents, for example, relate to a meeting involving relatively senior scientific officials from within the MOD meeting with Robert Low of the Condon group. The MOD documents show that British officials were reluctant to meet with him, fearing that he was a UFO nut, but were pleasantly surprised when they did have a meeting. Amusingly, private documents show that Robert Low (although widely regarded as being highly skeptical of exotic explanations for UFO reports) was not prepared to take at face value information supplied by British MOD officials about their views on UFOs. Ironically, the Condign Report shows a similar mistrust of statements by other governments about UFOs, stating that "it is recognized that some of the information 'released by other nations may be deliberate debunking or disinformation" (Volume 1, Chapter 5, page 1, para 2).

It is fairly clear from the content of his report that the author of the Condign Report did not bother to obtain a copy of the Condon Report. This is particularly significant given that the Condon study actually considered the plasma-UFO theory and, as discussed below, organized a conference of scientists to discuss the merits of that theory. The Condign report, on the other hand, appears to have been prepared in total isolation from the scientific and ufological community. It does not refer to, or address, even a small fraction of the material relating to the plasma-UFO theory that is cited in the relevant chapter of the Condon Report.

For anyone that wants to be a bit more diligent than the author

of the Condign Report, the paperback edition of the Condon Report can be bought via various websites (e.g. www.abebooks.com) fairly cheaply. Indeed, the complete text of the Condon Report can be read free of charge on the following websites:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/condon/text/contents.htm>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/condon/contents.html>

The bulk of Volume 1 is largely devoted to statistical analysis of a database of a limited number of the reports received by the Ministry of Defence in the period 1987 to 1997. The preparation of the relevant database clearly involved a rather substantial amount of work. That included the "tedious task of converting thousands of paper UAP reports into electronic form" (Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 1, para 1).

The statistical analysis is repeatedly acknowledged to be based on poor and incomplete data. For example, the report comments on the fact that "the great majority of UK Report Forms are incomplete or incompetently completed or as vague as the typical example UAP report [presented at Annex B to Volume 1]" (Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 2, para 3). It further states that "as DI55 are not permitted to make follow-up investigations after UAP events and not event to speak to witnesses to clarify the meaning of (often cryptic or missing observations) analysis is dependent only on the paper reports)" (Volume 1, Chapter 2, page 2, para 2).

As a result of these limitations the statistical analysis in the Condign Report could not (and does not purport to) result in any astounding conclusions.

In short, the statistical analysis appears to have largely (if not entirely) been a waste of a considerable amount of time and effort.

It is therefore surprising that the Condign Report bothers including a considerable number of pretty graphs and charts and a lengthy discussion of the results of the statistical analysis.

On an initial reading of the report, I was puzzled why the author had bothered to perform (or include in his report) such detailed statistical analysis of such poor data. It occurred to me that the author was simply unaware of the old computing adage, "Garbage In, Garbage Out" ("GIGO"). However, my initial thought was unfair to the author. He actually includes in the body of the report the following statement: "It is emphasized however that those conclusions drawn can only be as good as the reported data" (Volume 1, Chapter 3, page 3, para 2). Given the numerous complaints in the report about the inadequacies in the "reported data", I am left puzzled why the author bothered with such detailed statistical analysis (other than feeling that the Terms of Reference required him to perform such an exercise, regardless of his own views).

In any event, that statistical analysis does not in fact appear provide a basis for most of the conclusions of the report. Upon a preliminary examination of the Condign Report, it appears to me that about the only statement made in the executive summary as a result of the compilation and analysis of the database is that there is an increased incidence of UFO reports during periods of peak meteor activity.

Given that the Condign Report's content, in accordance with the relevant Terms Of Reference ("TOR"), largely relate to the statistical analysis performed, one might have expected the plasma-UFO theory advanced in the report to be supported by the statistical analysis. With this in mind, readers may wish to pay particular attention to the page of the report which actually deals with an attempt to find a correlation between UAP reports and weather conditions (Volume 1, Chapter 3, page 21, para 50). The relevant page stresses the fact that an attempt was made to analyze "the most obvious factor - that of the potential of enhanced electrical conditions in the atmosphere". However, the results of the consideration of several samples were mixed, with the overall conclusion being drawn that "there are many occasions when UAP reports are received when there is no recorded thunder conditions and hence no enhanced electrical

activity in the form of lightning. On those occasions (other man-made objects excepted) UAP must be caused by something else".

It seems almost too minor a matter to note that the results of the statistical analysis in relation to weather are in fact misrepresented in the conclusions section a few pages later on. The conclusions section states "Positive (+0.62) correlation was shown between thunder (lightning present) and the presence of UAP reports" [Volume 1, Chapter 3, page 31]. In fact, as noted above, the relevant page of the analysis dealt with three samples with mixed results. The first sample (1988 reports) has a correlation of -0.43 (i.e. a negative correlation, i.e. UAP are less likely to be reported when there is a high incidence of lightning), the second sample (1996 reports) has a positive correlation of 0.62, and the third sample (1988 reports) had a correlation of 0.19. It is not clear whether the correlation in relation to the third sample was positive or negative, since the relevant description of the results refers to a "weakly positive" correlation but this appears to be a correlation between days of thunder against days when no UAP reports were received (i.e. a negative correlation between UAP reports and lightning). Thus, the conclusion section's reference to a "positive (+0.62) correlation) merely refers to the one sample out of the three which most supports the theory being advanced. The other two samples (and the significant disparity in the results) are simply ignored in the conclusions section.

Instead of advancing a theory that plasmas caused by weather conditions are misreported as UFOs (as suggested by some reports in the media), the thrust of the material relating to statistical analysis is in fact that meteors are the most significant cause of plasmas which result in UAP reports.

The reasoning in support of this contention is probably the most amusing part of the report.

The report does not contain any references to data in support of the suggestion that plasma bodies are generated by meteors. Instead, the report refers to the large quantity of matter entering the earth's atmosphere which "in theory is said to burn up". The report then simply says that certain issues arise "if it is postulated that" not all this material burns up or impacts the surface. (The report acknowledges that there is "a dearth of information in the scientific press on this possibility").

The report then makes the further imaginative leap that the postulated further material turns into "meteor plasmas". The report notes a finding (which may not be considered very surprising) that "peak reporting periods co-incided with meteor show peaks", but contends that the reports did not involve (as one might have expected) sightings of "falling meteors" but were in fact sightings of "meteor plasmas". The report simply asserts that these sightings "were clearly events which occurred after the plasmas had been formed, were usually at low altitude and exhibited the regularly-seen erratic, bobbing, hovering and climbing motion which would not [sic] be mistaken by the public and other credible witnesses" [Volume 1, Chapter 3, paras 53-65 (particularly at paras 54-55 and 65)]

"Volume 2" : Outline

This volume comprises 25 "Working Papers" (also referred to as "Point Papers").

The 25 Working Papers appear to be based on extremely limited research. Most of the 25 "Working Papers" only cite one or two items in support. Indeed, few of those articles actually relate to the central contentions in the Condign Report and are in fact at most of peripheral relevance.

On an initial review of the Condign Report, the key Working Papers appear to be the first and last ones, i.e.: (a) Working Paper 1 (particularly Annex D and (especially) Annex F) in relation to UAP effects on humans and objects. (b) Working Paper 25 on magnetic field effects on humans.

The material in these two Working Papers relies upon the research of Michael Persinger about the possibility that

magnetic fields may affect brain activity, particularly the temporal lobe areas. The Condign Report accepts that there is a "high probability" that UAPs produce EM radiation which "can affect the brain", causing "the brain to interact in an unusual way with the imagination 'library', causing reports of visual activity which are not in fact a true representation of the facts" (Volume 2, Working Paper 1, Annex F, paras 13-16. See also Working Paper 25).

Stanton Friedman and others interested in astronautics will also find Working Paper 6 ("Exotic Technologies") particularly entertaining. Though interesting generally, I'd note in particular the confusion evident paras 3-8, 22, 30 and 32. Paragraph 3 is probably the most confused and I'd be interested in comments on it from astronomers. It states "Intergalactic travel requires [approximately] four million years for a return trip (travelling at just less than the speed of light), or three years, even to a nearby planet at 20Km [per sec] - a planet on which we can determine no signs of life in the form which would indicate 'beings' and their technology".

It is fairly clear from the content of the report that the author read about Persinger in books by Jenny Randles and/or Paul Devereux and then looked up articles by Persinger. It is also fairly clear that the author of the report did not bother to obtain Persinger's book or review the literature criticizing Persinger's conclusions.

In fact, it is reasonably certain even from a preliminary reading that the author of the Condign report obtained Paul Devereux's second book on Earthlights i.e. "Earth Lights Revelations" (1989), but had not read Paul Devereux's first book, i.e. "Earthlights". Paul Devereux's first book, i.e. "Earthlights" contains several reasons for doubting Persinger's conclusions. None of those reasons are referred to, or addressed, in the Condign Report.

One of the reasons that has repeatedly been expressed in the UFO literature for questioning the equating Persinger's lab experiments with real life UFO witnesses is the strength of the magnetic fields involved. As the Condign Report acknowledges, "unfortunately there are no electric or magnetic field strength measurements taken" of any emissions from UAPs (Volume 2, Working Paper 1, Annex F, para 5).

Furthermore, the Working Papers appear to have been drafted by the same person, rather than specialists in each of the relevant fields. This may be the explanation for the evident lack of understanding of some of the material summarized in those Working Papers.

The fact that all the Working Papers appear to have been drafted by the same person may also explain the omission of any reference to (or apparent awareness of) much of the existing relevant material.

Indeed, a substantial quantity of the content of the material relating to plasmas etc (e.g. Working Paper 10 on Earthlights) is taken from readily identifiable UFO literature. When I saw the material is "taken from readily identifiable UFO literature", I do not merely mean that that author has done a literature survey and has summarized the most relevant evidence and arguments. Instead, in at least some cases, the author of the Condign report has lifted material almost verbatim.

The Condign Report shows an awareness of (and takes material from) an extremely small number of UFO books. It is possible to identify the influence of certain books by Jenny Randles and Paul Devereux. I have not had time to confirm it, but it seems probable that some material was also obtained from one of Albert Budden's books. _____

Volume 2: The plasma-UFO theory

The Condign Report has been the subject of widespread media coverage (particularly in Britain) since the EMP Team made the press aware of the report.

Each media article focused upon the suggestion in the report that UFO reports may be caused by atmospheric-electrical plasmas of some type similar to ball lightning, but perhaps something

different, something we don't yet understand but generated by atmospheric processes.

Despite the fact that the media coverage concentrated on the plasma , in the first few days of reporting of the Condign report, media coverage failed to include any mention of the fact that the plasma UFO theory has in fact been around for approximately 40 years. Although one article (on the website of the journal Nature, [3]) has now quoted Ian Ridpath as stating that "the ideas about electrical plasmas being mistaken for alien craft are far from being a new idea", I have yet to see any references to the discussion of that theory that has taken place within ufology since the plasma UFO theory was first proposed. To some extent, this is explicable by reference to the content of the Condign Report. The Condign Report is almost devoid of references to the ufological literature relating to the plasma UFO theory. Indeed, the Condign Report is almost devoid of references, period.

Nor has there been any mention in the media (or, so far as I can recall, on the Internet) during the last week to the fact that the United States Air Force has previously (indirectly) funded a conference of scientists from several prestigious universities and scientific laboratories to discuss the plasma UFO theory. (This omission is more readily excused, since I do not recall any mention of that conference in UFO books).

As discussed below, this theory had in fact been the subject of several articles, at least one book and at least one conference of scientists. Indeed, the hypothesis that UFO reports may be caused by ball lightning was considered by the United States Air Force in the Project Grudge report, back in 1949. Despite being provided with that material, the US Air Force very rarely refer to lightning as being a cause of UFO reports. This can be seen from an examination of a summary of the results of Project Blue Book, a long running investigation of UFOs by the US Air Force. An ambitious project involving various ufologists has recently made available that summary (plus many other Project Blue Book documents) at the website below:
<http://www.bluebookarchive.org/browse.aspx>

(The existence of the relevant mass of US Air Force documents on the Internet has been referred to relatively infrequently to date. This may be because the ufologists involved in the relevant project have remained relatively quiet about their work. Or it may simply be that analysis of those documents is relatively dull and hard work compared to looking at the latest "cool pic" of a UFO or document of unknown provenance which "proves" that "They" know "The Truth". Those inclined to consider the relevant US Air Force documents may find the material at [6], [7] and [8] helpful.).

Evidence in support of a plasma-UFO theory was put forward in considerable detail in the first UFO book written by Philip J Klass, "UFOs - Identified". The Working Papers do not appear to pick up on most of the evidence and arguments in support of that theory advanced by Klass. Indeed, it is fairly clear that the author did not bother to obtain the book by Klass. Instead, he appears to have relied upon summaries of that evidence and/or reinvented the wheel.

It is noteworthy that this theory was subsequently abandoned, or at the very least marginalised, by Klass himself. The plasma UFO theory was relegated to a short mention in the next UFO book by Klass, although he still appears to have supported that theory (briefly commenting that he had become aware of several UFO reports "which provide further support for [the UFO plasma] hypothesis". [44]) However, a fellow skeptic that co-operated with Klass, Robert Sheaffer, has written that: "Several years after the publication of [the plasma-UFO] explanation in UFOs Identified (Random House, 1968), Klass began to rethink his appraisal of the UFO phenomenon. He now explains that when he first became interested in UFOs it did not seem to him to be possible that apparently sane and sober persons would mistake a distant planet or a hovering air-balloon for a huge, brilliant object just hundreds of feet away. But the experience of years of investigating UFO reports convinced him that such misperceptions are not only possible but in fact often happen. Klass now believes that the phenomenon of ball lightning plays only a minor role in the overall UFO picture". [42, 43].

"UFOs - Identified" was preceded by two relevant articles by Klass. In fact, both articles by Klass were preceded by at least one article that had already put forward the plasma-UFO theory several months earlier. A newspaper article dated 17 April 1966 had discussed experiments by "Jenzano" (the director of the Morehead Planetarium) which had created plasma in a laboratory and believed that "something like this is what UFO observers are seeing" [59]. The numerous references on the Internet giving Klass credit for first proposing the plasma-UFO theory are therefore slightly inaccurate.

The first article by Klass generated considerable press interest, catching the attention of publications as disparate as New Scientist, Electronic Design and Saturday Review. [30]

A Time-Life publication summarises the reaction to his articles as follows: "Klass received scant encouragement. Traditional scientists had little reason to pursue his hypothesis; those who had already made up their minds about UFOs were uninterested or openly hostile. Newsweek called his theory 'one of the most persuasive explanations of all' but added that the air force was 'noncommittal' and that UFO buffs were 'unimpressed'. One skeptic sarcastically described Klass's theory as 'a freak of nature - hitherto unknown to science: a clear weather plasma, akin to 'ball lightning', caused by an electrical discharge from nearby high-tension power lines, which was somehow able to detach itself, grow to tremendous size, and cavort about the countryside under its own power". [41]

Some researchers rejected the plasma-UFO theory out of hand. Others accepted that the theory could be an explanation of some, or even all sightings. Some of those researchers, however, complained that the scientific community had failed to test the plasma UFO theory e.g. Lloyd Mallan [37].

For a more detailed consideration of the UFO plasma theory put forward by Klass, see the relevant discussion in the various books listed at [40].

Many discussions in UFO books or on the Internet have rejected the plasma-UFO theory simply by reference to fact that it was (supposedly) originally put forward by Klass (an individual reviled by many pro-ETH researchers). If you are lucky, the person rejecting the plasma-UFO theory may at least mention that it was rejected by James E McDonald, one of a very small number of atmospheric physicists to have considered UFO reports in detail. However, it would be in the interests of all concerned if, instead of merely referring to McDonald's views, an explanation were given of the reasoning behind his rejection of the plasma UFO theory. Mere appeals to authority are commonly (and rightly) criticized by ufologists when a skeptic simply notes that an individual prominent scientist does not believe that UFO reports are worth investigating.

This is particularly desirable given that McDonald's views on the plasma UFO theory were expressed quite some time ago. If no details of the basis of his views is given, it would be easy to dismiss references to the position he held merely by noting that a lot of time has passed and much more is now known about plasma.

It is in fact possible to combine referring to McDonald's reasoning with the additional objective of referring to a significant U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics "Symposium on Unidentified Flying Objects", chaired by Congressman J Edward Roush ("the Roush hearing") on 29 July 1968. In his evidence at the Roush hearing, McDonald made the following comment on the plasma-UFO theory:

"When you deal with multiple-witness cases involving discs with metallic luster, definite outline, seen in the daytime, completely removed from a thunderstorm, perhaps seen over center Manhattan, or perhaps in Redlands, Calif., they are not ball lightning or plasmas. ... One of the most characteristic features of a plasma is its very short lifetime and exceedingly great instability. The difficulty of sustaining a plasma for more than microseconds is a very great difficulty. To suggest that clear weather conditions can somehow create and maintain plasmas that persist for many minutes, and fool pilots . is unreasonable. It is not a scientifically well-defended viewpoint." [5]

McDonald did not, unfortunately, have a book on UFOs published. A considerable amount of detail about his life and views is given in a biography of McDonald by Ann Druffel ("Firestorm : Dr James E McDonald's Fight for UFO Science" (2003)), a fascinating book even if somewhat biased in favour of the ETH and McDonald personally). It is, however, somewhat surprising that the book does not appear to mention the fact that McDonald's interest in UFOs was the subject of a significant dissertation by Paul McCarthy entitled "Politicking and Paradigm Shifting: James E. McDonald and the UFO Case Study". This omission is all the more surprising given that even Klass (not exactly a fan of McDonald.) has referred to that dissertation [56]. Fortunately, the complete text of that dissertation is available to read free on-line on the Project 1947 website at:

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/mccarthy/contents.html#shgintro>

"Firestorm" is at pains to stress repeatedly that McDonald rebutted arguments advanced by Klass point by point and includes some relevant brief comments at pages 165-166 (in Chapter 8). Unfortunately neither "Firestorm" nor the thesis actually give the relevant arguments in relation to the plasma-UFO hypothesis in any detail. So far, I have been unable to find any of the relevant papers by McDonald on the Internet (although some of the relevant papers have been collected into a book which may be purchased). Hopefully, the ufological community will be sufficiently organized that it will respond to the Condign Report by making some of McDonald's relevant papers available online.

The author of the Condign Report also does not appear to be aware of many of the arguments raised in opposition to the plasma-UFO theory which Philip J Klass was fair enough to include in his book, "UFOs - Identified". Klass reprinted a letter from Richard Hall which included the following comments: "Ball lightning ... bears little resemblance to the typical UFO report. Ball lightning has never been observed to have distinct geometrical outline, to be seen in this form in bright daylight, to persist for more than a few minutes at most (normally a few seconds), nor to exhibit the metallic-appearing surfaces, sometimes with porthole-like markings. UFOs have exhibited all these features". [11]

The Condon Report includes an entire chapter (by Martin D Altschuler) on the plasma-UFO theory, ball-lightning and similar matters. That chapter includes some comments on the book by Philip Klass and the plasma-UFO theory it advances. The Condon Report notes: "The book does not attempt to summarize any of the fundamental principles of atmospheric electricity, plasma physics, or atmospheric dynamics." [53]

More significantly, the same chapter of the Condon Report also details a "plasma UFO conference" attended by several physicists expert in either plasma physics or atmospheric electricity on 27 and 28 October 1967. That conference was organized by the Condon study (which, as noted above, was funded by a contract with the US Air Force). The attendees included:

(a) Marx Brook: New Mexico Inst. of Mining and Technology (b) Keith A. Brueckner: University of California (San Diego) (c) Nicholas C. Christofilos: University of California (Livermore) (d) Ronald T. H. Collis: Stanford Research Institute (e) Edmond M. Dewan: Air Force Cambridge Research Lab. (f) Herman W. Hoerlin: Los Alamos Scientific Lab. (g) Bernd T. Matthias: University of California (San Diego) (h) Arnold T. Nordsieck: Santa Barbara, California (i) Marshall N. Rosenbluth: James Forrestal Research Center (j) John H. Taylor: University of California (San Diego) (k) Condon UFO Study Members

Various aspects of atmospheric electricity were reviewed at this plasma UFO conference, such as ball lightning, and tornado and earthquake luminescence. Unusual UFO reports were presented for discussion. The Condon Report notes that "participants with a background in theoretical or experimental plasma physics felt that containment of plasma by magnetic fields is not likely under atmospheric conditions for more than a second or so. The plasma theory was not accepted by the participants in the conference, with "all participants [being] agreed that the UFO cases contained insufficient data for a definitive scientific conclusion".

Possibly because of the incompleteness of, or inaccuracies alleged in, the plasma-UFO theory advanced by Klass, several pro-ETH authors have been able to advance an alternative explanation. They have advanced theories that plasma are related to UFOs - but these authors have sought to contend that the plasma is generated by alien spaceships. For example:

(a) Paul Hill states that there is an "illuminated and illuminating sheath of atmosphere [around UFOs which] is a sheath of ionized and excited air molecules often called a plasma" which Hill asserts is caused by a "power-plant-connected, ionizing, wave type radiation from the UFO" [50]

(b) James M Campbell has written a book which discusses reports indicating the presence of plasma, contending that this plasma is the result of "the propulsion system of UFOs [involving] the emission of microwave energy". [55]

(c) A different connection between vehicles and plasma was put forward by Stanton T Friedman in his written statement evidence to the Roush hearing. He referred to publications relating to "interactions between vehicles and plasmas", stating that "there is a body of technology which I have studied and which leads me to believe that an entirely new approach to high speed air and space propulsion could be developed using the interactions between magnetic and electric fields with electrically conducting fluids adjacent to the vehicles to produce thrust or lift and reduce or eliminate such other hypersonic flight problems as drag, sonic boom, heating, etc". [60]

Secrecy and the erosion of trust

Until recently, the MOD had consistently denied carrying out any study of UFOs. The Condign Report itself refers to the fact that the MOD had made an "inappropriate statement that the MOD has not carried out any UAP investigations". The author of the report comments, with evident irritation, that it will "there will, most likely be a need to respond to the inappropriate statement that the MOD has not carried out any UAP investigations, which was issued in a written reply, by another Department" [Volume 1, page 5, para 16].

This is not the only example of official documents being somewhat at odds with answers given about UFOs in Parliament. Various statements on behalf of the British Government that UFO reports are investigated to determine whether they have any defence significance. However, internal Ministry of Defence documents from the same time period stated that this policy was not fulfilled. A document prepared by a Mr E Humpston of DI55b (the same department that commissioned the Condign Report) included a comment that an investigation which fulfilled the stated policy would require more time and effort than could be devoted from the available resources, requiring "2-3 man days ... for each investigation" (Public Record Office File Reference DEFE 31/119, memo dated 7th June 1967). In response to this memo, A D Hunter ADI/DI55 advised Mr Potts DSTI was that since further staffing on this low priority task could not be contemplated, "we must therefore always fall short of what is required to implement the stated official policy" (National Archives File Reference DEFE 31/119, memo dated 7th June 1967). The stated official policy, however, continued to be repeated.

Such contradictions between public statements and internal documents are an obvious cause of conspiracy theories.

Similarly, secrecy in respect of UFO reports and investigations feeds allegations of a "cosmic watergate" (a term used by some ufologists when alleging that Governments are concealing evidence of extraterrestrial visitors to this planet). Even the University of Colorado report on UFOs ("the Condon Report") contains fairly strident criticisms of secrecy in relation to ufo reports. The Condon Report is not generally considered to be biased in favour of ETH proponents. However, a section by Condon himself includes the following: "It would have been wise . to have declassified all or nearly all of the previous reports of investigations of flying saucer incidents .. But secrecy was maintained. This opened the way for intensification of the "aura of mystery" which was already impairing public confidence in the

Department of Defense. Official secretiveness also fostered systematic sensationalized exploitation of the idea that a government conspiracy existed to conceal the truth."

It is ironic that the Condign Report (itself kept secret for 6 years) refers to a covert study group in the USA during the 1950s, commenting that "the covertness of this investigation subsequently contributed greatly to charges of a government 'cover-up'" (Volume 1, Chapter 1, page 1, para 2).

The debate about secrecy in relation to UFO reports is usually oversimplified. The existence of secrecy in relation to UFO reports does not necessarily mean that the content of those reports reveals anything astounding. It is common to ignore the fact that several valid reasons for limited secrecy have been advanced by several authors. However, close examination of documents written by civil servants within the Ministry of Defence reveals that less valid reasons have sometimes influenced decisions against revealing ufo reports.

For example, there is one episode in particular that I find interesting (although no one else seems to have shared my concern about it, since I don't think anyone has referred to it since I mentioned it on UFO UpDates a few years ago). It relates to a request to the Ministry of Defence in 1975 by scientists Mark Stenhoff (an expert on ball lightning), Dr Paul Davies (the famous author) and Dr Christopher Evans (the author of a popular book about skepticism) for UFO reports to be released to advance understanding of ball lightning. A number of documents at the National Archives relate to this request, including request itself, the responses to it, and various internal Ministry of Defence documents considering that request. Those documents demonstrate the following:

(1) The reasons for the MOD being reluctant to release the relevant reports included the need to redact material identifying the person reporting the sighting or to obtain permission from that person. The MOD was obviously reluctant to be drawn into such a time consuming exercise.

(2) However, the documents also reveal a stated policy of being prepared to release otherwise confidential UFO reports to "a major scientific organisation of high standing" if it had "strong reasons for obtaining access". One of the documents relating to the request considers whether the request satisfied this test. This further document suggested that the request should be turned down since the 3 of you appeared to be a group of academic drawn together "by an interest in UFOs" and that this group therefore could not be described as "a major scientific organisation of high standing" (See National Archives File Reference AIR 2/19086, document E16 dated 11 June 1975 from JEA Harrison).

(3) The relevant MOD documents also include one relatively long memo discussing the potential release of the reports which notes that such release could be "embarrassing to the Department" for various reasons, including the "somewhat haphazard allocation" of the relevant reports to the various categories used in public statements on UFOs. (National Archives File Reference AIR 2/19086 document E21, undated but written in the context of correspondence during the summer of 1975).

Personally, I thought it quite interesting to find an express acknowledgement of "somewhat haphazard allocation" of UFO reports to the various categories of explanations of UFOs, and expressions of a desire to avoid release of documents demonstrating such "somewhat haphazard allocation" since this could "embarrassing to the Department". (Since I wanted to highlight this episode and the issues it raised, perhaps I should have attempted to emulate the dramatic nature of many accounts within ufology. I could have mentioned back then the facts (which are true) that (a) when I asked to see the relevant file I was asked to sit in a special private and supervised room, and (b) that I saw the relevant file before it should have been released under the statutory provisions which were applicable at that time.)

This incident is, to my mind, a particularly striking (though far from the only) example of a evidence supporting a point made by a UFO skeptic, Steuart Campbell: "In general, governmental agencies do not have the skill or knowledge to explain UFO

reports. But rather than admit this, they either offer ridiculous explanations or conceal information that would enable others to explain them. However, the secrecy involved gives the impression that something important is being concealed, fuelling the UFO myth. Governments are victims of their own preoccupation with secrecy." [23]

Criticisms have also been made by numerous other skeptics, including Carl Sagan. He has made the following comment in relation to the classification of UFO reports: "The armed forces have a tendency to classify everything in sight. Then the fact that such cases are classified starts rumours. Somebody who is in a position to know realizes the Air Force does have relevant data; and it is just a short step to the idea of official conspiracy to suppress the truth. Had the data not been classified, then independent scientific judgments would have been possible. In many cases, such independent scientific analysis would show that the cases have a natural explanation. The culprit is classification. I have a friend who says that in America today if you're not a little paranoid you're out of your mind. The military has a responsibility not to add further to the paranoia". [61]

Conclusion

Even on a preliminary review of its content, numerous severe flaws in the Condign Report can be readily identified.

As stated above, the severe flaws in the Condign Report highlighted below do not mean that the plasma theory (or any other theory) is necessarily wrong, and they certainly do not mean that the claims that extraterrestrials are visiting Earth are true. Publications of such sloppy quality give skepticism a bad name.

The Condign Report contains several statements which seek to make virtues out of its vices. For example, the report fails to refer to many of the specific cases (British and foreign) that ufologists may have hoped to see dealt with. Even if that expectation were restricted to cases which had occurred within Britain (or restricted even further to cases that were reported to the Ministry of Defence), it is an expectation which will be disappointed upon reading the report. The Executive Summary does not refer to even one specific case. More surprising, the hundreds of pages in Volumes 1, 2 and 3 are almost as completely devoid of reference to specific cases. However, the report seeks to make a virtue out of this, by stating: "Every effort has been made to take a wide systems approach, to avoid over-focusing on single events" (see Volume 1, Preface, page ii, penultimate para).

After reading over 100 pages of material, the reader is finally rewarded with a comment on a specific well known case. That comment relates to the best known recent British UFO case, the Rendlesham Forest incident. The MOD's file on the incident has been released to the public and is available on its website. That incident has been discussed in dozens of books (by skeptics and pro-ETHers) and has been the subject of several complete books. The relevant comment (in full) from the Condign Report is as follows "The well-reported Rendlesham Forest/Bentwaters event is an example where it might be postulated that several observers were probably exposed to UAP radiation for longer than normal UAP sighting periods. There may be other cases which remain unreported. It is clear that the recipients of these effects are not aware that their behaviour/perception of what they are observing is being modified" (Volume 2, Working Paper 1, Annex F, page F-4, para 13).

It is disappointing that media reporting of the initial release of the report did not refer to many of the above problems. At the time of writing, it remains to be seen whether the media spotlight will return to the report when the full document is made available on Monday 15 May 2006 - but I am not optimistic about the prospects of such coverage. The media spotlight has moved on.

The EMP Team are, of course, not responsible for the content of the relevant media reports. However, in an ideal world, it would have been desirable for the report to have been provided in

confidence to some researchers that held opposing views prior to the release of the report to the media. In this way, when the media turned its spotlight on issues relating to this report it would have been possible to obtain informed and considered comment from individuals holding differing views. It is unfortunate (albeit understandable) that they did not feel able to share the report in this way.

On balance, I think the content (or rather the lack of content) of the Condign Report will have a positive effect on ufology (at least in the UK).

The EMP Team deserve the gratitude of the ufological community for obtaining this material. The report provides an excellent opportunity for ufologists to put forward a case for scientists to look at the relevant data. It remains to be seen whether this opportunity will be grasped or (like most opportunities presented to ufology) merely squandered.

The theory advanced in the Condign Report is certainly not the final nail in ufology's coffin. It is a rather old and rusty nail...

Footnotes:

[1] The MOD announcement is at:

<http://tinyurl.com/nwwap>

[3] The relevant Nature news item is online at:

<http://www.nature.com/news/2006/060508/full/060508-6.html>

[5] McDonald, James E in the Roush Hearing (the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics "Symposium on Unidentified Flying Objects" on 1968.0729) at page 26 of the transcript of the Ninetieth Congress, Second Session, Number 7. Edited and annotated transcript presented by Fuller, John in his "Aliens in the Skies" (1969). Complete transcript available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/ufosymposium/contents.html>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/symposium/contents.html>

[6] The relevant documents can be viewed at the link below (or purchased on CD from the same website):

<http://www.bluebookarchive.org/browse.aspx>

[7] See <http://www.bluebookarchive.org>

[8] A list of Project Blue Book "unknowns" prepared by Don Berliner is online at:

<http://www.nicap.org/bluebook/unknowns.htm>

[9] Koi Chrono Core is a 1,800 page UFO Chronology (much of which is taken up with references) that I have circulated in draft on the Internet for anyone to download free of charge. The first link (below) is to a zipped Word copy of the full Chronology which is about 1.6 Mb: <http://tinyurl.com/re7ae>
[http://koi.com.virtuallystrange.net/Koi%2520Chrono%2520Core/koi_chronocoreh.zip]

The next link (below) is to an unzipped copy of the same Word document. This is quite a bit bigger, so I wouldn't recommend trying this one unless you have a rather fast internet connection and don't have unzipping software (or if you, like me until recently, don't know what zipped files are). It is about 9.1 Mb: <http://tinyurl.com/oahe7>
[<http://koi.com.virtuallystrange.net/Koi%2520Chrono%2520Core/koi%2520chronocore.doc>]

[10] The list of Project Blue Book "unknowns" is the basis of an interesting project by Brad Sparks. Brad has annotated many of the "unknowns" with basic details and references. This is a valuable resource if you are researching the list of "unknowns". See: <http://www.nicap.org/bluebook/CufosBBUnknowns.doc>

[11] Reprinted in "UFOs - Identified" at pages 55-56 (in Chapter 7) of the Random House hardback edition.

[22] Sagan, Carl in his "The Demon Haunted World" (1997) at page 84 (in Chapter 5) of the Headline softcover edition

[23] Campbell, Steuart in his book "The UFO Mystery Solved" (1994) at page 184 (in Chapter 12) of the Explicit Books softcover edition.

[24] Park, Robert in his book "Voodoo Science" (2000) at page 181 (in Chapter 9) of the Oxford University Press hardcover edition .

[26] Condon Report ("Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects", Edward U Condon (Director) and Daniel S Gillmor (Editor) (1969)) at pages 871, 874-876, 877 (in Section 5, Chapter 2 "UFOs: 1947-1968", by Edward U Condon) of the uncorrected version submitted to the Air Force (with the same page numbering in the 3 volume paperback edition distributed by the National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce), at pages 520, 522-524 of the Vision hardback edition (with the same page numbering in the Bantam paperback edition). The first of these editions has the same page numbering as the edition available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/condon/text/contents.htm>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/condon/contents.html>

[30] Stanton, L Jerome in his "Flying Saucers : Hoax or Reality?" (1966) at page 98 (in Chapter 6) of the Belmont paperback edition.

[31] Stanton, L Jerome in his "Flying Saucers : Hoax or Reality?" (1966) at page 149 (in Chapter 9) of the Belmont paperback edition.

[32] Greenfield, Irving in his "The UFO Report" (1967) at pages 122-123 (in Chapter 14), 136 (in Chapter 16) of the Lancer paperback edition.

[37] Lloyd Mallan in "The Official Guide to UFOs" (1968) (edited by the editors of Science & Mechanics) at page 124 (in unnumbered chapter entitled "What Happened at Wanaque, N. J.?") of the Ace paperback edition.

[38] Ruppelt, Edward J in his "The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects" (1956) at pages 130-131 (in Chapter 10) of the original 17 chapter Doubleday hardback edition, at pages 175-176 of the Gollancz hardback edition, at page 174 of the Ace paperback edition, at pages 130-131 of the 1959 revised Doubleday 20 chapter hardback edition, at page 93 of the reprinted Source Books softcover edition. The first of these editions (i.e. the original 17 chapter hardback edition) has the same page numbering as the version available free online at:

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/Rufo.htm>

[40] For discussion of "UFOs - Identified" by Philip J Klass and/or his plasma theory, see:

(a) Barry, Bill in his "Ultimate Encounter" (1978) at pages 174-179 (in Chapter 14) of the Corgi paperback edition.

(b) Clark, Jerome in his "The UFO Book: Encyclopedia of the Extraterrestrial" (1998) at page 369 (in an entry entitled "McDonald, James Edward (1920-1971)") of the Visible Ink Press softcover edition.

(c) Clark, Jerome in his "The UFO Encyclopedia: 1st edition: Volume 3 - High Strangeness" (1996) at page 298 (in an entry entitled "McDonald, James Edward (1920-1971)") of the Omnigraphics hardback edition.

(d) Condon Report ("Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects", Edward U Condon (Director) and Daniel S Gillmor (Editor) (1969)) at pages 1190-1194 (in Section 6, Chapter 7 "Atmospheric Electricity and Plasma Interpretations of UFOs", by Martin D Altschuler) of the uncorrected version submitted to the Air Force (with the same page numbering in the 3 volume

paperbound edition distributed by the National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce) at pages 748-750 of the Vision hardback edition (with the same page numbering in the Bantam paperback edition). The first of these editions has the same page numbering as the edition available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/condon/text/contents.htm>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/condon/contents.html>

(e) Erskine, Allen Louis in his "Why Are They Watching Us?" (1967) at pages 108-109 (in Chapter 13) of the Tower paperback edition.

(f) Evans, Hilary in his "The Evidence for UFOs" (1983) at page 109 (in Chapter 6) of the Aquarian softcover edition.

(g) Fitzgerald, Randall in "The Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrial Encounters" (2001) (edited by Ronald Story) at page 622 (in an entry entitled "UFOs Identified") of the New American Library softcover edition, at page 608 of the pdf edition (with the same page numbering in the Microsoft Word edition).

(h) Fitzgerald, Randall in "The Mammoth Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrial Encounters" (2001) (edited by Ronald Story) at pages 744-745 (in an entry entitled "UFOs Identified") of the Robinson softcover edition.

(i) Fitzgerald, Randall in his "The Cosmic Test Tube" (1998) at pages 297-299 (in Section 4) with a one sentence summary at page 376 (in the Guide To Books) of the Moonlake Media softcover edition.

(j) Friedman, Stanton in an interview in "UFOs And The Alien Presence: Six Viewpoints" (1991) (Edited by Michael Lindemann) at pages 15-16 (in Chapter 1) of the 2002 Group softcover edition.

(k) Greenfield, Irving in his "The UFO Report" (1967) at pages 122-123 (in Chapter 14), 136 (in Chapter 16) of the Lancer paperback edition.

(l) Gurney, Gene (USAF Lt Col) and Gurney, Clare in their "Unidentified Flying Objects" (1970) at pages 116-119 (in Chapter 9) of the Abelard-Schuman hardback edition.

(m) Jacobs, David in his "The UFO Controversy in America" (1975) at pages 216-217 (in Chapter 8) of the Indiana hardback edition, page 192 of the Signet paperback edition.

(n) Klass, Philip J in his "UFOs Explained" (1974) at pages 94-95 (in Chapter 10) of the Random House Hardback edition, at pages 111-112 of Random House paperback edition.

(o) Machlin, Milt in his "The Total UFO Story" (1979) at pages 48-49 (in the Chapter 2) of the Dale paperback edition.

(p) Mallan, Lloyd in "The Official Guide to UFOs" (1968) (edited by the editors of Science & Mechanics) at pages 123-125 (in unnumbered chapter entitled "What Happened at Wanaque, N. J.?") of the Ace paperback edition.

(q) McDonald, James E in the Roush Hearing (the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics "Symposium on Unidentified Flying Objects" on 1968.0729) at page 26 of the transcript of the Ninetieth Congress, Second Session, Number 7. Edited and annotated transcript presented by Fuller, John in his "Aliens in the Skies" (1969), with the relevant extract appearing at pages 77-78 (in Chapter 2) of the Putnam hardback edition. Complete transcript available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/ufosymposium/contents.html>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/symposium/contents.html>

(r) Randle, Kevin D in his "The October Scenario" (1988) at page 135 (in Part 3, unnumbered section entitled "Solutions and Theories") of the Berkley paperback edition.

(s) Ritchie, David in his "UFO : The Definitive Guide" (1994) at pages 63-64 (in an entry entitled "electrical phenomena") of the MJF hardback edition.

(t) Rutkowski, Chris in "UFO: 1947-1987" (1987) (edited by Hilary Evans with John Spencer) at page 274 (in Chapter 4.3.2, entitled "UFOs as Natural Phenomena") of the Fortean Tomes softcover edition.

(u) Rutledge, Harley D in his "Project Identification" (1981) at page 246 (in Chapter 20) of the Prentice-Hall hardback edition.

(v) Salisbury, Frank in his "The Utah UFO Display: A Biologist's Report" (1974) at page 228 (in the Appendix entitled "The Literature of Ufology") of the Devin Adair hardback edition.

(w) Schnabel, Jim in his "Dark White" (1994) at pages 93-96 (in Chapter 6) of the Hamish Hamilton softcover edition.

(z) Sheaffer, Robert in his "The UFO Verdict" (1980) at page 209 (in Chapter 20) of the Prometheus softback edition.

(y) Sheaffer, Robert in his "UFO Sightings: The Evidence" (1998) at page 270 (in Chapter 19) of the Prometheus hardback edition.

(z) Stanton, L Jerome in his "Flying Saucers : Hoax or Reality?" (1966) at pages 20-21 (in Chapter 1), 98 (in Chapter 6), 149 (in Chapter 9) of the Belmont paperback edition.

(aa) Steiger, Brad in his "Project Blue Book" (1976) at page 337 (forming part of Chapter 13) of the Ballantine Books paperback edition.

(bb) Strickland, Joshua in his "Extra-terrestrials on Earth" (1977) at pages 66-69 (in Chapter 5) of the Granada softcover edition.

(cc) Time-Life (Editors of) in "The UFO phenomenon: Mysteries of the Unknown" (1987) at pages 104-106 (in Chapter 3) of the Time-Life Book hardback edition.

(dd) Vesco, Renato in his "Intercept Ufo" (Formerly published as "Intercept - But Don't Shoot") (1971) at page 331 (in Chapter 10) of the Zebra paperback edition.

[41] Time-Life (Editors of) in "The UFO phenomenon: Mysteries of the Unknown" (1987) at page 105 (in Chapter 3) of the Time-Life Book hardback edition.

[42] Sheaffer, Robert in his "The UFO Verdict" (1980) at pages 8-10 (in Chapter 2) of the Prometheus softback edition.

[43] Sheaffer, Robert in his "UFO Sightings: The Evidence" (1998) at pages 23-25 (in Chapter 2) of the Prometheus hardback edition.

[44] Klass, Philip J in his "UFOs Explained" (1974) at pages 94-95 (in Chapter 10) of the Random House Hardback edition, at pages 111-112 of Random House paperback edition.

[45] Nickell, Joe and Fischer, John F in their "Mysterious Realms" (1992) at pages 178-180, 189-191, 209 (in Chapter 11) of the Prometheus hardback edition.

[47] For discussion of the Flying Saucer Working Party Report, see the following:

(a) Bruni, Georgina and Pope, Nick in an online article, on Nick Pope's website: http://www.nickpope.net/official_history.htm

(b) Clark, David and Roberts, Andy in an article entitled "Britain's Secret 'X-Files' Revealed", available online on their website at: <http://www.flyingsaucery.com/mod/comment.htm>

(c) Clarke, David and Roberts, Andy in their "Out of the Shadows" (2002) at pages 77-96 (in Chapter 6) of the Piatkus hardback edition.

(d) Pope, Nick in "The Mammoth Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrial Encounters" (2001) (edited by Ronald Story) at pages 241-243 (in an entry entitled "Flying Saucer Working Party") of the Robinson

softcover edition.

(e) Randles, Jenny in "The Mammoth Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrial Encounters" (2001) (edited by Ronald Story) at page 137 (in an entry entitled "British Government Interest in UFOs") of the Robinson softcover edition.

(f) Randles, Jenny in "The UFO Conspiracy" (1987) at pages 189-190 (in Chapter 31) of the Barnes & Noble hardback edition.

[50] Hill, Paul R in his "Unconventional Flying Objects : A Scientific Analysis" (1995) at 53-54 (in Section III) of the Hampton Roads softcover edition.

[51] The University of Colorado signed the relevant contract with the Air Force for the Condon report on 6 October 1966[see references for Koi Chrono Core 1966.1006], and this fact was announced to the press the following day [see references for Koi Chrono Core 1966.1007]).

[52] Roth, J Reece "Ball lightning as a route to fusion energy", PROC IEEE 13TH SYMP ON FUSION ENG. Vol. 2, pp. 1407-1411. 1989.

[53] Condon Report ("Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects", Edward U Condon (Director) and Daniel S Gillmor (Editor) (1969)) at page 1192 (in Section 6, Chapter 7 "Atmospheric Electricity and Plasma Interpretations of UFOs", by Martin D Altschuler) of the uncorrected version submitted to the Air Force (with the same page numbering in the 3 volume paperbound edition distributed by the National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce) at page 748 of the Vision hardback edition (with the same page numbering in the Bantam paperback edition). The first of these editions has the same page numbering as the edition available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/condon/text/contents.htm>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/condon/contents.html>

[54] Condon Report ("Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects", Edward U Condon (Director) and Daniel S Gillmor (Editor) (1969)) at pages 1193-1194 (in Section 6, Chapter 7 "Atmospheric Electricity and Plasma Interpretations of UFOs", by Martin D Altschuler) of the uncorrected version submitted to the Air Force (with the same page numbering in the 3 volume paperbound edition distributed by the National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce) at pages 749-750 of the Vision hardback edition (with the same page numbering in the Bantam paperback edition). The first of these editions has the same page numbering as the edition available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/condon/text/contents.htm>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/condon/contents.html>

[55] Campbell, James M in Chapters 3 and 6 of his book "Ufology". The text of the relevant book is available online at:

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/ufochap3.htm>

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/ufochap6.htm>

[56] Klass, Philip J in "The UFO Invasion" (1997) (edited by Kendrick Frazier, Barry Karr and Joe Nickell) at pages 34-40 of the Prometheus hardback edition (part of Chapter 2 at pages 29-43, "The Condon UFO Study"). The relevant chapter is a reprint of an article in the Skeptical Inquirer 10, number 4 (Summer 1986).

[58] The relevant Washington Post article is summarised by Whitley Strieber in his introduction to the Dell paperback edition of the "UFO Briefing Document" (1995) by Berliner, Don and Galbraith, Marie and Hunees, Antonio, at page 9 of the Dell paperback edition (Introduction).

[59] "Jenzano Makes Own 'Flying Saucers' at Planetarium", 17 April 1966, in the Morning Herald newspaper of Durham, North Carolina. The relevant article is quoted by Philip J Klass in his "UFOs - Identified" (1968) at pages 68-69 (in Chapter 8) of

the Random House hardback edition.

[60] Friedman, Stanton J in the Roush Hearing (the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics "Symposium on Unidentified Flying Objects" on 1968.0729) at page 217 of the transcript of the Ninetieth Congress, Second Session, Number 7. Edited and annotated transcript presented by Fuller, John in his "Aliens in the Skies" (1969). Complete transcript available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/ufosymposium/contents.html>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/symposium/contents.html>

[61] Carl Sagan in "UFO's: A Scientific Debate" (1972) (edited by Carl Sagan and Thornton Page) at pages 273-274 (in Chapter 14) of the Norton paperback edition.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 20:19:46 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:09:33 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Matthew James Didier <matthew.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 19:06:43 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 8 May 2006 13:09:41 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

Again I thank you for a most illuminating look into a very similar field of inquiry.

I think based on a detailed reading of your observations of human nature and my subsequent reflection of such, I think you genuinely describe the population. Both fields show similar percentages of human foibles.

So I must modify my original supposition that ghost researchers are better than UFO researchers in that they are really attempting to gather real data in the field. You correctly point out that only a very small percentage of these ghost researchers offer any real advancements to their field. Even so, it seems the numbers of such field researchers in the ghost field are much greater than the UFO field.

One problem is the lack of application of scientific method and the attempt to document and gather enough data to enable replication of experiments by independent researchers.

>90% (if not more) ghost investigators/researchers feel they
>already have the answers... so why bother? They simply
>show what THEY have found.

So similar to the UFO field!

>>EMF detectors make sense from the standpoint that someone has
>>developed a theory that ghosts either are EMF phenomena or
>>interact with this world using EMF. I have not seen adequate
>>data either showing an EMF correlation.

>Can someone show me this original theory? Aside from the
>movie, I've not seen the original paper.

Good point. I will try to find it. Maybe its just some sort of urban myth or gaffer wisdom handed down to us.

>Worse yet, after watching for twenty-plus years of people waving
>EMF meters like they're ghost detectors, I've not seen any solid
>data... In fact, thousands of would-be ghost investigators seem
>to prove that, indeed, ghosts do not leave a trail of slug-like
>EM fields... nor do they cause any notable changes therein where
>they are located. EMF and ghosts do not seem to correlate at
>all.

It is odd. All it takes is a detector(s) placed at a spot(s) and the data stream being recorded (via audio output or strip chart or internal memory) and the data correlated to some image with a ghost on it. Throw in a thermal cam or evp if you want too! I

haven't seen it either!

>Unless you count Michael Persinger's work combined with Dick
>Wiseman's efforts on temporal lobe hallucinations when humans
>are exposed to high EM fields for prolonged times.

No I don't count them.

>>Again you are painting the entire collective group of ghost
>>researchers rather poorly. Sure, some are wack jobs and weirdos,
>>but there is a percentage of sincere folk out there. Those with
>>bad reps will get weeded out by word of mouth and not get new
>>cases to research.

>Herein lies the problem... the worst do not get weeded out...
>there is no peer review. The worst simply continue to recruit
>believers in their faith and bolster their lines of defence
>against those of us evil "questioners".

>The worst of the worst are also fueled by the media love
>affair with them... the media loves the 'spooky-boo' aspect
>and group like the SPRs and ourselves won't play those cards...
>Ergo: The worst hams continue to get media attention and
>therefore more followers.

>I entreat you to study this... and show me how 'wrong' I am...

>I've been doing this, online, for almost a decade and I have yet
>to see anything else... with extremely rare exceptions.

I think you are right and it is sad how similar to UFOlogy this
is.

>I would honestly estimate, based on my experience on ghost
>tours and visiting haunted locations for investigations, that
>perhaps 10% of the people that show up are more interested in
>the experience/knowledge... and 90% go to these things to get
>the [blank] scared out of 'em, or to "get a picture of a
>recording of a ghost"... The latter is usually not to expand
>the understanding of the scientific community or even society in
>general, like many UFO hoaxers, it's to profit from selling it
>or to "impress" their friends.

Ah, sad! Pretty depressing. Leaves me just wanting to
work on stuff on my own without telling anyone because
I don't want cretins involved!

>But, what about my concept of "capturing a ghost", which would
>be the only absolute proof/evidence that would be, supposedly,
>accepted by the hard-core non-believers? As I stated, if I did
>'capture' one, would it fly with them? Probably not.

I think you would have to capture it with enough scientifically
acceptable data streams as possible and be able to describe the
instruments/setup/sensors/ procedures in adequate detail to not
only allow review of your method/experiment/data but also allow
others to duplicate the results. Only with replication can one
gather enough "proof" to be scientifically acceptable. Cold
fusion is still trying to gather such data as are the gravity
canceling experiments, and these two are primarily 'easy'
physics experiments that are supposedly doable in a lab without
requiring something to drop by to help (a ghost or UFO).

>>I suspect that for UPP, one needs to gather stereo visible
>>light/infrared/ EMF images of the phenomena and/or perhaps
>>establish recordable documentable stereo audio(or whatever
>>wavelengths seem best) interactions with the UPP to determine
>>its source.

>And would that be enough?

>The best you could do with that is be able to say, "I took a
>picture of something that was undeniably there."

Identifying the spectra of the phenomena enable better
instruments and understanding of physics behind the phenomena.
Then perhaps it could be enhanced by affecting the fields.
Stereo imaging is very good evidence, but what is critical is to
be able to develop a data collection method that guarantees
replication of the experiment (given sufficient observation
time).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: Project Condign - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 02:15:35 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:12:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Project Condign - Reason

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 19:56:08 +0100
>Subject: Project Condign - McGonagle

>When the main body of the report is published I am sure that the
>contents will be ably picked apart by those of us able to
>recognise it's weaknesses, but I also hope that some will
>recognise the significance of the report on several levels:

>1. Sec(AS) and it's descendant DAS were not told about it - they
>had no "need to know".

<snip>

>there are comments
>within the report which show that there has been no "Global
>cover-up", that the British are unaware of any US efforts, and
>the US were unaware of DI55's activity in respect of Project
>Condign.

I have no reason whatsoever to believe that the British
government knows anything about US efforts, etc, but I have to
point out that the first statement above rather undermines the
second. If it is established that DI55 (or whoever) kept
information from Sec(AS), then it's equally possible that other
information was kept from DI55.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - McGonagle

From: **Joe McGonagle** <joe.nul-ufo.org>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:02:38 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:15:05 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - McGonagle

Hi Lan, List,

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming6.nul>
>To: UFOUpdates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 21:04:34 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

<snip>

>And thus UFOs die yet again. It seems like only a couple weeks
>have passed since their last demise.

>As a matter of fact, it was only two weeks since the Guardian
>article explained that the Internet did them in for good. I
>wonder how long they'll stay dead this time before they have to
>be killed off once more?

Your point is valid. I have in the past complained to the Press
Complaints Commission about the coverage of the topic in the
media, but my complaint was not upheld.

The media is a fickle servant. They seize on what they think the
public want to hear, and emphasise those aspects.

To be fair, how many times within ufology has someone said that
"revelation" or "disclosure" was imminent? Probably about the
same number of times that ufology has been dead and buried. Who
can we complain to about those instances?

Cheers,
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:24:44 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:17:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project - McGonagle

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 9 May 2006 10:10:53 +0100
>Subject: Re: Condign - The Real MoD UFO Project

<snip>

>I agree. Also, if the study was done without the knowledge or
>approval of the Secretary of State for Defence (as it was) then
>we can surely say the study was unofficial. It was done, it
>seems, by a small group of interested persons within the MOD.
>This would in no way make it an official study, any more than
>the infamous 'Estimate of the Situation' of 1948 was an official
>Air Force study in the USA.

Hi Christopher,

I disagree with you here. This was a departmental-level review of the data in order to determine whether or not the department (DI55) should continue to take any interest in UFOs (UAPs). They were not obliged to report their progress or conclusions to a higher authority, but simply to justify a change to or (dis)continuation of an existing internal policy.

Ministers very rarely get involved in the minutiae of their department's activities (to the cost, for example of Charles Clarke, who recently lost his post as Home Secretary due to procedural failings and inter-departmental conflicts within the Home Office).

<snip>

>How then can the MOD Condign report claim that 'most' of the
>sightings are due to this? Do they mean 'most' of the total
>number of UFO reports, or do they mean 'most' of the remaining 5
>per cent? I assume our press journalists have simply read a
>brief summary and written a 'summary of the summary', and made a
>cock-up in the process.

As will be seen when the full document is released, it is often unclear whether the author is commenting on the total of reports in the database, or the subset of them which don't offer a ready explanation. I took his comments in this context to mean most of the unexplained reports.

Cheers,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:34:44 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:18:57 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - McGonagle

Hello Stephen, List,

>From: Stephen Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 15:29:19 EDT
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

>In particular, I am sure we will be referred to volumes of gun
>camera footage from UK military chase planes sent up to engage
>UFOs sighted in UK air space. Since that has been going on for
>50 years, there will be ample such footage. It will be wonderful
>to finally have that kind of powerful evidence finally available
>to the general public. So, everyone get ready for the UK
>military chase plane gun camera footage.

I'm afraid that you are in for a huge disappointment then. There is no reference at all in the documents to such events. I am aware of only one example of gun camera footage that was held by the MoD which we are now told "must have been destroyed" since the MoD can't find it. What are your sources that suggest that there is more than this held by the MoD?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:35:26 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:20:45 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - McGonagle

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming6.nul>
>To: UFOUpdates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 21:04:34 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

<snip>

>And thus UFOs die yet again. It seems like only a couple weeks
>have passed since their last demise.

>As a matter of fact, it was only two weeks since the Guardian
>article explained that the Internet did them in for good. I
>wonder how long they'll stay dead this time before they have to
>be killed off once more?

Hi Lan,

Your point is valid. I have in the past complained to the Press
Complaints Commission about the coverage of the topic in the
media, but my complaint was not upheld.

The media is a fickle servant. They seize on what they think the
public want to hear, and emphasise those aspects.

To be fair, how many times within ufology has someone said that
"revelation" or "disclosure" was imminent? Probably about the
same number of times that ufology has been dead and buried. Who
can we complain to about those instances?

Cheers,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 14](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 15:54:39 +0200
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 14:24:19 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - Bourdais

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 16:54:13 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 May 2006 10:24:46 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

><snip>

>>... the only sensible line of conduct would be a policy of
>>gradual lifting of secrecy.

>>It is still my opinion.

>Well, it's been 59 years since the "modern" UFO age began,
>right?

>In that 59 years, we have had zero lifting of secrecy.

>So bring on the "gradual lifting." Haven't seen even that,
>yet.

Eleanor, and all,

It may be argued that there has been no lifting of secrecy so far,officially, from the US government. Although it remains to decide who is in position to give that "official" line. Is it the Pentagon, with a 1,000 pages book to explain that the Roswell officers were lured by balsa wood sticks, or the GAO which stated that "the debate on what crashed at Roswell continues"? Or President Clinton who said publicly that he "had not been informed" of a ufo crash at Roswell, thus suggesting that it could be true but he does not know? In any case, what we see, going on since many years, is a growing body of testimonies, which have of course to be evaluated, some being obviously more fragile than others. That's the situation in the United States, but please note that there are noticable signs of evolution everywhere. From that viewpoint, the new, negative, document from the MOD may just be a retarding element.

A positive evolution of public opinion may not be easy to evaluate, but it is probably a reality. To take just an exemple, there are now some twenty well identified witnesses for the extraordinary case of Minot AFB, October 1968. And one witness has even been shown at the TV program "Seing is believing". This is quite a change for public perception. On the other end, I know that same show was bad on Roswell and abductions. So it's a kind of uncertain situation, but my impression is that things are progressing a bit, at least at the level of public opinion. Remember this: the Berlin wall fell in one night because crowds gathered on both sides and nobody dared to fire at them. Nobody had anticipated that stupendous event...

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Pictures From Retro UFO Conference - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 12:15:08 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:19:55 -0400
Subject: Re: Pictures From Retro UFO Conference - Kasten

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 11:56:54 -0400
>Subject: Pictures From Retro UFO Conference In Landers

>Source: Bill Hamilton's AstroSciences.Info Site

><http://www.astrosciences.info/gallery.html>

>Pictures From Retro UFO Conference Landers,
>California
>April 29, 2006

>And other images...

>[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

Good grief, Dan Fry is still alive. The man has got to be at least 80 or 90. He introduced me to alternative concepts of time back in the 60s at a retreat at Mouweuduk(?sp), WI.

Thanks for the photos.

KK

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:23:08 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:39:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Miller

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 17:13:32 -0500
>Subject: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>Letters Under Our Door

>A review of Robert Nichol's Star Dreams, a revealing new Crop
>Circle Documentary.

>By Alfred Lehmborg
>www.alienview.net

>What about the fakes?

>Isn't it true that these strange constructions in our cereal
>crops are of human construction? Don't they have to be
>_entirely_ of human construction for the skeptic's position to
>have the required validity? Just ONE 'genuine' circle,
>consider, and the game afoot's altogether new!

><more>

><http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2005/09/letters-under-our-door.html>

Hello Alfred,

I have good news and bad news for you in the next issue of UFO
Review.

You'll have to wait another week or two.....

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 15:36:52 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:42:36 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 19:08:35 -0300
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

>Steve,

>When the MoD Condign report comes out it won't matter didly
>squat what it says, the damage is done. Regardless how
>ridiculous the "scientific evidence" is in the report, that
>won't make it into the press. But the original reaction by the
>press will linger and will be what is remembered.

>I have a copy of the NEW YORK Times report, it's just lifted out
>of the Sunday Times paper. There's a chance it wouldn't have
>travelled far in the United states but it went across the
>country in Canada and was reported in the Australian media.

>I have to wonder what the probative value of the Condign report
>will be as compared to the media's temporary blitz.

Hi Don,

I think my point is that the report thus far has little or no
impact for the general public. A report in the New York Times
that is really a regurgitation of the Sunday Times article
doesn't really carry that much weight, IMO.

Have we seen any followup stories by reporters, other than press
statements by a few skeptics and others that get promptly
ignored?

I've not run into one other person that was aware of this
report, and I'm not sure what damage has been done by it.

Since it appears there wasn't much very scientific about it, I
suspect it won't be worth much more than a mention in UFO
history.

Like the AA 'film' we have no identity for the author and the
data used for analysis was destroyed, but let's see what it has
to offer and then we can tear it apart as needed.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Bassett

From: **Stephen Bassett** <SGBList2.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 17:02:35 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:48:57 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Bassett

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:34:44 +0100
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>Hello Stephen, List,

>>From: Stephen Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 15:29:19 EDT
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

>>In particular, I am sure we will be referred to volumes of gun
>>camera footage from UK military chase planes sent up to engage
>>UFOs sighted in UK air space. Since that has been going on for
>>50 years, there will be ample such footage. It will be wonderful
>>to finally have that kind of powerful evidence finally available
>>to the general public. So, everyone get ready for the UK
>military chase plane gun camera footage.

>I'm afraid that you are in for a huge disappointment then. There
>is no reference at all in the documents to such events. I am
>aware of only one example of gun camera footage that was held by
>the MoD which we are now told 'must have been destroyed' since
>the MoD can't find it. What are your sources that suggest that
>there is more than this held by the MoD?

I must apologize for I am a willing participant in the unfolding
'age of sarcasm' which now sweeps the nation and is best
witnessed by the rise of Jon Stewart, Stephen Colbert, and Bill
Maher to cult, guru status. (Dennis Miller should be added here
for those to the right of center.)

I was being sarcastic but with a point. It is my view that the
absence of gun camera footage in quantity from all government
studies is de facto proof of the lack of sincerity of any study
done by the US or UK governments on the subject.

For six decades planes from all first world nations have been
sent up to intercept UFOs. As the Cold War developed the need to
film these encounters in order to prevent international
incidents grew with each passing year.

If the first world governments were in the truth business on the
matter of UFOs, such gun camera footage would be in every study
and available to the public.

Of course, the opposite is true.

America and the United Kingdom are not in the truth business.
They are in the 'we will do as we please', 'you are too stupid
to be informed', 'we know what's best', 'leave us alone',
'militarist', 'secrecy as aphrodisiac', 'if it moves, kill it;
if it doesn't move, classify it' business.

One's fate as a global citizen is to a degree determined by
whether the US or the UK simply pats you on the head with some

clever deception or runs a cruise missile up your ass.

All of which is to say that many more people need to reach a point where their tolerance for this insulting, wretched, destructive, vile charade is zero.

BTW: I am fully aware there are many nations which choose to conduct their affairs in vile fashion. I just expect a bit more from my own and from our good and close friend across the pond.

SB

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 17:25:46 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:52:02 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 20:19:46 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

<snip>

>It is odd. All it takes is a detector(s) placed at a spot(s) and
>the data stream being recorded (via audio output or strip chart
>or internal memory) and the data correlated to some image with a
>ghost on it. Throw in a thermal cam or evp if you want too! I
>haven't seen it either!

I saw one documentary of an oscilloscope connected to a pickup
coil in the vicinity of an apparition. The scope was videotaped,
which is another way to record activity.

The scope did show some bursts of activity which looked rather
anomalous, during an evening in which some sort of manifestation
occurred. The manifestation may have been simply sounds - I
can't remember now.

Was that faked?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

UFO Abduction Seminar June 3 2006 NYC

From: **The Intruders Foundation** <ifinfo1.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 17:42:38 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:57:52 -0400
Subject: UFO Abduction Seminar June 3 2006 NYC

Budd Hopkins' Intruders Foundation Seminar Series Announcement

Linda Cortile And The Brooklyn Bridge Abduction Case -

Latest Developments, Newest Disclosures, And An Update To The
Book Witnessed

Saturday, June 3, 2006

Mark your calendars! The Intruders Foundation will offer a presentation by Budd Hopkins illustrating the development of the extraordinary Brooklyn Bridge abduction case, as well as an extended dialogue with the central figure, Linda Cortile. Linda will be appearing to discuss her experiences, her subsequent intriguing contacts with the late Cardinal John O'Connor, and evidence that the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church has shown a surprising interest in the UFO phenomenon - a subject that was not covered in Hopkins' book Witnessed. The audience will hear the initial tape recording by a government agent, whose all-important first-hand account of Linda's witnessed abduction triggered the case investigation. Hopkins will also present taped excerpts from one of Linda's hypnotic regressions in which she describes the abduction as it unfolded.

There has probably never been an abduction case with so many witnesses to one or more aspects of the event, nor one that so clearly suggested an alien interest in earthly political matters. Several relatively unknown facets of the phenomenon, such as the "Mickey-Baby Ann" scenario and the power of alien cooption techniques, were clearly displayed, as well as a range of physical evidence, including an x-ray of an implant in place in Cortile's body.

Linda continues to receive occasional phone calls from the agent named "Richard," and Hopkins is privy to an ambiguous letter of denial from the "Third Man" which, in style and format, is virtually identical to the confessional letters Hopkins had received from him during the investigation. In the final part of the evening, Linda will answer the audiences' questions about the case.

We are hopeful that one or two witnesses whose eyewitness accounts were not included in the book might also speak briefly about what they saw on November 29, 1989.

If you are interested in the events of that fateful night, we urge you to reserve your place soon. Seating is limited. Doors open at 7:00 PM.

REGISTRATION & INFORMATION

The seminar will be held on June 3 at the new meeting rooms of A.R.E., located on the SECOND FLOOR at 241 W. 30th Street (between Seventh and Eighth Avenues), New York, NY. The price of the seminar is \$30 for non-members and \$20 for members of IF, seniors and students. Reservations must be made by telephone at 212-645-5278, and will be filled on a first come, first served

basis. Payment must be made in advance to secure the reservation. Make checks payable to the Intruders Foundation, P.O. Box 30233, New York, NY 10011. Book early! Only 60 reservations will be accepted!

On-street parking is generally available in the neighborhood. The seminar will begin at 7:30 PM and end at 10:00 PM. Doors open at 7:00 PM. There will be a one half-hour intermission, during which light complimentary refreshments will be served. A book table will offer books, videotapes and other material for sale to those interested. For additional information, call IF at 212-645-5278.

Hope to see you there!

The Intruders Foundation Seminar Series is presented in the interests of open-minded scientific learning and the free exchange of research, ideas, and theories. IF makes no specific claims or endorsements regarding any materials, views, or subject matter presented by our guests.

Want to know more about Budd Hopkins and his nonprofit scientific research organization, as well as past and future IF events? Please visit our web site:

Intruders Foundation Web Site: www.intrudersfoundation.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:12:00 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:01:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shell

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:44:27 -0400
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Light Travels Backwards?

>Source: PhysOrg.Com - Tilburg, The Nethewr lands

><http://www.physorg.com/news66582110.html>

>May 11, 2006

<snip>

>"I know this all sounds weird, but this is the way the world
>works," says Boyd.

That quote is worth its weight in diamonds! The more we learn about physics, the weirder it gets, and proves over and over that human ideas of 'logic' and 'common sense' are just so much imposed codswallop. The world works the way it does, not the way we want it to work.

I've thought for a long time that there ought to be anti-photons just as there are so many other anti-particles, and anti-matter. Symmetry seems to be an underlying principle of the universe.

Maybe one day we will shed our preconceptions and be able to see the universe as it really is.

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming6.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:09:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:04:51 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens - Fleming

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.nul-ufo.org>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:02:38 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

>>From: Lan Fleming <lflaming6.nul>
>>To: UFOUpdates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 07 May 2006 21:04:34 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO Study Finds No Sign Of Aliens

><snip>

>>And thus UFOs die yet again. It seems like only a couple weeks
>>have passed since their last demise.

>>As a matter of fact, it was only two weeks since the Guardian
>>article explained that the Internet did them in for good. I
>>wonder how long they'll stay dead this time before they have to
>>be killed off once more?

>Your point is valid. I have in the past complained to the Press
>Complaints Commission about the coverage of the topic in the
>media, but my complaint was not upheld.

>The media is a fickle servant. They seize on what they think the
>public want to hear, and emphasise those aspects.

>To be fair, how many times within ufology has someone said that
>"revelation" or "disclosure" was imminent? Probably about the
>same number of times that ufology has been dead and buried. Who
>can we complain to about those instances?

But only the relative handful of UFO "enthusiasts" ever hear
claims of imminent disclosure (probably just as well, proving
that there's a plus side even to censorship). But through the
gigantic megaphone of the corporate news media, the message is
repeatedly blared that Ufology is dead, and for the most part,
only that message ever gets through to the public to the
exclusion of all facts to the contrary.

From what I've read of its history, ufology in the U.S. actually
died for all practical purposes in 1967 with the publication of
the executive summary of the Condon Report. Before that date,
organizations like NICAP had the attention of important
Congressional leaders and were a real threat to the government's
management of UFO information. Some top scientists were
endorsing the extraterrestrial hypothesis, and some major
newspapers even dared to ridicule some of the Air Force's more
nonsensical debunking stories.

But after the Condon Report, channels of communication between
UFO researchers and Congress closed. Few serious scientists
would jeopardize their careers being associated with UFOs -
except for debunking them. And of course, the news media seldom
mention the subject except for the many announcements of its
demise.

While Ufology may be dead or nearly so compared to what it was
in the 50's and 60's, there is an underlying objective

phenomenon that hasn't gone away. This, I suspect, is the reason that many journalists feel the need to repeatedly perform what almost seem to be ritual killings of ufology: a magical ceremony designed to banish the evil spirits that still haunt the world, much to the chagrin of the modern-day equivalent of tribal shamans.

Before my words are misrepresented again, I have to stress for the benefit of Steven Kaeser that I am not proposing a conspiracy theory. Quite the contrary, I'm suggesting there is a sociological explanation for the worldwide phenomenon of shoddy news media coverage of UFOs. I'm not the first to suggest that we need a psychosocial theory of debunkery.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:05:10 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:07:38 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 23:58:42 +0100
>Subject: Valuable UK UFO Project

>The British Ministry of Defence ("the MOD") has indicated that
>on Monday 15 May 2006 it will be releasing the full text of a
>report entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air
>Defence Region, ("the Condign Report") on its website. [1]

And here is the Condign Report itself. Enjoy.

<http://tinyurl.com/kqll2>

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Harrison

From: Diane Harrison <aufor.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:44:11 +1000
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:40:10 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Harrison

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 14:02:10 -0400
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

Hi Don,

When the story broke in Australia I was visiting with Bill Chalker in Sydney. The ABC called and wanted to do a story for the 7.00 p.m ABC News Report.

They interviewed Doug Moffett of UFOR NSW and then came round to Bill Chalker's home to do his interview.

Don, the ABC only interest was to ask a UFO researcher to confirm that this MOD UFO Study confirmed all UFO sightings are now confirmed to be Plasma?

Doug Moffett told the interviewer what he thought of this British MOD Study, how ridiculous it was if it explains away all UFO sightings as being Plasma.

Bill Chalker was interviewed, it was a bit of a rough start for Bill as the interviewer only wanted Bill to talk about UFO photos and grab some UFO footage, which looked to us as an attempt by the media to again discredit the UFO phenomenon.

Bill Stood his ground informed the interviewer to do a proper interview about the British UFO MOD Study or simply get _no_ UFO images or footage.

Bill got his way, answered all the question re. Australia's Military involvement in investigating UFOs and what he's found in the military files over the years. He was finally asked questioned about this new British MOD Study.

ABC News report aired only 1 minute of Doug & Bills interviews, but in that minute Doug & Bill made it very pefecttely clear "not all UFOs are Plasma and not all UFO researcher agreed with this study.

I videoed Bills interview which took around 12 minutes which will be placed on Bills blog as soon as he's able to upload it.

>It was in the New York Times, Steve. The same BS as was reported >by the UK press and the Candian Press and the Oz press. UFOs are >just plasma balls.

>>The researchers that I tend to pay attention to have held back >>their criticism

>More like fiddling while Rome burns, if you ask me. But whatever >works for you.

Cheers Don.

Warm Regards
Diane Harrison/Forla

Director the Australian UFO Research Network
<http://www.aufor.com>

Co Editor
UFOlogist Magazine
<http://www.ufologistmagazine.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

The Condign Report Release & Media Coverage

From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:21:39 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:41:48 -0400
Subject: The Condign Report Release & Media Coverage

The MOD's formerly-classified UFO study, Project Condign, is now available on the MOD's website:

<http://tinyurl.com/kgll2>

To coincide with this, I wrote a two page article in today's Daily Express. Some of the previous media coverage has been decidedly negative about ufology, so I hope that today's more upbeat article goes some way towards redressing the balance.

The article isn't available online but I'll post it on my website later this week.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 12:34:20 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:45:04 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Hall

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:05:10 +0100
>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

>>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 23:58:42 +0100
>>Subject: Valuable UK UFO Project

>>The British Ministry of Defence ("the MOD") has indicated that
>>on Monday 15 May 2006 it will be releasing the full text of a
>>report entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air
>>Defence Region, ("the Condign Report") on its website. [1]

>And here is the Condign Report itself. Enjoy.

><http://tinyurl.com/kql12>

Isaac,

Thanks for posting this. It is very helpful. However, it is not the report itself. It is an Executive Summary of the report.

I have a fundamental question for Dave Clarke et al. Did they consult any academic atmospheric physicists or meteorologists about the alleged atmospheric plasmas? In fact, do we know the names and affiliations of any of the scientists who participated in the study?

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Where Are The Aliens?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:52:40 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:52:40 -0400
Subject: Where Are The Aliens?

Source: KUAT-TV - Tucson, Arizona, USA

<http://www.kuat.org/story.cfm?ID=578>

Origins: Where Are The Aliens?

Tues, May 16, 8 p.m.

Where Are The Aliens? explores the latest news in the search for extraterrestrial life and asks: Given that our universe is broadly compatible to life, where is everybody?

Though scientists have been scanning the skies for radio traffic from ETs, they have not yet found any signals. That's not to say there aren't alien civilizations or that simpler life forms such as bacteria don't exist beyond Earth. But so far, nothing has turned up.

As far as Hollywood is concerned, aliens have turned up, and it's interesting to compare our popular conception of advanced ETs with what is biologically possible. Biologist and author Jack Cohen points out that, contrary to the movies, aliens probably wouldn't be even remotely humanoid. Nor would they be colossal bugs or grapefruit sized parasites living within us.

"Where Are the Aliens?" examines where rudimentary life might be hiding out in our solar system. And Tyson catches up with one of astronomy's most exciting recent breakthroughs: the discovery of the first planets to be found outside our solar system. Detecting more than 100 of these brand-new planets over the last few years, astronomers have developed an ingenious technique worthy of Sherlock Holmes for deducing whether or not they might be suitable for life.

"The history of exploration of our own world and the universe beyond has been full of surprises," says Tyson. "There's nothing special about our Sun; there doesn't seem to be anything magical about our solar system or our planet. And the chemicals of life are abundant in the universe."

"Are we alone?," he asks. "Are we rare? Are we common? We still don't know. But we will."

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

I Live In A Triangle

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:00:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:00:37 -0400
Subject: I Live In A Triangle

Source: The Taunton Gazette - New Haven, Connecticut

<http://tinyurl.com/jco5u>

05-15-06

I Live In A Triangle

By Dino Ciliberti
Managing Editor

It's an area of 200 square miles.

This is a hot spot in Massachusetts for paranormal activity.

It's a place of Indian curses, ghostly apparitions, cattle mutilations, Bigfoot creatures and low-flying UFOs.

And I live right in the heart of it.

It's the Bridgewater Triangle.

Most of us are actually living in it too.

The triangle, not as heralded in folklore as the Bermuda Triangle, encompasses the Bridgewater, Raynham, Taunton, Brockton, Mansfield, Norton, Easton with Abington, Freetown and Rehoboth at its angles.

According to legend, numerous sightings attributed to the triangle include gigantic snakes, huge birds and creatures that leave 18-inch footprints and are known as Bigfoot.

A researcher named Loren Coleman first described this area in the 1970s, when numerous sightings of UFOs were reported.

In one report, two huge UFOs landed on Route 44 in Taunton in December 1976. Another one was spotted in Bridgewater in late 1997. And then came another report a year later of a UFO near Route 44 in Middleboro.

The main location of the triangle is what's called the Hockomock Swamp.

Native American Indians called it the "devil's swamp" because that's where spirits lived. It's a huge swamp too - at 5,000 acres one of the largest in the Northeast.

Several websites are devoted to this mysterious triangle and for anyone who is interested in the paranormal, the stories are intriguing.

Sometimes I find myself looking at the sky when I drive home at night, looking for a glimpse of light that might be a UFO. I'll catch a light off the pond near my home and wonder. The same goes with the nearby lake.

Could these reports be true?

Could paranormal activity be going on right under our noses? Or is it just folklore, stories passed down to send a chill down a spine and make us ask whether we are really alone in the universe.

Who knows.

But the stories about the Bridgewater Triangle put together by Christopher Pittman on his website explaining what is the Bridgewater Triangle is worth a read.

The swamp is really where paranormal activity goes off the charts.

That's where Bigfoot has been spotted many times, either entering or exiting the area. In 1970, according to legend, Bridgewater police and State Police used attack dogs to search the area.

But they came up empty.

Even as recently as four years ago came reports about UFOs.

They were reported as black helicopters. But those helicopters have also been associated with UFO lore since the 1970s.

Maybe the area is haunted? Some say it is cursed.

The triangle extends to Dighton where there is a rock that also has been reported to prompt paranormal activity.

Some of these paranormal chasers - or ghostbusters - have even stayed overnight seeking to unearth the mysteries of the triangle.

They have also come up empty.

We might never know whether these stories are true. But these legends are worth sharing and passing down over the years. These folklore stories help inspire and intrigue.

So maybe this 200-square-foot mile area is haunted. Maybe there's something special going on there that we yet to have our finger on.

We can only imagine. And that's what's great about these stories.

We can let our imaginations run wild.

dciliberti.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Aykroyd Unplugged On UFOs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:04:57 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:04:57 -0400
Subject: Aykroyd Unplugged On UFOs

Source: The Trades.Com - Adair Village, Oregon, USA

<http://www.the-trades.com/article.php?id=4335>

May 15, 2006

Dan Aykroyd: Unplugged On UFOs

DVD Review by R.J. Carter

Okay, I'll admit to being the sucker for a good UFO documentary. Much like the slogan plastered across Mulder's poster: I want to believe. After all, the universe is a very, very big place, and I just can't imagine God being one for wasted space.

But just exactly what makes Dan Aykroyd the go-to guy for paranormal phenomena? Did someone think his stint in "Ghostbusters" was for real? Do they think he has inside information because he married Kim Basinger in "My Stepmother is an Alien?"

Apparently, the connection is much more personal than that. And while I think Director David Sereda's parallels to Albert Einstein are a bit laughable, Aykroyd does have his own experiences. Some may recall that he hosted a show on SciFi channel called Out There. Through this, he made quite the list of connections. One day, he apparently made a connection that was a little too hot. He describes an incident that occurred while he was preparing to tape a new episode. He had stepped outside and was taking a phone call to come back for a Saturday Night Live skit. During this conversation, Aykroyd claims he was approached by the notorious Men in Black -- not Will Smith or Tommy Lee Jones, either, but the possible real magilla, complete with a large black vehicle. They watched him, he turned away, turned back -- and they were gone. Within seconds.

"Two hours later," says Aykroyd, "we were told we were not to continue taping, and the show was cancelled, and none of them would air. Was that an MIB experience?"

Fortunately for fans of Out There, there's the possibility of repackaging the show for DVD. But whatever would have become of the information that might have been disclosed that day may now never be revealed.

Would that the rest of this documentary were that interesting. Aykroyd is not the host of this documentary; nor is he the primary subject. Rather, Sereda has placed a couple of cameras around him and Aykroyd to record them talking while Aykroyd smokes. In between the bits of conversation, the viewer is bombarded with photograph after photograph, video after video, of streaky, grainy, or downright hoaxy photographs of unidentified lights and objects -- many of them shown over and over again, either for effect or for lack of having enough photos to provide an 80-minute slideshow. We get to hear

repeatedly from former astronaut, Gordon Cooper (always introduced as "American Hero", which all our astronauts are but doesn't really need to be hammered quite so squarely every single time) and his experiences in the fifties with UFOs. And we also see former Canadian Minister of Defense, Paul Hellyer, speaking out about the politics of alien encounters.

Aykroyd himself is asked about multiple dimensions, multiverses, and time travel, as though Sereda is hoping to channel Heisenberg or Podolski. Aykroyd mentions a handful of movies about alien encounters, such as "The Day the Earth Stood Still" and uses these as a basis for forming a philosophy of what aliens might want.

On the whole, however, there's nothing neither new nor groundbreaking in this DVD. If you haven't ever heard of Roswell, New Mexico, if you didn't see the news stories about the "Phoenix Lights", or if you simply don't have an Internet connection to browse through the hundreds of accounts and photographs on the web, then this documentary might grab you.

For those who are sceptics, there's nothing here to convince you. And for those of us in the middle, it's a great big, 'meh', difficult to sit through sequentially, amateurish in cuts, introductions, and the inability of the director to put any kind of linear quality to the topic thread.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:47:39 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:27:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:23:08 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 17:13:32 -0500
>>Subject: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>Letters Under Our Door

>>A review of Robert Nichol's Star Dreams, a revealing new Crop
>>Circle Documentary.

>>By Alfred Lehmborg
>>www.alienview.net

>>What about the fakes?

>>Isn't it true that these strange constructions in our cereal
>>crops are of human construction? Don't they have to be
>>_entirely_ of human construction for the skeptic's position to
>>have the required validity? Just ONE 'genuine' circle,
>>consider, and the game afoot's altogether new!

>><more>

>><http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2005/09/letters-under-our-door.html>

>I have good news and bad news for you in the next issue of UFO
>Review.

>You'll have to wait another week or two.....

Hey Stuart -

Forgetting for a moment that one can always wait for good
news... bad news does improve with age. It remains that I am not
required to believe, only that I can. I'm not an ideologue,
just your garden variety poet/warrior.

I anticipate your next issue with glee whatever the news. Any
items you want to share privately will be, of course,
appreciated and kept in confidence...

Some of the aggregate 'it' is fake... sure. Enough of it is
not.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 13:52:34 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:29:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 12:34:20 +0000
>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

>>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:05:10 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

>>>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 23:58:42 +0100
>>>Subject: Valuable UK UFO Project

>>>The British Ministry of Defence ("the MOD") has indicated that
>>>on Monday 15 May 2006 it will be releasing the full text of a
>>>report entitled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air
>>>Defence Region, ("the Condign Report") on its website. [1]

>>And here is the Condign Report itself. Enjoy.

>><http://tinyurl.com/kqll2>

>Thanks for posting this. It is very helpful. However, it is not
>the report itself. It is an Executive Summary of the report.

Sorry Dick , but it is indeed a link to the report itself.

Have a look.

The relevant page gives links to the Executive Summary, Volume
1, Volume 2 and Volume 3.

Similarly, the long e-mail (over 25 pages of A4 pages of typed
comments) I sent to this List on Saturday (the first email in
this thread) were my initial comments on the full Condign Report
(or at least most of it) - not merely comments on the Executive
Summary or the media reports about it.

All the best,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:38:57 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:32:11 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 17:25:46 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 20:19:46 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>>Subject: Re: UFO Vs. Ghost Instrumented Field Research

>I saw one documentary of an oscilloscope connected to a pickup
>coil in the vicinity of an apparition. The scope was videotaped,
>which is another way to record activity.

>The scope did show some bursts of activity which looked rather
>anomalous, during an evening in which some sort of manifestation
>occurred. The manifestation may have been simply sounds - I
>can't remember now.

>Was that faked?

Anything can be faked. But if we impose repeatability upon any
research (particularly done by independent researchers) then it
is less easy to fake (requires too many participants to join in
the deception).

But you are right, one data set of one event cannot prove
anything.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 16:01:12 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:34:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:12:00 -0400
>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:44:27 -0400
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Light Travels Backwards?

>>Source: PhysOrg.Com - Tilburg, The Nethewr lands

>><http://www.physorg.com/news66582110.html>

>I've thought for a long time that there ought to be anti-photons
>just as there are so many other anti-particles, and anti-matter.
>Symmetry seems to be an underlying principle of the universe.

Hi Bob

In the conventional formalism there is an antiphoton and the symmetry is complete. The photon and antiphoton come out of the theory as indistinguishable uncharged spin-one bosons. They would look exactly the same on any spacetime diagram, so the photon is considered to be its own antiparticle. The same is true for (say) a neutral pion.

Or are you are implying that some future novel physics will bring in a deeper underlying symmetry in which the notion of a distinction between photon and antiphoton acquires a meaning? If so then I probably agree with you.

>Maybe one day we will shed our preconceptions and be able to see
>the universe as it really is.

I don't know about that. We can't directly "see" a great many of the entities that populate physical theory, and that includes antiphotons obviously.

We can only see most of nature through the eyes of extremely rarefied mathematical theories, and theories are by definition preconceptions. Some of them pan out, some don't, in some cases it seems impossible to think of ways of observing any measurable consequences either way. But they are the stuff of science.

If there ever was a day when physics could be done by simply making naive observations of what nature is really like (and I don't believe there ever was) then I fear it has long gone.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

UFOs Exist It's Official!

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:41:48 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:41:48 -0400
Subject: UFOs Exist It's Official!

Source: The Ministry of Defence, London, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/fgeeb>

15 May 06

UFOs Exist - It's Official!

The MOD has today published the results of a once-highly-classified official investigation into the existence of Unidentified Flying Objects. The report concludes that UFOs exist - but are a mixture of natural and-man-made phenomena, rather than evidence of extraterrestrial life.

The report examines 'UFO' sightings collected over a 30 year period, to ascertain whether there is any evidence of a threat to the UK and to identify any potential military technologies of interest. The study was not conducted to substantiate the existence of extraterrestrial life-forms but we can confirm that no such evidence was found.

As for 'UFOs', or Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (they're not always objects), the report concluded that while people reporting sightings are often genuine, rational explanations such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, including meteors forming 'buoyant plasmas', can explain them.

The report concludes that none of the UFO reports the MoD received had any Defence Intelligence value and led to the decision in December 2000 that the Defence Intelligence Staff no longer had any need to continue receiving UFO sighting reports.

Under Secretary of State for Defence, Tom Watson said:

"I am delighted that the Freedom of Information Act has meant that this once Secret report has been declassified and made public. In a department where lives are literally on the line and we can't release every document we have, this is yet more evidence of the MoD's commitment to openness."

The study, titled Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air Defence Region, was conducted between 1996 and 2000 during a policy review into the handling of UFO sighting reports by the MOD. The report contains sensitive information concerning the UK Air Defence Region and was therefore classified Secret and given a limited distribution. Until the introduction of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, all government records were closed from public viewing for a period of 30 years after the last action was taken.

The report has been released now because MoD received a Freedom of Information request for a copy of the report. Embracing the spirit of open government, and despite the size (over 450 pages) and original classificatioOD staff have taken great care to ensure that the majority of this large report is made available.

There is a real an enduring interest in Unidentified Flying Objects. By far the most popular topics of FOI requests has been UFOs, followed by Recruitment enquiries; enquiries from staff; and historical events such as World War Two, the Falklands conflict and the Balkans. Recent FOI MoD releases on UFOs have attracted media interest from as far away as Japan.

[Thanks to Nick Pope 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Jacobs

From: Bob Jacobs <jacobs.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 11:20:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:43:41 -0400
Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'? - Jacobs

>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 09:29:11 -0700
>Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

>>From: Robert Jacobs <jacobs.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>,
>>Date: Mon, 08 May 2006 10:59:53 -0500
>>Subject: Re: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

>>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 06 May 2006 21:22:19 -0400
>>>Subject: The Warhead That Got 'Beamed'?

>>>Does anyone know if that military report of a test missile
>>>warhead, fired out over the Pacific some years ago and got
>>>circled in flight and 'beamed' by a UFO "tumbled into the
>>>ocean," or simply continued on its trajectory with the
>>>electronics disabled?

><snip>

>>My name is Bob Jacobs. I'm the one who, as a lieutenant in the
>>U.S. Air Force was in charge of the tracking site at Big Sur,
>>California.

>>I wrote the piece about this incident for the MUFON Journal. I
>>have subsequently written a rebuttal to "the debunkers" claims.

>>The fact is that the dummy warhead in question did not hit its
>>target at Eniwetok Atoll.

>>The story as I wrote it is absolutely true. It was verified
>>multiple times in letters from the late, retired USAF Major
>>Florenz J. Mansmann in whose office at Vandenberg Air Force Base
>>in California, I viewed the film.

>Hello Bob,

>As I recall, there have been some questions in the past on this
>List about the event. The main question, I think, is, how well
>did missiles fired to the West from the Vandenberg Base show up
>on film taken from the special telescope at Big Sur?

>If a missile and/or its fiery jet could be discerned well from
>that distance, a UFO many meters in diameter should show up
>better still, especially if emitting its own light of some kind.

Jim

From the Big Sur site we could see quite plainly the metallic
missile body. In fact as we acquired the missile as it emerged
from the coastal fog cover, the three-nozzle tail section of the
Atlas series missiles filled the frame.

We followed the missile through all three stages of powered
flight and had the dummy warhead package centered in the frame

as the anomaly appeared.

Bob Jacobs

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 13:22:54 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:46:39 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 15:36:52 -0400
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 19:08:35 -0300
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

><snip>

>>Steve,

>>When the MoD Condign report comes out it won't matter didly
>>squat what it says, the damage is done. Regardless how
>>ridiculous the "scientific evidence" is in the report, that
>>won't make it into the press. But the original reaction by the
>>press will linger and will be what is remembered.

>>I have a copy of the NEW YORK Times report, it's just lifted out
>>of the Sunday Times paper. There's a chance it wouldn't have
>>travelled far in the United states but it went across the
>>country in Canada and was reported in the Australian media.

>>I have to wonder what the probative value of the Condign report
>>will be as compared to the media's temporary blitz.

>I think my point is that the report thus far has little or no
>impact for the general public. A report in the New York Times
>that is really a regurgitation of the Sunday Times article
>doesn't really carry that much weight, IMO.

>Have we seen any followup stories by reporters, other than
>press statements by a few skeptics and others that get promptly
>ignored?

>I've not run into one other person that was aware of this
>report, and I'm not sure what damage has been done by it.

>Since it appears there wasn't much very scientific about it, I
>suspect it won't be worth much more than a mention in UFO
>history.

>Like the AA 'film' we have no identity for the author and the
>suspect it won't be worth much more than a mention in UFO
>history.

Steve,

On SDI, Saturday evening Stuart Miller mentioned that he had a
few dozen hits for newspapers in the United States. These picked
up on the Sunday Times article and other articles released in
the UK.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Anderson

From: Paul Anderson <paulanderson.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:31:44 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:48:36 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Anderson

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 12:34:20 +0000
>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

>Isaac,

>Thanks for posting this. It is very helpful. However, it is not
>the report itself. It is an Executive Summary of the report.

>I have a fundamental question for Dave Clarke et al. Did they
>consult any academic atmospheric physicists or meteorologists
>about the alleged atmospheric plasmas? In fact, do we know the
>names and affiliations of any of the scientists who participated
>in the study?

It appears that the whole document is indeed there, as Volumes
1-3 are listed in multiple links below the Executive Summary
link.

While I don't buy the idea of plasmas as the overall explanation
by any means, some included "admissions" are certainly of
interest, I think, for example (from the PhysOrg.com article):

"The report refers to UFOs as Unidentified Aerial Phenomena
(UAPs) and asserts that they pose little or no danger to
aircraft unless violent manoeuvres are undertaken to either
chase or avoid them. However, it does say that they have caused
fatalities in other countries where aircraft have deliberately
chased the UAP."

"The report states 'that UAP exist is indisputable... [they]
clearly can exhibit aerodynamic characteristics well beyond
those of any known aircraft or missile - either manned or
unmanned'."

Paul

--

Canadian Crop Circle Research Network
<http://www.cccrn.ca>

The Prairie Circular
<http://www.theprairiecircular.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 14:13:21 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 21:52:34 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:23:08 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 17:13:32 -0500
>>Subject: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>Letters Under Our Door

>>A review of Robert Nichol's Star Dreams, a revealing new Crop Circle Documentary.

>>By Alfred Lehmborg
>>www.alienview.net

>>What about the fakes?

>>Isn't it true that these strange constructions in our cereal
>>crops are of human construction? Don't they have to be
>>_entirely_ of human construction for the skeptic's position to
>>have the required validity? Just ONE 'genuine' circle,
>>consider, and the game afoot's altogether new!

>><more>

>><http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2005/09/letters-under-our-door.html>

>Hello Alfred,

>I have good news and bad news for you in the next issue of UFO
>Review.

>You'll have to wait another week or two.....

Hi Stuart,

I listened with interest to the broadcast on SDI, Saturday evening - Sunday Morning for you, of course - and Robert Nichol's remarks about his documentary which I viewed in Laughlin, Nevada a couple of months ago. This was a very well done documentary, visually pleasing.

I was perhaps less affected than others in the room [I didn't well up] because I can't really get around the basic difference between the Crop Circle Phenomenon and the UFO phenomenon; that being that today's technology still can't duplicate the capability of these UFO/UAP [other than the fact that they both move through the air] while we've had the technology for over 3 millenium-or more-to create crop circles.

The beginning of these crop circles stems from - and should not be confused with - the earlier trace cases that were attributed to landing impressions made by some object which had settled in a field or a swamp or wooded area. Ted Phillips has hundreds of these.

I like to look at the pictures but my interest quickly fades

after that. But it's not my area of interest so I leave the investigation of and theorizing as to whom and why, to others.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Anthony

From: Gary Anthony <garyant.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 19:09:20 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 22:14:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Anthony

[Non-Subscriber Post]

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 12:34:20 +0000
>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

Hi Dick, List,

Since having the complete report over 12 days, I have fielded out plasma relevant bits to at least thirty pertinent plasma physicists. So far, in a nutshell more than half won't even look at it and the other half, though providing some useful initial comments and resource information, are unwilling to have their names associated with the report. Before going on holiday David Clarke did have one or two academic journals express an interest in the contents of the report, we'll have to wait and see what these are?

On Jan Aldrich's P47 List I've already volunteered 12 negatives for the overall report but there are many other aspects of Condign which the UFO community needs to address and dissect. I would direct the reader back to Isaac Koi's original UpDates post on this thread as it broadly encompasses my views about Condign.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m14-012.shtml>

If readers go back to my initial post 'Important Breaking News' and read the first paragraph again they will note it is not solely the content or reasoning of the report which is curious but the background as well.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m06-009.shtml>

Here I would also refer the reader to Joe McGonagle's post at:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m13-009.shtml>

As well as fielding out portions for scrutiny, we compiled a directly referenced bibliographical list from Condign for the plasma and other examples that form various hypotheses in the report, in determining how relevant these papers are.

My own personal opinion is that all but two of the plasma concepts can be ruled out, based on poor data acquisition (rubbish in - rubbish out) and bad reasoning by the author of the report. The two which may explain some UFO reports are plasmoids as they relate to ball lightning phenomenon and a water based plasma mentioned at the end of volume 3. But since in the latter example Mr X doesn't apply sufficient technical information on how such a plasma is charged, it's just a novel and remotely possible notion. (Latter conjectures based on expert input). Personally, I've already been able to find grounded scientific papers which demolish both the ionospheric plasma and meteoric plasmas as they are hypothesised in Condign. (Most know that meteors leave a plasma trail, but not sufficient in electron density to cause the kind of regular sustained

effects that Mr X suggests).

For your perusal I am reproducing the Condign bibliography here, so you can all see how little scientific source material was used:

Volume 1

Intensity of Amnesia is Positively Correlated with Human Abductions& False Memory Syndrome Dittburger T.L. & Persinger M.A. Behavioural Neuro-Science Laboratory, University of Ontario. Perceptual & Motor Skills No 77 1995.

Chapter 4 page 8

Volume 2

RF Hazards Exposure Limits European Union Geneva 1995 Tech 3278-E.

Working Paper 1 F3

RF Energy. Deposition in a Heterogeneous Model of Man. Near Filed Exposures. M.A. Stuchley et al. IEEE Trans. Biomed Eng. Dec 1987.

Working Paper 1 F5.

Laboratory- Produced Ball Lightning R.K. Golka, Journal of Geophysical Research Vol 99 No D5 May 20 1994.

Working Paper 2 2-7

Smirnov B. M. Sov Phys. USP 35 650 (1992) and Phys Rep No 224 151 (1993).

Working Paper 2 2-10

Ball and Bead Lightning J.D. Barry Plenum 1980.

The Nature of Ball Lightning S Singer Plenum 1971.

Hydrodynamic Model of the Interaction of Ball Lightning with the Airstream of an Aircraft in Flight N. I. Gaidukov. Technical Physics 38(9) Sep 1993.

Ball Lightning Turner D.J. Phil. Trans. Royal Society, London 1994.

A Model For Ball Lightning Fryberger D. Ostfold College Norway Report No 1997:5 Part 1 (1994) Proc First International Workshop on ULAP, Hessdalen.

A Model of Ball Lightning As A Magnetic Knot With Linked Streamers. A.F. Ranada, M. Soler & J.L. Trueba. Journal of Geophysical Research. Vol 103 Sep 1998.

Working Paper 2 2-12, 2-13.

Oceania World Index, Johan van der Heijden 1996

Working Paper 3, 3-1

Figure 1. High Incidence of UAP Locations (J Randles) Working Paper 3, 3-5.

Discrimination of After-Images G.S. Brindley, J. Psychology 147 (1959).

Further Studies of the Positive Visual After-Images C.A. Padgham Opt. Acta. Vol 4 1959

Working Paper 4, 4-2, 4-3.

Radar Scattering From Dusty Plasmas LaHoz C, Physica Scripta 45. Univ. Of Tromso, Norway 1991.

Working Paper 5, 5-4.

Hyper Energetic Manned Aerospacecraft Propelled by Intense Pulsed Microwave Beam L.K. Myrabo. SPIE Vol 2557 (1995).

Propulsion of Small Vehicles using Millimetric Waves SPIE Vol 2154 (1994)

Working Paper 6, 6-5.

Lovell A.C.B Meteor Astronomy UP 1954 p248.

Working Paper 7, 7-2.

Flying Saucers & The Straight Line Mystery Criterion Michel Aime 1958

Ley Lines In Question Williamson & Bellamy ISBN 0437-19205-9

The View Over Atlantis J Mitchell SAGO Press 1969.

Various Figures from Paul Devereux s books. Earthlights.

Working Paper 10, 10-7.

British Geological Survey, Edinburgh.

Persinger, (as at Working Paper 25)

W Paper 12-2.

UK Military Low Flying Handbook (NATO Restricted) Edition 82 Dec, 1997.

A.I. Lazarev, State Optical Institute, All Russia Scientific Centre, St Petersburg 1997.

Cloud Study Ludlam and Scorer, Muray 1960.

Working Paper 13-5, 13-6

SIDC Brussels at www.dxlc.com/spolar J. Alvested 1988.

British Geological Survey, Edinburgh.

Geographical Variables and Behaviour Persinger. M.A. Laurentian University Canada (1983).

The Dent Fault System&. Underhill, J.R. et al Journal of the Geographical Society, London Vol 145 (1988).

Handbook of Geophysics and Space Environments Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories

Working Paper 16-3, 16-4.

Observing Earth Satellites Desmond King Hele. MacMillan 1983.

Working Paper 17-1.

Hypothesis on the Nature of Atmospheric UFO Mukharev L.A. Radiotekhnika Elektronika No 8 1991 pp1437-1443.

Working Paper 19-1.

On the Instability of the Ionospheric Plasma& Brovotto P & Maxia V. Il Nuovo Cimento, Italy 1995.

Working Paper 21-1.

Linking of Vortex Rings Aref & Zawadzki. Nature Vol 354 Nov 1991.

Working Paper 23-1.

Measurement of Charge Transfer in Sprite-Producing Lightning&

Cummer S.A & Inan U.S. Geo. Phys. Res. Letters Vol 24 p1731-4, 15 July 1997.

Full Wave Calculation of 30 VLF/LF Wave Fields Radiated from a Lightning Discharge Nemiroff et al. ISAP 1996 Proc 1996 Int. Symp. Ant & Prop.

Model of Red Sprite Optical Spectra Milikh et al. Geo Pages Res

Letters Vol 24, 15 Apr 1997.

Working Paper 24-3.

Enhancement of Temporal Lobe-related Experiences during Brief Exposures to Milligauss Intensity Extremely Low Frequency Magnetic Fields L.A. Ruttan, M.A. Persinger, S Koran. J of Bio-Electricity 9(1).

Differential Effects of Waveforms and the Subjects Possible Temporal Lobe Signs&. Magnetic Fields M.A. Persinger et al. J of Bio-Electricity 10 141-184 (1991).

Modifications of Semantic Memory in Normal Subjects&. Magnetic Field P.M. Richards, M.A. Persinger, S.A. Koran. J of Electro and Magnetobiology 15(2) 141-148 (1996).

Volume 3

Radio Meteorology Bean D.R. and Dutton E.J. US Govt Printing Office, Washington.

Chapter 1 page 2

Computation of the RCS of the Turbulent Plasma Cylinder Shi Jiaming et al. Inst. Of Plasma Physics 43rd Inst of State Ministry of Electronics PR China CIE Radar Conference 1996.

Chapter 1 page 4

Study of Plasma Formations in an Erosion Discharge Avramenko R.F., Bakhtin B.I et al Sov. Tech Phys 35 (12) Dec 1990.

A Conceptual Study of Stealth Plasma Antenna Kang. W.I. Radar M & Alexoff I. Plasma Science Laboratory, University of Tennessee.

Spherical Formations In The Atmosphere as a Physical Phenomenon A.I. Mesenyashin. Journal of Electrostatics No. 36, 1995.

Page A-6.

Best Regards,

Gary Anthony

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

British Skies UFO-Free For Last 30 Years

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 22:18:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 22:18:20 -0400
Subject: British Skies UFO-Free For Last 30 Years

Source: PhysOrg.Com - Evergreen, Virginia, USA

<http://www.physorg.com/news66919678.html>

May 15, 2006

British Skies UFO-Free For Last 30 Years

None of the numerous UFOs reported over Britain in the last 30 years was a flying saucer, the government said as it released previously secret defence files probing mysterious aerial sightings.

The declassified study - "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP) in the UK Air Defence Region" - concluded that such UAP do exist and are "usually described as coloured lights and sometimes as shapes".

"Very occasionally they are reported with sound and even with smell," it added.

But it noted that "reports occur because they comprise unfamiliar and unexpected lights, shapes and patterns, in the context in which the observer sees them. The phenomena occur on a daily, worldwide basis".

Man-made objects, such as airplanes, are also often mis-seen or are actually meteors re-entering the Earth's atmosphere causing "bouyant plasmas".

Rare weather, atmospheric conditions or other "barely understood" natural events could also be causes.

"There is no evidence that any UAP seen in the UKADR are incursions by objects of any intelligent (extra-terrestrial or foreign) origin, or that they represent any hostile intent," the unnamed author of the report said.

"There is no evidence that 'solid' objects exist which could cause a collision hazard."

The study, which aimed to assess whether Britain was threatened by UAPs and "should the opportunity arise, to identify any potential military technologies of interest", concluded there was "nothing of defence intelligence value".

But it warned Royal Air Force pilots, who are most likely to encounter such phenomena, not to try to intercept UAPs because of the threat of collision.

The report, marked "Secret. For UK Eyes Only", was made public following a request under the Freedom of Information Act.

c. 2006 AFP

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 16:21:36 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 22:21:37 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

>From: Stephen Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 17:02:35 EDT
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:34:44 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>>From: Stephen Bassett <SGBList2.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 15:29:19 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

><snip>

>>So, everyone get ready for the UK military chase plane gun
>>camera footage.

>>I'm afraid that you are in for a huge disappointment then.
>>There is no reference at all in the documents to such events. I
>>am aware of only one example of gun camera footage that was held
>>by the MoD which we are now told 'must have been destroyed'
>>since the MoD can't find it. What are your sources that suggest
>>that there is more than this held by the MoD?

<snip>

>I was being sarcastic but with a point. It is my view that the
>absence of gun camera footage in quantity from all government
>studies is de facto proof of the lack of sincerity of any study
>done by the US or UK governments on the subject.

>For six decades planes from all first world nations have been
>sent up to intercept UFOs. As the Cold War developed the need to
>film these encounters in order to prevent international
>incidents grew with each passing year.

<snip>

Like Steve Bassett, I'd like to know where the gun camera
footage is. We've all expressed interest in that puzzle. I know
there was/is footage in Canada because I've heard about it by
those who should know but can't-as usual-go on the record.

I also wonder if some of these released studies aren't
duplicates of the real thing. What if mirror projects were set
up with the same project names like Project Sign, Grudge, Blue
Book or The Coldign Project etc. but these were buried in
departments that didn't have to divulge anything? If a hint of
this report came out it would just be written off as the public
report while the good one never had to be released because the
owners could always claim, "We've been open with the report,
there it is; that's all we found."

This could be done very cheaply, two people fro PBB and one
person for the Coldign Project while the real money was being
spent in the Top Secret mirror project.

Going back to the gun camera footage, we know that's not all there is because there has been no release of those. There has to be gun camera footage and still photographic images. Pilots regularly photographed each other during interception mission when the Soviets tested airspaces. Same with the USAF /USN in or near China. Cameras galore. But gun camera footage was/is SOP on jet interceptions or pursuit of enemy aircraft.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Science Fantastic

From: **Stanton Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 18:46:31 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 22:28:10 -0400
Subject: Science Fantastic

Listers may be interested in the fact that I have been invited to appear with Theoretical Physicist, Michio Kaku on his new radio show Science Fantastic on Saturday, May 20, at 6-7 PM, Eastern.

Kaku, an expert on String Theory, had appeared in one of the few good segments on the 2nd half of the Peter Jennings Special on Feb. 24, 2005. It is ironic that Dr. Seth Shostak, one of the most prominent SETI cultists, will appear during the previous hour. The show is supposed to be on about 90 stations of of the Talkradionetwork.I understand that it is available on the internet via streaming.

From what I gather, Kaku thinks maybe 1 or 2% of UFO sightings can't be explained. I told the producer 10-20% would be closer to the mark. The Internet seems to show that he is also anti-nuclear, which I very definitely am not.

There will, I am told, be discussions and then call-ins as well. Could be interesting... not supposed to be a debate.

Any input from those who may have heard other comments he has made about UFOs 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 15](#)

Are humans 'Fit' For True Space Travel?

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 02:59:28 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 22:50:14 -0400
Subject: Are humans 'Fit' For True Space Travel?

Hello List

Reading 'Gravity' by Tess Gerritsen (which is weirdly prescient of 06's 'red rain & star jelly' and maybe mystery diseases), a different question arises: are humans 'fit' for true space travel yet?

We don't (publicly) have adequate technology - shielding against radiation & more physical impacts, even basic communications, nor have we achieved the physics that will allow effective travel &/or transfer.

Maybe more important, could we face the cold empty reaches of interstellar space, alone and unprotected from its forces - knowing that we're unable to run to the comfort of (our) planet's air, food & water, green grass & gravity?

For me that's a 'not at all sure' which probably means no - and think that goes for rest of normal humanity. However, if we find/decide that some folk are traveling space right now, what should that tell us about them?

Maybe -

a) if truly advanced (perhaps unrecognizable) beings:- that they've achieved the technology (indistinguishable from 'magic' remember) and the physics to travel safely and are therefore thousands of years - or even a million - ahead of us;

b) if not dissimilar to us in physiology and with near-recognizable technology:- that they're driven by unguessably strong motives (or rulers) - and are probably quite 'mad'.

From the 'human' perspective that is.

That's the organic ones of course, all bets off if they're non-organic.

Cheers Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:02:46 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 08:16:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Golubik

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 16:01:12 +0100
>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:12:00 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 13:44:27 -0400
>>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Light Travels Backwards?

>>>Source: PhysOrg.Com - Tilburg, The Nethewr lands

>>><http://www.physorg.com/news66582110.html>

>>I've thought for a long time that there ought to be anti-photons
>>just as there are so many other anti-particles, and anti-matter.
>>Symmetry seems to be an underlying principle of the universe.

>In the conventional formalism there is an antiphoton and the
>symmetry is complete. The photon and antiphoton come out of the
>theory as indistinguishable uncharged spin-one bosons. They
>would look exactly the same on any spacetime diagram, so the
>photon is considered to be its own antiparticle. The same is
>>true for (say) a neutral pion.

<snip>

It also worth while noting that a photo can spontaneously decay
into an electron-positron pair (particle and antiparticle).
Another way to visualize a photon is... as having a certain
handed spin, let's say left, but in order to observe it as an
antiparticle you would have to overtake it in order to observe
it having a spin of the opposite hand (rotation)... since
nothing travels faster than light in a vacuum, than we currently
know of, you can never observe a photon with the opposite spin
orientation.....

Viktor Golubik, $k's = c's$

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 08:19:18 -0400
Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

Have to ask.

For me it was the fact it was the only subject that made my parents and other adults run the other way and leave me alone for good stretches. Sometimes weeks on end.

If I wanted to stay up late and watch tv all I had to do was start asking about UFOs. The grandparents and others who had been through WWI and WWII and the elders who had been through the airship phenom of the late 1800s all gave me a wide berth when I brought up the subject.

Then when I was about 10 years old my parents got me another encyclopedia set that actually had a concise, well leveled section on UFOs. No big deal, just that one of the theories was that some were of extraterrestrial origin.

I left it alone and went on about life until 10 years later working on my first job at a newspaper. UFO reports would come in regularly from people I knew and trusted. None of them were offball to any degree. Just a wide array of races, religions, occupations. Got to be a bother after a while and then classmates in college were also discussing it.

I've seen UFOs very up close and wasn't interested. It's like an old saying that what you don't look for will surely show up.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Specific Cases In Condign Report?

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 00:14:35 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 08:22:59 -0400
Subject: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

I have been reading the just released Condign Report onr UAP in the UK - UAPITUK?

I haven't found the specifics of any one case yet, although I have found oblique references that suggest specific cases.

Poor UK. No hard evidence. Only a few landing traces.

Looks as if the main research effort amounted to a statistical analysis. They refer to "thousands" of sightings being converted from "paper forms" to computer format.

Hmmmm... Did they ever hear of Special Report #14? I guess not. So re-invent the wheel if you got the time and money.

Actually what I have read so far seems well written by one or more people who are able to bring many areas of physics and science to bear on the problem. Somewhat like the earlier Condon Report, this one takes up a lot of space with the descriptions of various types of "Candidate Explanatory Phenomena" (CEP) (A term I invented to refer to refer to hypothetical explanations in terms of known phenomena). The Condon report was a veritable textbook for mirages, radar, etc. This report seems not to be that detailed... but I haven't read the whole thing yet.

If anyone has located a particular case and its 'explanation'" in this 'web' of .pdf files please let me know what file it is in.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Chalker

From: **Bill Chalker** <bill_c.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 14:48:10 +1000
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 08:26:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Chalker

>From: Gary Anthony <garyant.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 19:09:20 +0100
>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 12:34:20 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

<snip>

>For your perusal I am reproducing the Condign bibliography here,
>so you can all see how little scientific source material was
>used:

<snip>

Hi Gary & List,

Examining the PDF files now available on the MOD FOA site it is notable that in the Volume 1 PDFs that Chapters 4 & 5 and annexes A thru E are missing. Presumably this is an oversight, but these are critical for a coherent analysis of the total report.

Given that Dave Clarke is on holidays, Gary I wonder if you can contact the MOD FOA people to get them to post the missing chapters and annexes.

Regards,

Bill Chalker
<http://theozfiles.blogspot.com>
www.thozfiles.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 11:23:46 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 12:48:04 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Miller

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 13:22:54 -0300
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 15:36:52 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 19:08:35 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>><snip>

>>I think my point is that the report thus far has little or no
>>impact for the general public. A report in the New York Times
>>that is really a regurgitation of the Sunday Times article
>>doesn't really carry that much weight, IMO.

>>Have we seen any followup stories by reporters, other than
>>press statements by a few skeptics and others that get
>>promptly ignored?

>>I've not run into one other person that was aware of this
>>report, and I'm not sure what damage has been done by it.

>>Since it appears there wasn't much very scientific about it,
>>I suspect it won't

>On SDI, Saturday evening Stuart Miller mentioned that he had a
>few dozen hits for newspapers in the United States. These
>picked up on the Sunday Times article and other articles
>released in the UK.

Hi Don, Steves,

To briefly summarise, Don and Steve Bassett were concerned that the Condrign report would have a negative affect on public perception of OAP's, sorry UAPs, whereas Steve Kaeser was of the opinion that the story received little coverage and would be ineffectual.

My own experience is this. The story has received very wide coverage internationally, and certainly in north America. This is bourne out by the evidence of my own eyes in researching news stories for my web site coupled with a very long posting that Dave Clark put up on UfologyUK in which he listed just some of the media outlets that had taken the story up. Even a pal in Conn. who has absolutely no interest in the subject whatsoever, sent me a news lead reference on it so it obviously crept across his radar somehow. There is no doubt that all the major networks in the States made reference to it somewhere within their media outlets.

However, I do agree with Steve K that the story has had little

negative impact on public opinion as can be seen and determined so far. Again from personal experience; I had lunch with a local senior journo last week, at the height of the brouha, and we must have talked about it for all of 30 seconds. He wasn't that interested.

If anything, it has had the affect of actually rekindling curiosity and interest in the subject and may well turn out in the end, with the benefit of hindsight, to have had a positive impact.

I cannot though agree with Steve K when he says that the report will turn out to be not worth much more than a mention in UFO history.

Any government enquiry into UFOs is significant, particularly when it is done in secret, unlike Condon et al. And particularly when it comes from an organisation that for years denied any interest whatsoever and would collectively roll its eyes at the mere mention of. There is no doubt that this is a very important document regardless of its conclusions. And who knows what it might be a spring board for in the future?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 11:40:37 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 12:49:57 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Miller

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 07:47:39 -0500
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:23:08 +0100 (BST)
>>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 17:13:32 -0500
>>>Subject: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>>Letters Under Our Door

>><http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2005/09/letters-under-our-door.html>

>>I have good news and bad news for you in the next issue of
>UFO Review.

>>You'll have to wait another week or two.....

>Hey Stuart -

>Forgetting for a moment that one can always wait for good
>news... bad news does improve with age. It remains that I am
>not required to believe, only that I can. I'm not an
>ideologue, just your garden variety poet/warrior.

>I anticipate your next issue with glee whatever the news. Any
>items you want to share privately will be, of course,
>appreciated and kept in confidence...

>Some of the aggregate 'it' is fake... sure. Enough of it is
>not.

Hi Alfred,

What is contained in the next issue of UFO Review is not new;
it's been out there for a while now and remains by and large
deliberately ignored or just overlooked.

Basically, anything more than a swirl and you can pretty much
forget it.

But... it's not straight forward and it sure is damn weird. One
mystery removed, another steps up.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Science Fantastic - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 03:39:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:16:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Science Fantastic - Kaeser

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 18:46:31 -0300
>Subject: Science Fantastic

>Listeners may be interested in the fact that I have been invited to
>appear with Theoretical Physicist, Michio Kaku on his new radio
>show Science Fantastic on Saturday, May 20, at 6-7 PM, Eastern.

>Kaku, an expert on String Theory, had appeared in one of the few
>good segments on the 2nd half of the Peter Jennings Special on Feb.
>24, 2005. It is ironic that Dr. Seth Shostak, one of the most
>prominent SETI cultists, will appear during the previous hour. The
>show is supposed to be on about 90 stations of of the
>Talkradionetwork.I understand that it is available on the internet
>via streaming.

>>From what I gather, Kaku thinks maybe 1 or 2% of UFO sightings
>can't be explained. I told the producer 10-20% would be closer to
>the mark. The Internet seems to show that he is also anti- nuclear,
>which I very definitely am not.

>There will, I am told, be discussions and then call-ins as well.
>Could be interesting... not supposed to be a debate.

>Any input from those who may have heard other comments he has made
>about UFOs would be appreciated.

Hi Stan,

Dr. Kaku appeared on a scientific panel sponsored by the Sci-Fi
Channel and the Coalition for Freedom of Information in
Washington DC in 2002 and you can find a link to his talk on
interstellar propulsion at:

<http://www.freedomofinfo.org/science.html>

This should be right up your alley.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 04:40:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:16:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:23:08 +0100 (BST)
>>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 17:13:32 -0500
>>>Subject: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

<snip>

>Hey Stuart -

>Forgetting for a moment that one can always wait for good
>news... bad news does improve with age.

<snip>

My apologies -- bad news does NOT improve with age...

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.miller4.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 11:23:46 +0100 (BST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:17:14 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Miller

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 13:22:54 -0300
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 15:36:52 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 19:08:35 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>><snip>

>>I think my point is that the report thus far has little or no
>>impact for the general public. A report in the New York Times
>>that is really a regurgitation of the Sunday Times article
>>doesn't really carry that much weight, IMO.

>>Have we seen any followup stories by reporters, other than
>>press statements by a few skeptics and others that get
>>promptly ignored?

>>I've not run into one other person that was aware of this
>>report, and I'm not sure what damage has been done by it.

>>Since it appears there wasn't much very scientific about it,
>>I suspect it won't

>On SDI, Saturday evening Stuart Miller mentioned that he had a
>few dozen hits for newspapers in the United States. These
>picked up on the Sunday Times article and other articles
>released in the UK.

Hi Don, Steves,

To briefly summarise, Don and Steve Bassett were concerned that the Condrign report would have a negative affect on public perception of OAP's, sorry UAPs, whereas Steve Kaeser was of the opinion that the story received little coverage and would be ineffectual.

My own experience is this. The story has received very wide coverage internationally, and certainly in north America. This is bourne out by the evidence of my own eyes in researching news stories for my web site coupled with a very long posting that Dave Clark put up on UfologyUK in which he listed just some of the media outlets that had taken the story up. Even a pal in Conn. who has absolutely no interest in the subject whatsoever, sent me a news lead reference on it so it obviously crept across his radar somehow. There is no doubt that all the major networks in the States made reference to it somewhere within their media outlets.

However, I do agree with Steve K that the story has had little

negative impact on public opinion as can be seen and determined so far. Again from personal experience; I had lunch with a local senior journo last week, at the height of the brouha, and we must have talked about it for all of 30 seconds. He wasn't that interested.

If anything, it has had the affect of actually rekindling curiosity and interest in the subject and may well turn out in the end, with the benefit of hindsight, to have had a positive impact.

I cannot though agree with Steve K when he says that the report will turn out to be not worth much more than a mention in UFO history.

Any government enquiry into UFOs is significant, particularly when it is done in secret, unlike Condon et al. And particularly when it comes from an organisation that for years denied any interest whatsoever and would collectively roll its eyes at the mere mention of. There is no doubt that this is a very important document regardless of its conclusions. And who knows what it might be a spring board for in the future?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 08:05:08 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:19:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shell

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 16:01:12 +0100
>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>Or are you are implying that some future novel physics will
>bring in a deeper underlying symmetry in which the notion of a
>distinction between photon and antiphoton acquires a meaning? If
>so then I probably agree with you.

Yes, that's exactly what I was implying. Good to know you probably agree with me.

>>Maybe one day we will shed our preconceptions and be able to see
>>the universe as it really is.

>I don't know about that. We can't directly "see" a great many of
>the entities that populate physical theory, and that includes
>antiphotons obviously.

I was using "see" in a very broad sense. We see through grand experiments and verifiable theories, not just with our eyes. Perhaps I should have said "understand" rather than "see".

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Are humans 'Fit' For True Space Travel? -

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 08:20:08 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:44:44 -0400
Subject: Re: Are humans 'Fit' For True Space Travel? -

>From: **Ray Dickenson** <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 02:59:28 +0100
>Subject: Are humans 'Fit' For True Space Travel?

<snip>

Hi Ray,

Yes, it's a bit disappointing to learn that the human body is really not up to space travel, as described in science fiction literature during the past century. Of course, I also remember an old film shown in my elementary school that showed how astronauts would have to wear a lot of fur covered clothing to stay warm in the cold of space. Of course, they hadn't figured out there wasn't an atmosphere yet, which was a more serious hurdle (IMO), but it's been a real learning curve for us poor dumb humans.

But if one is to assume that the technology to travel lightyears is possible, then one could also assume that control of the internal environment would have to be true as well. I don't think it really matters what type life form it is, since the primal forces of the Universe (primarily in the form of raw radiation) would tear at almost anything. And in the long run if civilization reached into space, then pockets of it will likely develop without direct knowledge of Earth (which is another science fiction thread that's been used several times).

Our perspective is extremely narrow in the broad scheme of the Universe, and even many of our cherished theories of the past century are being re-written as new information is made available. But until we achieve some form of artificial gravity and also develop appropriate shielding against errant radiation, man is very limited in the amount of space travel he can safely achieve.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:37:28 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:46:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 00:14:35 -0400
>Subject: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>I have been reading the just released Condign Report onr UAP in
>the UK - UAPITUK?

>I haven't found the specifics of any one case yet, although I
>have found oblique references that suggest specific cases.

<snip>

Hi Bruce,

See the long email I sent to this List on Saturday (giving my initial comments on the Executive Summary, Volume 1, Volume 3 and most of the more interesting Workinh Papers in Volume 2) at:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m14-012.shtml>

Just before the footnotes in my email is a section entitled "Conclusions", which includes some relevant comments. For ease of reference, I stated the following:

"The Condign Report contains several statements which seek to make virtues out of its vices. For example, the report fails to refer to many of the specific cases (British and foreign) that ufologists may have hoped to see dealt with. Even if that expectation were restricted to cases which had occurred within Britain (or restricted even further to cases that were reported to the Ministry of Defence), it is an expectation which will be disappointed upon reading the report. The Executive Summary does not refer to even one specific case. More surprising, the hundreds of pages in Volumes 1, 2 and 3 are almost as completely devoid of reference to specific cases. However, the report seeks to make a virtue out of this, by stating: "Every effort has been made to take a wide systems approach, to avoid over-focusing on single events" (see Volume 1, Preface, page ii, penultimate para)."

"After reading over 100 pages of material, the reader is finally rewarded with a comment on a specific well known case. That comment relates to the best known recent British UFO case, the Rendlesham Forest incident. The MOD's file on the incident has been released to the public and is available on its website. That incident has been discussed in dozens of books (by skeptics and pro-ETHers) and has been the subject of several complete books. The relevant comment (in full) from the Condign Report is as follows "The well-reported Rendlesham Forest/Bentwaters event is an example where it might be postulated that several observers were probably exposed to UAP radiation for longer than normal UAP sighting periods. There may be other cases which remain unreported. It is clear that the recipients of these effects are not aware that their behaviour/perception of what they are observing is being modified" (Volume 2, Working Paper 1, Annex F, page F-4, para 13)."

All the best,
Isaac

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 14:19:55 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:48:55 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Koi

>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 14:48:10 +1000
>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

<snip>

>Examining the PDF files now available on the MOD FOA site it is
>noteable that in the Volume 1 PDFs that Chapters 4 & 5 and
>annexes A thru E are missing.

<snip>

Hi Bill,

As are pages 39-53 of Chapter 3 of Volume 1.

I'm sure the MOD will sort this out soon.

Annexes A and B in particular are significant to an understanding of the Condign Report.

While waiting, you may be interested in the email I sent on Saturday since it included some quotes from the "missing" material and comments on other bits of it.

All the best,

Isaac

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 14:59:19 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:50:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:02:46 EDT
>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 16:01:12 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:12:00 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>>><http://www.physorg.com/news66582110.html>

>>>>I've thought for a long time that there ought to be anti-photons
>>>>just as there are so many other anti-particles, and anti-matter.
>>>>Symmetry seems to be an underlying principle of the universe.

>>>>In the conventional formalism there is an antiphoton and the
>>>>symmetry is complete. The photon and antiphoton come out of the
>>>>theory as indistinguishable uncharged spin-one bosons. They
>>>>would look exactly the same on any spacetime diagram, so the
>>>>photon is considered to be its own antiparticle. The same is
>>>>>true for (say) a neutral pion.

><snip>

>It also worth while noting that a photo can spontaneously decay
>into an electron-positron pair (particle and antiparticle).
>Another way to visualize a photon is... as having a certain
>handed spin, let's say left, but in order to observe it as an
>antiparticle you would have to overtake it in order to observe
>it having a spin of the opposite hand (rotation)... since
>nothing travels faster than light in a vacuum, than we currently
>know of, you can never observe a photon with the opposite spin
>orientation.....

Yes Victor!

This is precisely what I was alluding to when I mentioned an
"underlying symmetry" where the distinction of photon and
antiphoton might acquire physical meaning. A photon spin of +1
returns to exactly the same state as does an antiphoton spin of
-1, = 0, giving the cancellation of superposed antiparallel
vectors like +t and -t in a null proper spacetime interval. If
we think of this as corresponding to +c and -c then photons
effectively do "travel faster" than light, by exactly c, as well
as "slower" than light by exactly -c, taking no time at all to
fill an interval of zero space. In other words what we call "a
photon" can be the local-real representation of a complex (i.e.
real + imaginary) scale-free basis state of an element of
nonlocal quantum spacetime whose excited states have their own
local-real representation as fermion pairs.

The beauty of this (IMO) is that a quantum of spacetime becomes
congruent with any arbitrary interval, and scale-specific

theories around the Planck region become just a theoretical extremum of an underlying scale-free theory. See

<http://www.parcellular.fsnet.co.uk/SpinIntro%20master.htm>

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 10:55:12 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:54:11 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Shell

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>Have to ask.

Two things:

1. My dad was a TV newsman from the 50s through the 80s.

Just down the road from me is a little town called Wytheville, VA. Wytheville was the site of a major flying-triangle flap that lasted for years.

My dad was a skeptic initially, but over the years he interviewed many of the eye witnesses to these things that were showing up regularly near Wytheville. He became convinced that these honest, down to earth people were seeing something real that didn't fit with most people's viewpoint on reality. His absolute conviction that something truly strange was going on up in Wytheville carried over to me.

2. I saw a UFO very clearly in broad daylight one summer in the early 70s. It was one of those shining "metal" cylinder things. I watched it from horizon to horizon, which took several minutes, and saw it shoot down a beam of light that was intensely bright even on a clear summer day. Since then there has been no question in my mind that UFOs exist. The only question is "what are they?"

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 16:14:56 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:55:36 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 00:14:35 -0400
>Subject: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>I have been reading the just released Condign Report onr UAP in
>the UK - UAPITUK?

>I haven't found the specifics of any one case yet, although I
>have found oblique references that suggest specific cases.

>Poor UK. No hard evidence. Only a few landing traces.

>Looks as if the main research effort amounted to a statistical
>analysis. They refer to "thousands" of sightings being converted
>from "paper forms" to computer format.

>Hm... Did they ever hear of Special Report #14? I guess not.
>So re-invent the wheel if you got the time and money.

I suppose the explicit terms of reference were to study reports
in the UK Air Defence Region. Actually it looks as though the
average report quality - insofar as one can judge - is poor
compared to those of Blue Book (themselves far from complete, of
course).

>Actually what I have read so far seems well written by one or
>more people who are able to bring many areas of physics and
>science to bear on the problem.

Although in fact there are typos, inaccurate page references,
duplicated sentences and indeed duplicated groups of paragraphs
in various places throughout, Vol 1, Chapter 3 (Statistical
Analysis) in particular struck me as being a bit sloppy, even
semi-literate, and poorly argued too, in contrast to most of the
Work Papers and Related Studies. It felt to me perhaps like
something that might have been thrown together to provide
justification for conclusions that actually had been reached on
quite other, undisclosed, grounds.

>Somewhat like the earlier Condon
>Report, this one takes up a lot of space with the descriptions
>of various types of "Candidate Explanatory Phenomena" (CEP) (A
>term I invented to refer to refer to hypothetical explanations
>in terms of known phenomena). The Condon report was a veritable
>textbook for mirages, radar, etc. This report seems not to be
>that detailed... but I haven't read the whole thing yet.

There's some pretty interesting stuff in there. A shame that so
much radar data - several whole pages in addition to many
paragraphs here and there - has been deleted.

>If anyone has located a particular case and its 'explanation'" in
>this 'web' of .pdf files please let me know what file it is in.

I don't see one. There is almost nothing about any individual
incident. Some tantalising references to radar unknowns stand
out:

1) "In December 1989 5 NATO radars, part of ACCS, were within coverage of a UAP report. Three radars had detections but two did not . . ." Working Paper #5, p.4.

Can anyone correlate this with a known and dated incident?

2) "In the 1960s [note: outside the study period - where is this documentation from?] Preston Air Traffic radar has occasionally made UAP detections. More recently, RAF Neatishaed, RAF Waddington Airfield Approach Radar and the CAA radar at Claxby, apparently had similar detections." Ibid.

3) "On one event a triangular (visual) formation was tracked on radar with an acceleration from 100 to 980 kts in two seconds and an altitude change from 7000 to 3000ft in 1 second." Working paper #5, p.5.

4) ". . . one UK event on the DIS record [for the study period?] where 3 radar's [sic] (2 RAF and one CAA) had simultaneous contact with a UAP, which eventually faded and disappeared." Vol 3, Chap 1, p.8.

I'm still looking for the detailed argument about how the "triangles" - as in 3) above - are supposed to be due to total internal optical reflection somehow caused in the region between three plasmas! Anyone found this yet, or is it is the missing Chapters 4 & 5?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Science Fantastic - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 03:39:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 12:44:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Science Fantastic - Kaeser

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 18:46:31 -0300
>Subject: Science Fantastic

>Listeners may be interested in the fact that I have been invited to
>appear with Theoretical Physicist, Michio Kaku on his new radio
>show Science Fantastic on Saturday, May 20, at 6-7 PM, Eastern.

>Kaku, an expert on String Theory, had appeared in one of the few
>good segments on the 2nd half of the Peter Jennings Special on Feb.
>24, 2005. It is ironic that Dr. Seth Shostak, one of the most
>prominent SETI cultists, will appear during the previous hour. The
>show is supposed to be on about 90 stations of of the
>Talkradionetwork.I understand that it is available on the internet
>via streaming.

>>From what I gather, Kaku thinks maybe 1 or 2% of UFO sightings
>can't be explained. I told the producer 10-20% would be closer to
>the mark. The Internet seems to show that he is also anti- nuclear,
>which I very definitely am not.

>There will, I am told, be discussions and then call-ins as well.
>Could be interesting... not supposed to be a debate.

>Any input from those who may have heard other comments he has made
>about UFOs would be appreciated.

Hi Stan,

Dr. Kaku appeared on a scientific panel sponsored by the Sci-Fi
Channel and the Coalition for Freedom of Information in
Washington DC in 2002 and you can find a link to his talk on
interstellar propulsion at:

<http://www.freedomofinfo.org/science.html>

This should be right up your alley.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 16](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 04:40:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 12:46:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

>>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 20:23:08 +0100 (BST)
>>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 13 May 2006 17:13:32 -0500
>>>Subject: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

<snip>

>Hey Stuart -

>Forgetting for a moment that one can always wait for good
>news... bad news does improve with age.

<snip>

My apologies -- bad news does NOT improve with age...

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

White Sands Looks Deep Into Outer Space

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 13:30:19 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 13:30:19 -0400
Subject: White Sands Looks Deep Into Outer Space

Source: Los Cruces Sun-News - New Mexico, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/gk92d>

May 15, 2006

White Sands Missile Range Facility Looks Deep Into Outer Space

This column is provided by White Sands Missile Range's Public Affairs Office. For more information, call the office at (505) 678-1134.

At the northernmost edge of White Sands Missile Range sits the Ground-Based Electro-Optical Deep Space Surveillance facility. Its mission is to detect, track and identify all tasked space objects within its area of coverage. The system is capable of tracking deep-space objects as small as a soccer ball in orbits from 3,000 to 20,000 miles with a limited near-earth detection capability.

Much like its sister Air Force sites on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean; on Maui, Hawaii; and at Moron, Spain; the White Sands detachment is far from its operations group and wing headquarters. It has the distinction of being the first operational site in the Ground-based Electro-Optical Deep Space Surveillance system. Observation data is provided to the Joint Space Operations Center at Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station, Col.

The location at White Sands was chosen for its near perfect weather year-round and almost absolute darkness on moonless nights. Because the site uses an optical sensor, mission operations are limited to relatively clear sky conditions at night.

The site employs three powerful telescopes and can send an average of 11,000 observations per night on as many as 2,500 different satellites to include payloads, rocket bodies, and debris.

Also, the unit is the sounding board for new innovations in optical surveillance. New equipment such as the infra-red cloud imaging system and the Deep STARE upgrade from ebsicon tubes to Charge Coupled Devices have been proven at White Sands prior to installation at the other optical detachments. These multi-million dollar upgrades have improved optical surveillance seven-fold and put GEODSS in the forefront of USSTRATCOM's space control mission.

The White Sands site has been around since before Air Force Space Command and began as Detachment 1, 1st Strategic Aerospace Division, Strategic Air Command in April 1981. Since then, the unit has changed hands several times and finally became part of the 1st Space Wing, Air Force Space Command on May 1, 1983.

Both the detachment and its parent squadron were reassigned to the wing from the 73d Space Group on May 15, 1992, when the 21st Space Wing assumed responsibility for all space surveillance units.

Upon closure of the 18th SPCS in June 2004, the optical dets were brought directly under the 21st Operations Group.

The site is operated and maintained by 19 contract workers. One Air Force Captain assigned is responsible for ensuring the mission is accomplished and the contractor's work performance is satisfactory.

The current contractor is Northrop Grumman Technical Services, which has held the contract since October 1, 1983.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:05:47 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 13:45:42 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Ledger

>From: Diane Harrison <aufor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:44:11 +1000
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 11 May 2006 4:02:10 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

><snip>

>When the story broke in Australia I was visiting with Bill
>Chalker in Sydney. The ABC called and wanted to do a story for
>the 7.00 p.m ABC News Report.

>They interviewed Doug Moffett of UFOR NSW and then came round
>to Bill Chalker's home to do his interview.

<snip>

>Bill Chalker was interviewed, it was a bit of a rough start
>for Bill as the interviewer only wanted Bill to talk about UFO
>photos and grab some UFO footage, which looked to us as an
>attempt by the media to again discredit the UFO phenomenon.

>Bill stood his ground informed the interviewer to do a proper
>interview about the British UFO MOD Study or simply get _no_
>UFO images or footage.

>Bill got his way,

<snip>

Hi Diane,

I'm about 1/3rd of the way through reading the Condign Report.
I'm on dial-up so it's slow going downloading.

What was asked of Bill Chalker is what I feared, and fear will
be the case for media questions for some time to come. "Well
isn't there a scientific conclusion to UFOs, that they are all
natural phenomenon?"

So far I've seen much conjecture in the Condign report but no
science. The report does say that there is no evidence of any
Intelligent Extraterrestrial component to the phenomenon, but so
far I've not come across any proof to support that theory; it's
just a flat statement.

Others have gotten much further along in the report than I - I
have to download, during the after-hours to avoid tying up the
phone line but I'm seeing similar comments from other.

Gary Anthony - one of the researchers who filed an FOIA for the
documents that led to the Condign Report - has reported that he
can't get mainstream science to look at the Plasma Ball theory
mentioned in the report.

I've been concerned since the beginning that the phenomenon would backslide because of the media's thirst for an answer that they could spread far and wide, and now they think they have a solid source. They would not get away with such a narrow band look if this was a more prosaic, mainstream, science issue. And I don't think we should let them slide that easily. Confront them.

Back to the Report.....

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

UK MoD Condign Updated

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:30:33 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 13:47:40 -0400
Subject: UK MoD Condign Updated

Hi List,

I've just noticed that the MoD have added to the following section:

It will take me a week to download this report on dial-up.
Don ledger

<http://tinyurl.com/pt4eu>

UAP in the UK Air Defence Region: Volume 1

This was added since i downloaded most of that section last night.

- * Volume 1 Part F PDF [6.7 MB]
- * Volume 1 Part G PDF [10.1 MB]
- * Volume 1 Annexes Part A PDF [10.1 MB]
- * Volume 1 Annexes Part B PDF [12.7 MB]

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Secrecy News -- 05/16/06 - Aftergood

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:53:42 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 13:49:18 -0400
Subject: Re: Secrecy News -- 05/16/06 - Aftergood

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 57
May 16, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

FAS Membership Special Offer:
<http://www.fas.org/static/member-offer.jsp>

** HOUSE MOVES TO ABOLISH NNSA COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OFFICE
** SOME NEW DOD DIRECTIVES ON INTELLIGENCE, SELECT AGENTS, ETC.
** SELECTED CRS REPORTS
** THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE ESPIONAGE ACT: LETTERS

HOUSE MOVES TO ABOLISH NNSA COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OFFICE

The Counterintelligence Office of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) would be abolished under new legislation and its functions would be reintegrated into the Department of Energy.

The action would mark a striking reversal of one of the key intelligence reforms adopted following a series of security lapses at the Department of Energy national laboratories in the 1990s, which led to the establishment of the NNSA with its own counterintelligence activity.

Section 3117 of the House version of the FY 2007 Defense Authorization Act "would consolidate the counterintelligence programs of the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration under the Department of Energy." See:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_cr/hr5122-doe.html

For related background, see "Intelligence Reform at the Department of Energy: Policy Issues and Organizational Alternatives," Congressional Research Service, April 10, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/intel/RL33355.pdf>

The consolidation of DoE and NNSA counterintelligence under the authority of DoE was reportedly sought by the DoE Office of Intelligence, led by Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, and the move would tend to strengthen the influence of his Office.

Some sense of the scope of activities of the DoE Office of Intelligence can be gleaned from a DoE classification guide that was released last week in redacted form.

See "DOE Classification Guide for Intelligence Information" (redacted), August 2001 (change 1, November 29, 2004), (1.7 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/doe/class.pdf>

SOME NEW DOD DIRECTIVES ON INTELLIGENCE, SELECT AGENTS, ETC.

Some notable new directives from the Department of Defense on defense and intelligence policy include the following.

"DoD Intelligence Interrogations, Detainee Debriefings, and Tactical Questioning," DoD Directive 3115.09, Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence) 3 November 2005, change 1, 10 May 2006:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/d3115_09.pdf

"DoD Law of War Program," DoD Directive 2311.01E, May 9, 2006:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/d2311_01e.pdf

"Minimum Security Standards for Safeguarding Biological Select Agents and Toxins," Department of Defense Instruction 5210.89, April 18, 2006:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/i5210_89.pdf

"Safeguarding Biological Select Agents and Toxins," Air Force Policy Directive 10-39, 26 April 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/usaf/afpd10-39.pdf>

"Air Force Critical Infrastructure Program," Air Force Policy Directive 10-24, 28 April 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/usaf/afpd10-24.pdf>

SELECTED CRS REPORTS

Some recent reports of interest from the Congressional Research Service include the following.

"U.S. and International Responses to the Global Spread of Avian Flu: Issues for Congress," updated May 1, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33219.pdf>

"U.S. Policy Regarding the International Criminal Court," updated April 26, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31495.pdf>

"Russia," May 8, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33407.pdf>

THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE ESPIONAGE ACT: LETTERS

A provocative article written by Gabriel Schoenfeld in the March 2006 issue of Commentary Magazine proposed that the New York Times should be held liable under the espionage statutes for having published the December 16, 2005 article that revealed the existence of the Bush Administration's warrantless domestic surveillance program.

Discussion of that proposal continues with several lengthy letters to the editor in the June 2006 Commentary, including one from myself, along with a reply from the author.

"Mr. Schoenfeld argues that the paper committed not only a shameful act but a crime," wrote Morton Halperin of the Open Society Institute. "My view is that it may have violated a criminal statute but that its conduct was far from shameful."

"What should the Times have done when it received the information? Exactly what it did do," Mr. Halperin wrote.

"During the 90 years of the [Espionage Act's] existence, no one in government has attempted to push it in the direction Mr. Schoenfeld advocates, because to do so would have been constitutionally questionable and politically incendiary," wrote Paul McMasters of the Freedom Forum.

"Although portions of the Espionage Act are riddled with ambiguous language, the provisions governing unauthorized

publication of classified communications intelligence are perfectly clear, and the Times's actions unequivocally violated them," responded Mr. Schoenfeld. "I find it striking that not one of my correspondents challenges this."

See "The New York Times and the Espionage Act," Gabriel Schoenfeld and Critics, Commentary Magazine, June 2006, linked from here:

<http://www.commentarymagazine.com/>

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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 19:31:15 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 13:52:25 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Koi

>From: Stuart Miller <stuart.miller4.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 11:23:46 +0100 (BST)
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

>My own experience is this. The story has received very wide
>coverage internationally, and certainly in north America. This
>is borne out by the evidence of my own eyes in researching
>news stories for my web site coupled with a very long posting
>that Dave Clark put up on UfologyUK in which he listed just
>some of the media outlets that had taken the story up.

<snip>

Hi Stuart, List

I don't think our American cousins have gotten a true impression of just how much coverage the release of this report got in the media here in the UK, albeit coverage which didn't last very long - basically just on the Sunday and Monday, with a little bit yesterday (including an article by Nick Pope in one of our larger circulation newspapers) when the Ministry of Defence put the report on its website.

My own experience included seeing a couple of items on television news (rare in itself here in the UK), which were longer than most such mentions in the past, plus a fair amount on the websites of the British media.

I know that Dave Clarke and Andy Roberts are away this week, so I hope that Joe McGonagle or Gary Anthony will email to UpDates the list that the EMP Team prepared of the relevant news coverage.

That list has already been posted on the UfologyinUK List, but will not have been seen by many of the non-British members of this List.

I know that Gary in particular has been a bit reticent about posting on many UFO lists, including UpDates, and has kept a relatively low profile. However, now that he has had his name splashed all over the Internet as being one of the two people to make the relevant FOIA requests to obtain the Condign Report, hopefully he can now be encouraged to join in the discussions here. I think many members of this List would be surprised at the contribution he could make, adding a different and valuable perspective.

So far, quite a few of the references I've seen in Internet discussion groups to the members of the EMP Team have concentrated on the two members best known to the international ufological community - i.e. the more controversial members, Dave Clarke and Andy Roberts) to the exclusion of the other two members - or referred to Joe McGonagle and Gary Anthony as if they were little clones of Dave and Andy...

>However, I do agree with Steve K that the story has had little
>negative impact on public opinion as can be seen and determined

>so far. Again from personal experience; I had lunch with a local
>senior journo last week, at the height of the brouha, and we must
>have talked about it for all of 30 seconds. He wasn't that
>interested.

The general media moved on to other matter within days, or even hours, of the original story. Most UFO Internet discussion groups were not far behind.

>If anything, it has had the affect of actually rekindling
>curiosity and interest in the subject and may well turn out in
>the end, with the benefit of hindsight, to have had a positive
>impact.

I share this sentiment - hence the title of my long email on Saturday at the link below about the content of the report (i.e. "Valuable UK UFO Report"). See in particular the section near the beginning entitled "Preliminary points - seeing the silver lining" and the section entitled "Conclusion" just before the footnotes.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m14-012.shtml>

>I cannot though agree with Steve K when he says that the report
>will turn out to be not worth much more than a mention in UFO
>history.

I too have to disagree with Steven Kaeser. At the very least, the Condon Report is fairly significant to British ufology since a Ministry of Defence spokesperson has now has stated that it is unlikely that there will be any further study of UFOs by the MOD unless and until new evidence emerges. (Anyone else see some similarities to the closing of Project Bluebook following the Condon Report?)

All the best,

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](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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

New Reports Posted To NUFORC Website

From: Peter B. Davenport <director.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 11:53:35 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 13:54:32 -0400
Subject: New Reports Posted To NUFORC Website

To the List:

NUFORC has just posted approximately 900 new reports to its website. I apologize for the delay, given that the last post was on March 11.

In addition, we have posted to our homepage three interesting cases, two recent cases from the Pacific Northwest, and an interesting report from Paintsville, KY, that allegedly occurred in February 2002.

I invite comments from the list regarding the latter. Does anyone know of the case the witness describes, in which a freight train is alleged to have collided with a UFO?

I have received e-mail already from individuals who apparently work in the railroad industry, who apprise me that the factual content of the report appears to them to be correct, and that the terminology used by the witness appears to be consistent with someone who is knowledgeable with the train industry. The witness has failed to respond to two messages from me about the alleged event.

Regarding the event over Portland, OR, on the evening of Saturday, April 29, 2006, I have attempted on several occasions to induce The Oregonian newspaper to do an article, or at least to interview one, or more, of the witnesses to the alleged event. To date, all attempts have failed.

For similar cases, involving clusters of multiple lights over a major metropolitan area, I invite you to view the cases posted to our site for the following locations and dates:

Prescott, AZ Date: February 04, 2000
<http://www.nuforc.org/webreports/ndxe200002.html>

Rockford, IL Date: February 16, 2000
<http://www.nuforc.org/webreports/ndxe200002.html>

Carteret, NJ Date: July 15, 2001
<http://www.nuforc.org/webreports/ndxe200107.html>

Tinley Park, IL Date: August 21, 2004
<http://www.nuforc.org/webreports/ndxe200408.html>

Tinley Park, IL Date: October 31, 2004
<http://www.nuforc.org/webreports/ndxe200410.html>

Tinley Park, IL Date: October 01, 2005
<http://www.nuforc.org/webreports/ndxe200510.html>

Peter
NUFORC
Seattle

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Faccenda

From: **Joe Faccenda** <uforth.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:13:01 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:15:38 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Faccenda

>From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>I've seen UFOs very up close and wasn't interested. It's like an
>old saying that what you don't look for will surely show up.

I'm surprised you were not interested Greg.

I would have thought any person having a close encounter - close enough to make out details such as the visible field the craft was generating around its perimeter, or details of its construction etc. as in my sighting - would have been very interested indeed, possibly even describing it as a 'life changing event'

While it may seem reasonable to be 'blaze' about a sighting, many ufologists have gone through their lives without any encounters at all, and to their credit have remained steadfast in their conviction that there is indeed anomalous craft in our skies.

Perhaps your uninterested as with many on this list who have seen a Ufo is, so what?

Has it in any way explained where these craft come from? what is their purpose? what propels them? and a whole encyclopaedia of other questions? unfortunately not.

At best we have theories or reasoned arguments, and while there is logic to many of the theories, we are left just as bemused as on having a sighting in the first place, as to what it is really all about.

Regards

Joe Faccenda

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:06:22 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:17:30 -0400
Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards? - Shough

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 08:05:08 -0400
>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 16:01:12 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Light Travels Backwards?

>>>Maybe one day we will shed our preconceptions and be able to see
>>>the universe as it really is.

>>I don't know about that. We can't directly "see" a great many of
>>the entities that populate physical theory, and that includes
>>antiphotons obviously.

>I was using "see" in a very broad sense. We see through grand
>experiments and verifiable theories, not just with our eyes.
>Perhaps I should have said "understand" rather than "see".

I did realise what you meant, and that was precisely my point of course!

As I said, you can't get rid of "preconceptions" because these are the guesses we make about the world, tested through the mediation of elaborate theory and experiment, all very far removed from immediate experience.

The idea that we can wipe this gunk of scientific sleep from our eyes - metaphorically - then naively and passively begin to register 'how the universe really is' won't wash. We can never look at nature except through our centuries of intellectual preconceptions. The trick is to find the right preconceptions :-)

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 16:11:28 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:19:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 14:13:21 -0300
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

<snip>

>... while we've had the technology for over 3 millenium-or
>more-to create crop circles.

To the incredible level of detail and precision observed - and over a single night? With interwoven layers and no foot prints? The crabwood glyph with line width varying to exactly the right width to show shading differences, for example?

And how about that TV documentary in which a helicopter's camcorder, descending through about 500' AGL, switched from colour to black-and-white, then the image broke up, then the engine stopped, only to restart when the pilot autorotated away from the glyph? And a subsequent overflight above 500' showed that the camcorder again recorded a normal image in colour?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:11:38 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:20:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Dickenson

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:37:28 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>However, the report seeks
>to make a virtue out of this, by stating: "Every effort has been
>made to take a wide systems approach, to avoid over-focusing on
>single events" (see Volume 1, Preface, page ii, penultimate
>para)."

<snip>

Hello Isaac,

And you can see why - here's one set of military sightings on
one night.

<http://www.global-conspiracies.com/triangle.htm>

(scroll down to 'Night Sightings' and 'Security Threat')

Looks like they're hoping to 'define' such reports away.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Science Fantastic - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 17:14:57 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:22:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Science Fantastic - Friedman

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 03:39:18 -0400
>Subject: Re: Science Fantastic

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 18:46:31 -0300
>>Subject: Science Fantastic

>>Listeners may be interested in the fact that I have been invited to
>>appear with Theoretical Physicist, Michio Kaku on his new radio
>>show Science Fantastic on Saturday, May 20, at 6-7 PM, Eastern.

>>Kaku, an expert on String Theory, had appeared in one of the few
>>good segments on the 2nd half of the Peter Jennings Special on Feb.
>>24, 2005. It is ironic that Dr. Seth Shostak, one of the most
>>prominent SETI cultists, will appear during the previous hour. The
>>show is supposed to be on about 90 stations of of the
>>Talkradionetwork.I understand that it is available on the internet
>>via streaming.

>>>From what I gather, Kaku thinks maybe 1 or 2% of UFO sightings
>>>can't be explained. I told the producer 10-20% would be closer to
>>>the mark. The Internet seems to show that he is also anti- nuclear,
>>>which I very definitely am not.

>>There will, I am told, be discussions and then call-ins as well.
>>Could be interesting... not supposed to be a debate.

>>Any input from those who may have heard other comments he has made
>>about UFOs would be appreciated.

>Dr. Kaku appeared on a scientific panel sponsored by the Sci-Fi
>Channel and the Coalition for Freedom of Information in
>Washington DC in 2002 and you can find a link to his talk on
>interstellar propulsion at:

><http://www.freedomofinfo.org/science.html>

>This should be right up your alley.

Not really. Theoretical types really aren't accountable are they?

Nobody was talking about the results of programs costing a billion\$ plus on nuclear airplanes, fission and fusion rockets, nuclear ramjets or the use of cosmic freeloading...

I had almost forgotten about the conference. Just jealous I wasn't invited I guess... because I would have shown slides of real systems.

Saturday should prove interesting... I might sign up for the \$5.95 per month so as to catch the Shostak interview...

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:23:36 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:37:28 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

Hi Isaac

I wonder if you've looked at the 'properties' boxes of the Vol 2 PDFs on the MoD site? The others are all blank, as you might expect, but these have an "author". This is

"sondhui379"

This appears to have been left in by accident. It may well be meaningless of course. I've mentioned this to the EMP group as you call them (ElectroMagnetic Pulse?? Some coincidence surely! ;-)) but I wondered if you or anyone else on the list had any thoughts on this.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 16:24:19 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:25:22 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - White

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>Have to ask.

When I saw my first UFO book, Adamski's, which has now been discredited, apparently, my thought was "ETs? That sounds logical for this big, complex universe."

I've followed articles and read a couple of other books since then, but always found other pastimes more compelling than UFO research. I was delighted circa 2002 to come across Errol Bruce-Knapp's 'Strange Days.. Indeed' program out of Toronto.

But mostly, it's just been a very long wait for government to come clean.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 17:55:33 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:26:40 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Boone

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 10:55:12 -0400
>Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>>Have to ask.

>Two things:

>1. My dad was a TV newsman from the 50s through the 80s.

>Just down the road from me is a little town called Wytheville,
>VA. Wytheville was the site of a major flying-triangle flap
>that lasted for years.

>My dad was a skeptic initially, but over the years he
>interviewed many of the eye witnesses to these things that were
>showing up regularly near Wytheville. He became convinced that
>these honest, down to earth people were seeing something real
>that didn't fit with most people's viewpoint on reality. His
>absolute conviction that something truly strange was going on up
>in Wytheville carried over to me.

Outstanding! I've been so close to those triangles I could have
hit em' with an expectoration of hypersalivated tobacco. :) When
did these occur? We need to talk off list though.

>2. I saw a UFO very clearly in broad daylight one summer in the
>early 70s. It was one of those shining "metal" cylinder things.
>I watched it from horizon to horizon, which took several
>minutes, and saw it shoot down a beam of light that was
>intensely bright even on a clear summer day. Since then there
>has been no question in my mind that UFOs exist. The only
>question is "what are they?"

>Bob Shell

Oh, those cylinders were scary. It was tough to tell if they
were blimps or not back in the 60's. Oh I could go on about
that!

It's a tribute that now two generations of your family have been
hot on the trail of UFOs. Kind of has that Andy and Opie feel of
honesty and clarity to it. I have this feeling that you have
some of the coolest UFO stories to tell!

My dad used to bolt from the sofa and give me \$5 to hush up
whenever I mentioned UFOs. That's how I started my first line of
Hot Wheels cars collection back in the '60's.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

My Heroes

From: **John Velez** <johnvelez.aic.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 23:21:14 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:29:10 -0400
Subject: My Heroes

Hi All,

Just a quick note to say that I consider people like Dave Furlotte, Stan Friedman, Dick Hall and a very few others, to be heroic figures in modern ufology.

Dave for his always solid and sober reporting and thoughtful, well-composed commentaries, and Dick and Stan for all the monumental and seminal work they have contributed all these many years.

All of these individuals doggedly fight for a rational approach and hard science in a field fraught with irrational individuals and others who are essentially threatened by independent investigation because it conflicts with their personal agendas.

Dr. Steven Greer, the self-appointed representative of the people, (now the Canadian people as well apparently,) being one glaring example of the antithesis of the aforementioned ufological heros.

Get down on your knees and pray to whatever Guardian Deities you may believe in that people like Stan and Dick and my former SDI mate Dave Furlotte - all live for a hundred years,

Who is around now that can step into their shoes. Who will succeed them? Nobody, that's who! They broke the cake-mold when they made these guys.

My heros. Keep in there wailin' boys - till you just can't swing the bat any longer.

Lochiam! Cien a=Flos!

John Velez

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 23:39:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:33:05 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:37:28 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 00:14:35 -0400
>>Subject: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>I have been reading the just released Condign Report onr UAP in>
>the UK - UAPITUK?

>>I haven't found the specifics of any one case yet, although I
>>have found oblique references that suggest specific cases.

><snip>

>See the long email I sent to this List on Saturday (giving my
>initial comments on the Executive Summary, Volume 1, Volume 3
>and most of the more interesting Working Papers in Volume 2) at:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m14-012.shtml>

<snip>

I fond references to cases... actually photos... in Volume 2.

<ROFL>

They incorporated some doozies. Figure 5 of Working Paper 11 is
a very poor copy, left-right reverse, of a photos of an F-15 and
UFO by Ed Walters in Jan 1994.

The photo Figure 11 labelled Oregon, 1950, seems to be missing
McMinnville case, maybe?

Somewhere in there... I lost the location and don't feel like
searching again, there is a figure labelled "Challenger" which I
suppose they thought was a photo of the Challenger disaster. It
has nothing to do with the Challenger. It is a single frame from
the 1978 New Zealand film.

<ROFLMAO>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Looking For Aliens On The Moon

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:38:47 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:38:47 -0400
Subject: Looking For Aliens On The Moon

Source: The NewScientist.com News Service - Sutton, Surrey UK

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/2p6x>

16 May 2006

Looking For Aliens On The Moon

When astronauts return to the Moon, they should keep their eyes peeled for extraterrestrial artefacts =96 pieces of technology from alien civilisations that have wound up on the lunar surface either by chance or design.

So says Ian Crawford, a researcher from University of London=92s Birkbeck College in the UK. He told a SETI specialist meeting of the Royal Astronomical Society (RAS) in London last week that although he considers such a find a long-shot, it is definitely worth bearing in mind.

"This is not a primary reason to go back to the Moon =96 there are very strong scientific reasons for going back. But if we go back to the Moon in the next 20 or 30 years, then amongst those things we might like to keep our eyes open for are alien artefacts,=94 Crawford told New Scientist.

The focus of the RAS discussion was the history and status of the search for extraterrestrial intelligence =96 an endeavour that has largely relied so far on large radio telescopes listening for electromagnetic signals from other technological civilisations.

Little additional cost

Crawford thinks scientists will be keen for the next lunar astronauts to sift through the lunar soil in greater quantities and in more detail was possible during the Apollo era. So there would be little additional cost to remain open to the idea that alien material may exist within those upper metres of the moon=92s regolith.

Seth Shostak, senior astronomer at the SETI Institute in Mountain View, California, says the possibility of such an interesting payoff for little additional cost makes the idea of looking for artefacts worth considering.

"On the Moon, I think it=92s certainly worthwhile taking a couple hundred square feet or so of material and looking it over," he says. But SETI researchers "probably wouldn't bet their mortgages on finding anything".

Message in a bottle

Looking for small artefacts, or even probes or time capsules, in our solar system is not a new idea in the SETI community, Shostak notes. Indeed, our own civilisation has already taken this approach several times.

NASA's Pioneer 10 and 11 spacecraft carry metal plaques showing the spacecraft's time and place of origin. And the Voyager 1 and 2 probes carry gold-plated records (pictured) bearing messages, images and sounds depicting life on Earth for any extraterrestrials who might encounter them thousands of years from now.

In 2004, an engineer and a physicist published a paper in Nature suggesting that if extraterrestrials were not in a hurry, their best shot at making contact with other civilisations would not be with radio waves, but with an interstellar message in a bottle -96 a physical artefact to tell other intelligent life forms something about their existence.

Crawford says the moon would be a good target for such "inscribed matter", given its lack of geologic activity and airless environment. But if an intentional targeting of a relatively small body sounds a little too like 2001: A Space Odyssey, he says there is also a possibility first brought to his attention by a 1998 paper by Ukrainian astronomer Alexy Arkhipov.

This suggests that if enough space faring societies have existed, even if they never travelled beyond their own planetary systems, they may have produced enough space debris to make it possible that micron-sized particles could have reached our own solar system. And Crawford says such tiny material could have fallen to the moon, remaining there within the top 10 or 15 metres of regolith.

Excruciating detail

But several lunar experts describe the prospect of finding extraterrestrial artefacts on the moon as "far-fetched". Gary Lofgren, lunar curator in charge of the scientific preservation of the Apollo lunar samples at the Johnson Space Center in Houston says even if such extraterrestrial micron-sized particles are there, it would be incredibly difficult to find them, requiring special instrumentation that has never been sent to space before.

Apollo astronauts brought a total of 842 pounds (382 kilograms) of lunar material to Earth and researchers are still studying the samples today. Lofgren says: "People have gone through the samples in excruciating detail and haven't found anything that would suggest extraterrestrial activity."

In fact, he says, scientists have even been surprised by how little of the material has been assigned an origin off the moon -96 rocks from Earth or Mars thrown up by meteorite impacts, for example.

Still, Lofgren says, scientists will be eager to study new samples from the Moon, noting that the Apollo samples only cover six sites clustered around the equator. And he says, a discovery of material that cannot be explained by an origin and evolution within our solar system "would be an incredible find".

Scott Hubbard, former director of NASA's Ames Research Center and now a SETI Institute researcher says: "While nothing is impossible, I find the payoff from seeking a cometary in-fall in the Moon's permanently shadowed craters much more compelling than extraterrestrial civilisation artefacts."

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Unsung Heroes

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 09:09:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:42:00 -0400
Subject: **Unsung Heroes**

Unsung Heroes...
by Alfred Lehmborg

Unsung Heroes... These could be defined as critically necessary persons better than yourself. Am I right?

These could be people who use personal stone to plug away at pertinent but tediously detailed grunt works of intellectual toil and who actually flesh out the bones of our aggregate cultural advancement, grease civilizations wheels, or put the "there" there when the clueless are standing around plaintively wailing "where... where."

Could they be further defined as persons who take the long hard haul in the aggregate production of our meaningfully productive human consciousness? Could they take this arduous trek only as a result of selflessly honest conscience and earnest endeavor on their own?

Seems so.

More at:

<http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2006/05/unsung-heroes.html>

alienview.nul

www.AlienView.net

AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Macabbee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 11:32:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:55:12 -0400
Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project - Macabbee

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 09:05:10 +0100
>Subject: Re: Valuable UK UFO Project

>And here is the Condign Report itself. Enjoy.

><http://tinyurl.com/kgll2>

Where Condon... oops... I mean CONDIGN Went Wrong.

The bizarre bouyant plasma theory....

Wow!

Philip J Klass must be chortling with glee. Apparently the CONDIGN writer never read UFOS IDENTIFIED published in 1968 wherein gigantic plasmas reign supreme.

The picture on the front cover of Klass' book shows a bright object at high altitude which PJK suggested was a plasma. It is the only 'UFO' endorsed by PJK!! The photo was taken by a Royal Canadian AF Pilot. See the whole story of this "gigantic plasma" at

<http://brumac.8k.com/RJC/RJC.html>

PJK was "clued" into the plasma idea by reports of UFOs seen near power lines (in particular Muscarello in New Hampshire, 1965(?)). After that... the sky was the limit! He argued that the increase in sightings starting in the 1940's was partially a result of increased dust and particulate matter in the atmosphere caused by increased industrialization. (Condign would agree).

He argued that plasma UFOs would be seen as light sources at night - Condign would agree.

He argued that plasma UFOs could appear metallic in the daytime - Condign would agree.

He argued that the presence of a plasma UFO could cause a car to stop by short-circuiting the battery. Actually he argued that the "image charge" of a plasma could short circuit a battery inside the car under the hood... or 'bonnet'. Perhaps Condign would agree... but not if the writer knows his/her E&M theory.

Condign goes beyond PJK by adding in bouyancy, presumably because a hot plasma is less dense than the surrounding air.

Condign also assumes high speed due to "fields" that apply forces to the plasma. Since a plasma is electrically neutral and so not likely to be moved by a strong uniform electric field one wonders what field this would be.

A spatially varying electric field with a gradient might move a plasma, but also rip it apart because of the gradient across the volume of the plasma.

One of the most bizarre plasma proposals is that Black Triangles" result from a 'field' that causes the atmosphere between three plasmas to become light absorbing so that no light is reflected and the area between the plasmas appears 'black'.

Plasma uber alles!!

Note: any sighting which was not conventionally explainable and which stretched even the plasma theory beyond reasonable limits was suggested by PJK to be a hoax (e.g., Zamorra). So Phil allowed for the following possibilities:

Misidentification - most

Hoax - a few

Plasma - the unexplained, credible reports

At least the Condign report does not dump the unexplainables into the hoax column. It does allow for the possibility of a few hoaxes.

A major weak point, not shared by the earlier Condon Report, is that there was no follow up on sighting reports... no witness interviews, etc., because it was all 'top secret stuff'.

Therefore the analyst(s) was/were left with only one or two page reports which, as any ufologist worth his salt knows, cover only part of the story, especially for a detailed study.

Note: this is similar to the situation with the 1952-1955 Special Report #14 Battelle study. However, the paper reports studied by the Battelle/AF researchers were often backed up by field investigations by AF investigators that occurred soon after the events.

Although this study limited itself to UK reports, it nevertheless found that TRue UFOs (TRUFOS) are real: if you disregard the strained plasma explanation then one is left with unexplained, and in many cases truly unexplainable, reports. Every study carried out has come to the same conclusion: there are reports (5 - 20%) which can only be explained by new and novel phenomena.

The skeptics stretch some "known" phenomenon (e.g. plasma) until it fits the unknowns.

Maccabee's First Rule for skeptics/debunkers:

Any explanation is better than none.

But sometimes the "stretch " is even less likely than ET!

I suspect that the instigator/writer of this report, perhaps the person who told Nick Pope in 1993 that he/she finally had some money for a study, actually already had his/her mind made up that it was a plasma phenomenon and that all that was necessary to prove it was a careful statistical study that could prove that conventional phenomena could not explain the strangest cases. The study would then develop the plasma theory until it explained the strangest cases. The way the report is written suggests to me that "plasma" was in the back of the mind of the writer at every stage of the report.

Oldsters will remember that Dr. James MacDonald, professor of atmospheric physics, ripped Klass' theory to shreds... it was "Klass dismissed". He pointed out that a plasma has no 'free charge' (overall electrically neutral) and therefore wouldn't be driven by electric fields (at best it could be moved slightly by an electric field gradient). The Condign writer seems to think that a plasma does have a 'charge'. The writer, like Klass, seems to think that a plasma near a car could stop it. MacDonald pointed out that the Klass theory of the "image charge" short circuiting the battery under the hood made no sense (the image charges reside on the metal surface closest to the source of free charge... but a plasma has no 'free charge'.)

It will be interesting to see if 'straight science' takes up the challenge to study this novel plasma theory and decide whether or not (a) it makes any sense on its own and (b) whether or not

it makes any sense in the context of the UFO sightings which led to the creation of this 'theory/hypothesis'.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 17](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:44:14 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 15:29:06 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Kaeser

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 19:31:15 +0100
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

>Hi Stuart, List

>I don't think our American cousins have gotten a true impression
>of just how much coverage the release of this report got in the
>media here in the UK, albeit coverage which didn't last very
>long - basically just on the Sunday and Monday, with a little bit
>yesterday (including an article by Nick Pope in one of our larger
>circulation newspapers) when the Ministry of Defence put the
>report on its website.

Hi Isaac,

If the CIA, NSA, or any other Federal Agency in the US had released a similar report, it would have been all over the news on this side of the big pond as well. I've been advised of a number of papers that picked up the Sunday Times story from the wire service and ran that, but I've not heard of any local writeup or additional coverage. It may be there, but I've not seen it.

But I see that the MOD is updating the FOIA site and I have to go back to downloading... <g>

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 15:13:24 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 09:30:27 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Boone

>From: Joe Faccenda <uforth.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 15:13:01 EDT
>Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>>I've seen UFOs very up close and wasn't interested. It's like an
>>old saying that what you don't look for will surely show up.

>I'm surprised you were not interested Greg.

>I would have thought any person having a close encounter - >close
>enough to make out details such as the visible field the craft
>was generating around its perimeter, or details of its
>construction etc. as in my sighting - would have been very
>interested indeed, possibly even describing it as a 'life
>changing event'

>While it may seem reasonable to be blaze' about a sighting, >many
>ufologists have gone through their lives without any encounters
>at all, and to their credit have remained steadfast in their
>conviction that there is indeed anomalous craft in our skies.

<snip>

Hiya Joe!

I guess because I grew up in the latter half of the 20th Century with shows like Star Trek and Lost in Space I wasn't concerned as much about whether there was life outside of Earth. To me as a youngin' I just saw it as another thing to have to deal with along with the regular spectacles like the Vietnam War and wild animals running amok.

I remember at six years old in kindergarten and we were at a school assembly where the space program was being highlighted because IBM and most of the folks in my home town worked at IBM was so involved in space flight programs. I recall when they showed a slide of the Moon and our teacher said we would be there in a few years I bolted up from my seat and shouted:

"What? You mean we haven't even gotten to the Moon yet? Man, I got here at the wrong time! I thought we were more advanced than that!"

My sister and her friends busted out laughing and of course my parents were called in.

I was disappointed because as a child I didn't know the full difference between fantasy and reality. I got bored. I often get bored today seeing how far behind we are regarding space exploration. Like yourself, I assume if you're my age you were told by the year 2000 we'd have flying cars and bubble houses and dogs that could talk. Now we have an often arrested space

program, one space station that's not even American and our cars still use fossil fuels and our dogs don't talk but have psychiatrists, lawyers and advocacy groups.

So when some bright soul wrote a concise look at UFOs for one of the encyclopedias that was just matter of fact, I cognited that ever present observation that Earth was a planet, it revolved around a star, there were billions of stars ergo planets and life, so what?

I did however at a young age notice the terror and aversion the adults had toward the subject. It was the only subject even to this day that caused them to cower, and I'm talking about folks who lived through the world wars and civil rights riots. Nothing could shake their trees except the subject of UFOs. I had an uncle that was invincible. A Korean War Vet, former cop, been shot numerous times and lived, toughest hard bit man you would want to meet. Mention UFOs and he backed up and shut up. I mean I grew up around some of if not the toughest people. Yet bring up UFOs and they went into a mode of fear.

To me, UFOs weren't a thing to be afraid of as I had far more pending dangers such as gangsters, Soviet missiles, crooked cops, psychotics, and girls wearing go-go boots who listened to too many Nancy Sinatra songs.

UFOs were a ho-hum subject to me but as I got older the problem manifested itself so overtly that I couldn't get away from it. I avoided the subject. To me it made good fodder for comic books and sci-fi stuff, but the late 70's and on the problem just grew to a crescendo that ended up in close encounters and sound people I knew, including cops and top engineers/scientists/academics who were shaken to their core. Since I worked at the local newspaper they would badger me with this stuff. I thought they were off their rockers but seeing craft up close I could see why they would be shaken. To me it was a 'Wow! Way cool ship!' attitude. To others it was nerve rattling and in far too many cases devastating. They had no one to go to except the local psychiatric institutions that would hole them up for who knows how long. It wasn't a pretty picture to see strong people reduced to a cowering state of existence. It really breaks the heart.

That was back in the Hudson Valley section of NY. Even today I'll get an occasional email or phone call from someone even officials, asking what can be done. I send them to the professionals on this list's websites. Education about the matter first is best.

So for me, UFOs, ETs, were a curiosity due to the fact those who encountered such constantly goofed up production somehow. Sure I saw first hand the cover ups and the threats and I ain't a fella you threaten. That's the kick that got me to delve more into the subject because some knuckleheads felt they could sell me a woof ticket and I'm the kind of guy what will cash one and give em' back some change. It's only out of compassion for the people I know personally, the researchers, and the people I've had the opportunity to meet via the web who have far, far, far, too many stories to compile about their experiences that ended up traumatic. John Velez pointed that out to me in a post and corrected me in my bedside manner so to speak regarding abductees. My problem was it wasn't the abductees that had the bulk of the traumatic stories, it was the witnesses, whistleblowers and just concerned good folks who had gotten threatened or harassed.

I've never seen an alien beat someone up or steal their iPod or throw racial epithets at people. So to me that threat is on the back burner compared to the people I've seen do such evil things.

On the bright side, Ufology unlike any other field of study keeps one on one's toes. One must study every science and humanity, cultures, languages, etc. It's the only field of study where one can't keep up unless one has done one's homework. A fella can't lose when he's constantly educating himself. Physics, botany, astronomy, geology, biology, it just doesn't end. Raises the IQ I would testify.

As for Ufologists who've not seen a craft it could be a blessing in disguise. Be careful what you wish for.

Best ,

Greg

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Rome

From: Irene Rome <ikrom1.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 12:57:42 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 09:33:57 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Rome

On 5/16/06 12:54 PM, "UFO UpDates - Toronto"
<ufoupdates.nul>wrote:

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>Have to ask.

<snip>

I was in my first couple of months at New Mexico A&M, Las Cruces (now NM State University), in 1955. I was studying late one night (approximately 11 pm) in my room, on the second story of a two-story dormitory (Garrett Hall). My desk faced a large window which was open. I looked up, surprised! to see a very large sphere floating towards the hall, gaped a moment, and ran to wake my roommate who also saw it. As it came nearer it was evident that it would go overhead. I ran downstairs to see if I could see more of it, but there was no sign of it. I looked up to the window and asked roommate what happened and she replied, "It just went 'out', like a light".

The sphere was no more than 40 feet above the ground, was softly lit, not incandescent, its color resembled that of the full moon. It was perhaps twenty feet in diameter. No markings. The trajectory was straight line, it "floated" but did not bob as a balloon might.

I made a couple of inquiries and someone suggested that it might have been a "sodium bomb" being tested at White Sands Proving Ground, which were used to light up a battlefield at night. I have never been able to confirm this.

(Years later, I read Raymond Fowler's account of the Andresson/Luca affair. It was in that book that Fowler told of his mother's sighting of a sphere similar to the one I saw, in fact she used similar language to describe it.)

I've since seen another UFO, a star-like object while I was on the highway, and another star-like object at home.

At any rate, that was the beginning of my off and on relationship with UFology.

Life changing event? You bet. I don't know how 'experiencers'/abductees survive with their knowledge.

Reenee

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Terri

From: **Terri Kelly** <grimfarvity.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 14:06:38 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 09:38:09 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Terri

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

<snip>

Hello to all,

My name is Terri Kelly. I've been lurking for a long time, but now I would like to join in the discussion. Hopefully I can contribute something useful. You can learn about me at adventuresinliving.org.

My very-close encounter with a black triangle is detailed in an essay I wrote for publication in 1991:

adventuresinliving.org/literati/essay3.htm

It is actually one of two sightings I've had. In the second, a friend and I were gazing at the night sky when we both saw a light quickly move left, stop, and then backwards to its original position. Up to that point the light looked like any star in the sky. But stars don't move that fast, and satellites don't suddenly stop and go backwards. Both of these encounters took place while I was living near Mount St. Helens.

Even though I've had these sightings, I'm still in the category of "I want to believe" because I trust my critical brain more than my eyes. Like so many of those who have had encounters, I've since been looking for a scientific explanation. For the last few years I've been learning about time travel. Now I am more inclined to believe that UFOs are related to time travel. Many of the odd variables present in the UFO-as-alien theory are more plausible when applied to time travel theory. Them is us. But this list is not about time travel so that's all I'll say about that!

I have a blog called 'Dark Backward' where I am keeping track of oddities of time and space, and the physics that could make time travel a reality: darkbackward.blogspot.com. Thank you for the lively, intelligent discussions here.

Terri 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 00:42:27 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 10:27:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 16:11:28 -0400
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 14:13:21 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

><snip>

>>... while we've had the technology for over 3 millenium-or
>>more-to create crop circles.

Hi Eleanor

>To the incredible level of detail and precision observed - and
>over a single night? With interwoven layers and no foot
>prints? The crabwood glyph with line width varying to exactly
>the right width to show shading differences, for example?

People exacted the science of stomping down grass thousands of
years ago. They threshed wheat and barley that way for
centuries. So they were able to make a nice little circle in the
crops. That's what I meant by," while we've had the technology
for over 3 millenium-or more-to create crop circles."

In the last ten years anyone with \$150.00 had the money to buy a
GPS and certainly laser theolidites are easy to come by. String
and planks are easy to find as well. Pre-planning "might" take
care of the intricacies of some of these circles. Often we see
the tractor lines going across the field and right through the
glyph. There's a way in there.

>And how about that TV documentary in which a helicopter's
camcorder, descending through about 500' AGL, switched from
colour to black-and-white, then the image broke up, then the
engine stopped, only to restart when the pilot autorotated away
from the glyph? And a subsequent overflight above 500' showed
that the camcorder again recorded a normal image in colour?

Don't know about that one but I'd have a look at it. The pilot
had no choice but to auto-rotate away, that's how the pilot
maintained lift. What model helicopter are we talking about-
perhaps a Robinson R22 or R44? Maybe the pilot got caught in the
chopper's own rotor-wash well. As for the cam corder, dollars
will get you donuts it was set on auto-iris.

I can't say that all of these circles are hoaxed or just plain
anonymous artwork perhaps, but I'm certain that most are.

I have enough trouble just keeping up with the UFO phenomenon.
Crop circles are only of minor interest to me. Since they are in
someone elses arena, I'll leave it to them.

Do you have a URL for that helicopter-over-glyph incident?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 22:47:23 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 10:25:18 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 00:14:35 -0400
>Subject: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>I have been reading the just released Condign Report onr UAP in
>the UK - UAPITUK?

>I haven't found the specifics of any one case yet, although I
>have found oblique references that suggest specific cases.

>Poor UK. No hard evidence. Only a few landing traces.

>Looks as if the main research effort amounted to a statistical
>analysis. They refer to "thousands" of sightings being converted
>from "paper forms" to computer format.

>Hm... Did they ever hear of Special Report #14? I guess not.
>So re-invent the wheel if you got the time and money.

I suppose the explicit terms of reference were to study reports
in the UK Air Defence Region. Actually it looks as though the
average report quality - insofar as one can judge - is poor
compared to those of Blue Book (themselves far from complete of
course).

>Actually what I have read so far seems well written by one or
>more people who are able to bring many areas of physics and
>science to bear on the problem.

Although in fact there are typos, inaccurate page references,
duplicated sentences and indeed duplicated groups of paragraphs
in various places throughout, Vol 1, Chapter 3 (Statistical
Analysis) in particular struck me as being a bit sloppy, even
semi-literate, and poorly argued too, in contrast to most of the
Work Papers and Related Studies. It felt to me perhaps like
something that might have been thrown together to provide
justification for conclusions that actually had been reached on
quite other, undisclosed, grounds.

>Somewhat like the earlier Condon
>Report, this one takes up a lot of space with the descriptions
>of various types of "Candidate Explanatory Phenomena" (CEP) (A
>term I invented to refer to refer to hypothetical explanations
>in terms of known phenomena). The Condon report was a veritable
>textbook for mirages, radar, etc. This report seems not to be
>that detailed... but I haven't read the whole thing yet.

There's some pretty interesting stuff in there. A shame that so
much radar data - several whole pages in addition to many
paragraphs here and there - has been deleted.

>If anyone has located a particular case and its 'explanation'" in
>this 'web' of .pdf files please let me know what file it is in.

I don't see one. There is almost nothing about any individual
incident. Some tantalising references to radar unknowns stand
out:

1) "In December 1989 5 NATO radars, part of ACCS, were within coverage of a UAP report. Three radars had detections but two did not... " Working Paper #5, p.4.

Can anyone correlate this with a known and dated incident?

2) "In the 1960s [note: outside the study period - where is this documentation from?] Preston Air Traffic radar has occasionally made UAP detections. More recently, RAF Neatishaed, RAF Waddington Airfield Approach Radar and the CAA radar at Claxby, apparently had similar detections." Ibid.

3) "On one event a triangular (visual) formation was tracked on radar with an acceleration from 100 to 980 kts in two seconds and an altitude change from 7000 to 3000ft in 1 second." Working paper #5, p.5.

4) "... one UK event on the DIS record [for the study period?] where 3 radar's [sic] (2 RAF and one CAA) had simultaneous contact with a UAP, which eventually faded and disappeared." Vol 3, Chap 1, p.8.

I'm still looking for the detailed argument about how the "triangles" - as in 3) above - are supposed to be due to total internal optical reflection somehow caused in the region between three plasmas! Anyone found this yet, or is it is the missing Chapters 4 & 5?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:02:07 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 09:45:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle sightings.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Schramm

From: **Kathleen Schramm** <spiritrose22.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:28:58 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 10:22:14 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Schramm

>Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>Have to ask.

My first experience with ETs and UFOs was when I was 12 years old. I discounted every "sighting" as a "dream" until I saw the image of an ET in a photo I took while on vacation. To mention the obvious, I have been hooked ever since.

Kat

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: UK MoD Condign Updated - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 15:49:42 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 09:41:15 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD Condign Updated - Kaeser

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:30:33 -0300
>Subject: UK MoD Condign Updated

>I've just noticed that the MoD have added to the following
>section:

>It will take me a week to download this report on dial-up.

>Don ledger

><http://tinyurl.com/pt4eu>

># UAP in the UK Air Defence Region: Volume 1

>This was added since i downloaded most of that section last night.

>* Volume 1 Part F PDF [6.7 MB]
>* Volume 1 Part G PDF [10.1 MB]
>* Volume 1 Annexes Part A PDF [10.1 MB]
>* Volume 1 Annexes Part B PDF [12.7 MB]

I've taken a quick look at Annexes Part A and it appears to include some case information, but I don't know how well they're identified. I'm not able to review the entire file now, but I've created another CD for distribution to a few researchers who probably won't see it otherwise.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: New Reports Posted To NUFORC Website - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:31:30 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 09:48:03 -0400
Subject: Re: New Reports Posted To NUFORC Website - Golubik

>From: Peter B. Davenport <director.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 11:53:35 -0700
>Subject: New Reports Posted To NUFORC Website

>To the List:

>NUFORC has just posted approximately 900 new reports to its
>website. I apologize for the delay, given that the last post was
>on March 11.

>In addition, we have posted to our homepage three interesting
>cases, two recent cases from the Pacific Northwest, and an
>interesting report from Paintsville, KY, that allegedly occurred
>in February 2002.

>I invite comments from the list regarding the latter. Does
>anyone know of the case the witness describes, in which a
>freight train is alleged to have collided with a UFO?

>I have received e-mail already from individuals who apparently
>work in the railroad industry, who apprise me that the factual
>content of the report appears to them to be correct, and that
>the terminology used by the witness appears to be consistent
>with someone who is knowledgeable with the train industry. The
>witness has failed to respond to two messages from me about the
>alleged event.

>Regarding the event over Portland, OR, on the evening of
>Saturday, April 29, 2006, I have attempted on several occasions
>to induce The Oregonian newspaper to do an article, or at least
>to interview one, or more, of the witnesses to the alleged
>event. To date, all attempts have failed.

Hi Peter,

You might remember me. I used to live in Phoenix and had given you a little funding when you first started out at NUFORC... I think it was around \$50... just trying to help:)

I'd love to assist you in this investigation and provide you with some ground support. Kentucky is not so far away from me. I'm a very good and thorough investigator with a hands-on analytical science background in many areas and types of analysis. I can also interview witnesses and video tape testimony.

Can you give the list a few more details about this incident:

- 1) How did you learn about it (I'm making no assumptions here)?
- 2) Do you know the name of the Freight Train Company?
- 3) Do you know which specific track it occurred on?
- 4) How many people have you talked with? Do you have their names?

- 5) Do you have the name of the primary witness... I'm making no assumptions here?
- 6) Do the people you've talked with know the primary witness only? Or, have you talked with several other secondary witnesses who had some sort of direct contact/knowledge with this incident separate from the primary one (independent)?
- 7) Do you have an exact physical location for this incident?
- 8) If you have the exact area, perhaps this list could contribute funding... enabling us to rent the appropriate equipment and run some preliminary soil and radiation screens of the area. Any look on the ground might prove crucial and beneficial...
- 9) I can also go to the area and talk directly with witnesses... I find this to be the most rewarding.

Thanks,

Viktor Golubik (k's = c's)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: UK MoD BS - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 19:18:39 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 09:43:23 -0400
Subject: Re: UK MoD BS - Balaskas

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:05:47 -0300
>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

>>From: Diane Harrison <auforn.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 08:44:11 +1000
>>Subject: Re: UK MoD BS

<snip>

>>Bill Chalker was interviewed, it was a bit of a rough start
>>for Bill as the interviewer only wanted Bill to talk about UFO
>>photos and grab some UFO footage, which looked to us as an
>>attempt by the media to again discredit the UFO phenomenon.

>>Bill Stood his ground informed the interviewer to do a proper
>>interview about the British UFO MOD Study or simply get _no_
>>UFO images or footage.

><snip>

>I'm about 1/3rd of the way through reading the Condign Report.
>I'm on dial-up so it's slow going downloading.

>What was asked of Bill Chalker is what I feared, and fear will
>be the case for media questions for some time to come. "Well
>isn't there a scientific conclusion to UFOs, that they are all
>natural phenomenon?"

>So far I've seen much conjecture in the Condign report but no
>science. The report does say that there is no evidence of any
>Intelligent Extraterrestrial component to the phenomenon, but so
>far I've not come across any proof to support that theory; it's
>just a flat statement.

Hi Everyone!

When the University of Colorado's 989 page UFO study "Condon Report" came out in 1969 the press did not have time to read the whole thing except from the summary prepared by the debunker head of this UFO study, Dr. Edward U. Condon. This summary was based on Condon's personal opinions rather than the many facts and conclusions in the actual report which contradicted and invalidated his opinions. Unfortunately, with deadlines to meet, it was Condon's opinions in the summary that the media based their news articles on. With the UK's "Condign Report", things are a little different since the press started to write about MoD's UFO study even before it was made public, otherwise the reporting was as irresponsible and incomplete as it was in 1969 with the Condon Report.

Last night, by coincidence, I was reading Daniel Drasin's very informative and enlightening article 'Zen...and the Art of Debunkery - How to Debunk just about Everything' in the October/November 1998 issue of 'Infinite Energy', pages 65-69. So Don, though the Condign Report states "there is no evidence of any Intelligent Extraterrestrial component" to UFOs but in your

reading of the full report you did not "come across any proof to support that theory" is because, as debunkers they must have been familiar with Drasin's many points for debunkers. Below are just a few of the many relevant pointers for debunkers in Drasin's famous article.

- Since the public tends to be unclear about the distinction between evidence and proof, do your best to help maintain this murkiness. If absolute proof is lacking, state categorically that "there is no evidence!"
- If sufficient evidence has been presented to warrant further investigation of an unusual phenomenon, argue that "evidence alone proves nothing!" Ignore the fact that preliminary evidence is not supposed to prove ANYthing.
- In any case, imply that proof precedes evidence. This will eliminate the possibility of initiating any meaningful process on investigation - particularly if no criteria of proof have yet been established for the phenomenon in question.
- Insist that criteria of proof cannot possibly be established for phenomena that do not exist!

There are many, many more of these pointers for debunkers in his article. You can find an updated version of Drasin's article at the web site below. It is certainly worth reading and is much shorter and more edifying than the Condign Report. You and fellow ufologists will particularly like Drasin's "Part 2: Debunking Extraterrestrial Intelligence".

<http://members.aol.com/ddrasin/zen.html>

>Gary Anthony - one of the researchers who filed an FOIA for the >documents that led to the Condign Report - has reported that he >can't get mainstream science to look at the Plasma Ball theory >mentioned in the report.

That is because "mainstream science" now knows all about the Plasma Ball theory and many other newly discovered plasma-like natural atmospheric phenomena such as Red Sprites, Blue Jets and Elves thanks partly to ufologists and the many early reports that science could no longer simply dismiss or ignore. These unexpected but widespread atmospheric plasmas that were unknown to science just over a decade ago cannot be easily mistaken for UFOs since they are largely a very short-lived phenomenon, usually less than a second in duration. If such short-lived phenomena can be given as the explanation for UFOs, then the mysterious flashes of light that the Apollo 11 astronauts also reported seeing (in addition to the UFO that was apparently following them on their way to the Moon) should then be considered as UFOs or UAPs too.

We must not forget there is not one but many explanations for UFOs. Plasmas can only explain just a very few UFO reports. Although not popular with the authors of the U.S.'s Condon and U.K.'s Condign Reports, the intelligent extraterrestrial explanation is still, to me, the only one that satisfies all the facts for many puzzling UFO sightings and it has not, or cannot, be ruled out by any UFO study.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 10:13:50 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 10:35:48 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:37:28 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>Hi Isaac

>I wonder if you've looked at the 'properties' boxes of the Vol 2
>PDFs on the MoD site? The others are all blank, as you might
>expect, but these have an "author". This is

>"sondhui379"

>This appears to have been left in by accident. It may well be
>meaningless of course. I've mentioned this to the EMP group as
>you call them (ElectroMagnetic Pulse?? Some coincidence surely!
>;-)) but I wondered if you or anyone else on the list had any
>thoughts on this.

Hi Martin,

I think "sondhui379" is probably a red herring. The name of the
"author" in the metadata of the pdf documents will almost
certainly merely by the name of the identity of the person that
scanned the hardcopy into a pdf.

This is highly unlikely to have been the person that actually
wrote the report. The scanned pdf was not prepared at the time
the report was written, but considerably more recently.
Remember, the report was written by late 2000. The scanned pdf,
however, was prepared relatively recently. This is clear from
the fact that the scan is of a hardcopy which has been redacted
in accordance (or at least purported accordance) with the
Freedom of Information Act, and refers to various section
numbers in the FOIA. The FOIA only can into effect in relation
to the MOD relatively recently.

Also, it is extremely likely that the scanning of such a long
document would be beneath the rank (or, in British Civil Service
speak, the "grade") of the author of the report. It is highly
unlikely that the scanning was done by anyone above EO grade
("Executive Officer") and was more likely to have been an AA or
AO (Administrative Assistant or Administrative Officer). The
author of the report was very likely above EO grade or
equivalent - my current guess would be about a Grade 7, or
possibly a Grade 5. (The author may not have been a formal
member of the Civil Service, so these grades are merely
indicative to the sort of role/rank he held).

Anyway, in case you still want to track down "sonhui379", I'd
simply note that the civil service usernames follow conventions
pretty similar to the rest of the world. Thus "sondhui379" may
be a combination of a surname, initial and then a number. I note

that "sondhu" is a surname (of Indian extraction I think) so
"sondhu i 379" may be a plausible breakdown.

By the way, EMP also works as "Electro Magnetic Phenomena".
Coincidence?

All the best,

Isaac

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:43:13 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:43:13 -0400
Subject: Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure

Source: The Nation - Bangkok, Thailand

<http://tinyurl.com/lxefk>

Thu, May 18, 2006

Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure

In June, a horde of UFO fans will travel from all over to world to gather in Roswell, New Mexico, to attend the 12th Annual Roswell International UFO Festival.

From June 30-July 3, thousands of people will seek the truth from UFO researchers while happily enjoying wacky forms of entertainment.

Amid the Galactic Costume Contest, Lights in the Night parade and a slew of huskers and vendors in the civic plaza, noted scientists and UFO experts will deliver guest lectures and workshops.

The annual UFO Festival celebrates the unique distinction for which Roswell is famous: the mysterious 1947 crash of something or other in the desert outside of town. Since then, Roswell has blossomed into a multi-million dollar tourist destination, with seven new hotels and scores of restaurants - the perfect place to seek an "out-of-this-world" experience.

Many believe that in July 1947, what crashed just outside Roswell was an unidentified flying object. The supposed recovery of "aliens" has been the subject of international attention. The so-called "Roswell incident" was reported to the intelligence office at the military base in Roswell, and for days thereafter, the crash site was closed while the wreckage was cleared.

This is so spooky, generating exactly the sort of excitement that happened in Thailand last week when an "unidentified flying object" landed in a backyard in Uthai Thani: a four-inch jelly-like slug. Soon more sightings were reported in Bang Kapi, Samut Prakan, Chon Buri, Phrae and Khon Kaen.

Television channels thoroughly covered the story, televising the wonder and fear of rural people who believed the objects came from another world and accidentally landed from the sky. One woman boiled the UFO with rice for her children, believing that the meal would make her kids smarter.

It was fun to learn that while scientific officials asked for two days to examine the white tube-shaped thing, a housewife instantly recognised it and posted on the website Pantip.com that the mysterious object was actually a fever gel pad, used to reduce fever in children.

Ho hum.

Two conclusions can be drawn from this.

First, a little knowledge makes people receptive to all kinds of heresy. For them, scientific proof is unnecessary.

Second, Thailand is reckless with waste disposal. If the person who used the fever gel pad had properly dumped it, the damn thing wouldn't have been caught up in the wind and rain and flown around in the air to land as a backyard UFO.

Whatever, now that we know it's a fever gel pad, Thailand is disqualified to join the UFO Festival in Roswell. That's too bad. We were this close to being a new tourist magnet.

[achara_d.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

Close Encounters Of The Strange Kind

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:49:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:49:45 -0400
Subject: Close Encounters Of The Strange Kind

Source: The High Desert Star - Yucca Valley, California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/fq3fb>

Thursday May 18, 2006

Close Encounters Of The Strange Kind

By Jimmy Biggerstaff
Hi-Desert Star

LANDERS - They're out there all right, in more ways than one. Several hundred people were way out at the Integratron Saturday for the Retro UFO Space Convention.

The gathering was a throwback to a 25-year span from 1953 to 1978 when Integratron builder George Van Tassel held spaceship conventions at nearby Giant Rock.

The scent of sunblock wafted on the warm breeze of a desert spring day as the curious gathered to listen to stories of alien encounters, abductions, spaceships and journeys that aren't described in any AAA literature.

Take, for example, Michael Barr, who came here from Las Vegas dressed for the occasion, but looking less like Elvis and more like Zoltar. His blue ankle-length robe was trimmed in silver, gathered with a Buzz Lightyear bellypiece.

An eight-inch conical collar completed the ensemble. Barr's powdered eyebrows complemented his snow-white pageboy wig. The ready-for-trick-or-treats conventioneer described with alacrity a UFO sighting he experienced at the Ontario airport in 1978.

"Out of nowhere," (descriptions of UFO sightings often start with that wide-eyed prelude) "a silver disc hovered over the runway, then it was gone." Barr testified that he "gets yanked around all over the place by the ETs."

A pair of large tents was erected on the grounds to house presentations by recognized experts in UFOlogy.

Speaker Greg Bishop took a fanciful approach to the subject of the day. His talk gave a historical perspective to all things alien, with lighthearted observations like how '50s-era other-worldly beings all seemed to have names resembling synthetic fabrics, like Orthon.

The Rev. Robert Short described President Eisenhower's alien encounter when he visited Muroc Dry Lake in the western Mojave near Lancaster.

During an afternoon Intergalactic Interaction gathering, folks talked about a trip to the center of the earth with the matter-of-fact, casual air of someone describing a trip to the supermarket.

The response to a question, "Are you local?" took on a larger meaning when an unusually garbed participant cryptically replied, "No, I traveled a great distance."

An underlying theme among many contactees Saturday was a mistrust of the government, a belief that it's hiding something. A general cover-up of a spaceship crash in Roswell, N.M., in 1947 is the conspiracy theorists' proof.

Roswell is to alien aficionados what Hollywood is to movies, what Detroit is to cars. Which is why Guy Malone moved there from Tennessee in 1999.

Malone is an ordinary enough looking fellow. Other than the fact that he was painted silver from the neck up and wore snug-fit black framed, reflective sunglasses.

A Christian UFOlogist, Malone sponsors his own UFO-related gatherings and organizes conferences where he lectures on subjects like Biblical abductions.

Malone noted that a book he has written isn't carried by Roswell's UFO museum "because it dealt with religion." A Christian bookstore wouldn't carry it either - "because it dealt with UFOs."

Laura Lee Mistycah and Ann Lessel wandered the premises, offering to help people who have had alien encounters. They said that what help they might offer depends on what kind of encounter a potential client has had. For example, the business partners said they can remove implants. "But not the ones that we put in ourselves."

Wayne and Millicent Price from Redlands like coming to the desert and like Giant Rock. They were representative of one group of people at the convention - the normal looking and normal talking ones. Whatever normal is.

Properly attired in floppy hats and loose, light knockabout clothing for their desert rambling, the Prices seemed strangely underdressed among the rolls of Reynolds Wrap and swaths of silver fabric worn by several spectators and participants in Saturday's confabulation.

Lloyd Noel provided a unique historical perspective to the proceedings. Dressed as George Van Tassel, Noel told an audience assembled in the Integratron, "The only dimension I've been in that seems a little tainted is the one we're in right now."

Noel channeled Van Tassel, describing the College of Universal Wisdom he founded on the site in the 1950s.

Channeling of a different variety was going on under Cable Channel 69's canopy, where Paul Morehead and Lee Johnson recorded recollections from folks who remember Van Tassel's Giant Rock conventions.

Pre-convention literature reported that 11,000 attended the 1959 event. That's counting the Earthlings too, presumably.

Rob Harris, who organized the weekend's activities with wife Barbara, spoke about the convention the day afterward like a guy who'd successfully completed a marathon, which isn't too far off the mark.

Harris was as pleased as he was relieved that the couple was able to pull off a successful convention after a 28-year hiatus.

The single bit of bad news is that the organizers will lose money on the enterprise because code enforcement rules stipulated a maximum crowd of 200 (terrestrials, anyway) on the Integratron grounds at any time. An unknown number of people were turned away at the gate because of the crowd size limitation.

Barb and Rob would like to sponsor more spaceship conventions in the future, and are hopeful they can arrive at a solution with code enforcement officials to host a larger crowd.

Conventions are where people with similar experiences and

attitudes gather to validate each other's stories. And those stories flew like laser beams at a Disney light show Saturday.

Are the encounters and galactic highjinks for real? Definitive responses are often difficult to pin down when it comes to outerspace matters.

Some would say, if it was real to the contactee, then their perception becomes their reality. Who's to knock a guy for seeing a dragon in a puffy cloud, or an Indian in a mountainside rock formation?

Nobody was knocking anybody's stories Saturday, no matter how outlandish they seem upon reflection in the cold, harsh here-and-now world.

Maybe that's the disconnect. Maybe we'd be better off if we spent a little less time in this serious, reality-based business and more time in what is traditionally considered a fanciful world, a world where flying saucers and little green men are the norm.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

UFO Report Reveals Lancs Sightings

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:46:06 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:46:06 -0400
Subject: UFO Report Reveals Lancs Sightings

Source: The Lancashire Evening Post - UK

<http://tinyurl.com/kd61a>

17 May 2006

UFO Report Reveals Lancs Sightings

[with photo gallery]

Bright green lights above the M6 and a moon-like object hovering in the Preston skies are just two of the 'UFO' sightings to have been reported in Lancashire.

The Ministry of Defence has revealed details of 'sightings' which, it says, proves that UFOs cannot be proved to be alien craft.

They say most of the sightings are explicable... the rest 'plasma'.

Now the formerly top secret lists of all the sightings that have happened across the country have been made public and Lancashire has had its fair share.

In the last four years there have been five cases which would have suited X-File heroes Mulder and Scully.

The study, called Unidentified Aerial Phenomena in the UK Air Defence Region, set out to investigate UFOs, but the body of evidence it collected was nothing short of phenomenal.

DC Gary Heseltine, who works for British Transport Police and is a UFO enthusiast, has been keeping an unofficial database of sightings dating back to 1901.

He said: "I've had two experiences with objects that I cannot explain in my life and UFOs are fascinating.

"There have been a number of recorded sightings in Lancashire.

"These reports that have been released are really interesting, and far from putting people off the subject I think it will actually raise more questions than it answers. I believe that all these reports are coming from high quality witnesses and at least a percentage of these must prove that extraterrestrial life exists."

Under secretary of state for defence, Tom Watson, said: "I am delighted that the Freedom of Information Act has meant that this once secret report has been declassified and made public."

Download and read the report at www.direct.gov.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 18](#)

UFO Seen In South-East Queensland

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:53:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:53:27 -0400
Subject: UFO Seen In South-East Queensland

Source: The Queensland Times - Melbourne, Australia

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/k881>

17.05.2006

UFO Seen In South-East

Police and radio stations were inundated with calls from concerned people around south-east Queensland last night reporting a strange green light streaking across the sky.

Guesses about the origin of the mystery light ranged from a crashed plane to an odd shooting star to the inevitable rumours of an alien invasion.

Last night authorities remained dumbfounded about the origin of the light.

A cop on the beat in Ipswich was one of those to witness the baffling phenomenon, calling in a report to his communications base about 6.20pm.

"There was a bright flash of green light across the sky," the policeman reported.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

UFO Festival Looks Into The World Of Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:04:58 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:04:58 -0400
Subject: UFO Festival Looks Into The World Of Aliens

Source: The Statesman Journal - Salem, Oregon

<http://tinyurl.com/q8szm>

May 18, 2006

UFO Festival Looks Into The World Of Aliens

Scientists, revelers and people who've been abducted come together in McMinnville

Angela Yeager
Statesman Journal

May 18, 2006

Marius Dekker doesn't want to talk about his experience being abducted by aliens - even though he is giving a speech about the subject this weekend.

Vancouver, Wash., resident Dekker, 70, is a retired chemical engineer and scientist who will be speaking about his abduction experience at a workshop on UFOs at 10 a.m. Saturday.

"It is a very good possibility I was abducted. I can't go into it on the phone," he said, after being asked to explain his abduction experience.

"You'll just have to come see my talk. I'm not going to get into the whole story on the phone. It first happened in Holland, when I was 16. I suspect I was abducted. I am examining these things now."

Dekker's workshop is part of the McMenamins UFO Festival, which is Friday and Saturday in downtown McMinnville. There also is a preview event at 7:30 tonight at the Kennedy School in Portland, featuring a screening of the 1994 Showtime movie "Roswell."

The event is in its seventh year and brings the serious and the goofy sides of aliens and UFOs together. There are workshops and forums with speakers on UFOs and alien abduction, as well as more light-hearted events such as the UFO Costume Parade at 1 p.m. Saturday, which is followed by an Alien Pet Costume Contest at 2 p.m.

Dekker was selected to speak because of his research into abduction; he is one of the festival's many scheduled speakers.

Dekker is retired, but worked as a chemical engineer in Alberta, Canada, and as a math, physics and chemistry professor at Capilano College in Vancouver, British Columbia.

He said he started believing in aliens later in his life.

"I grew up as a scientist and a real nerd and had little use for UFO talk," he said. "Over the course of many years, I have

reversed my feelings about them."

This will be Dekker's first time attending the UFO Festival in McMinnville. He refused to give any details on what he will talk about for his speech, other than to say he will chronicle the "long story" about why he believes he was abducted. He would say, however, that "missing time" is one of the main elements that abductees find they have in common.

"It's the most telling sign," he said. "People wondering, 'Where have I been in the last three hours?'"

When asked if that could just be memory loss, Dekker explained: "People might think they just had a memory lapse, but there's usually more to it."

Another high-profile speaker at this year's festival is Jesse Marcel Jr., who will give the keynote speech to promote his new book, "Roswell: It Really Happened."

According to Tim Hills, the project historian with McMenamins Pubs, Marcel is a big name in the UFO community.

Marcel Jr. will speak at 7 p.m. Friday at the Mack Theater and will follow his speech with a reception and book signing in a tent that will be set up next to the Hotel Oregon on Evans Street.

Aside from people giving serious speeches about UFOs and aliens, there are those who go to the festival as an excuse to paint their faces and put on pairs of antennas to parade through downtown McMinnville.

The UFO Costume Parade is one of the highlights of the event each year and is organized by McMenamins and the McMinnville Downtown Association. The parade will feature more than 24 entries this year, including floats and marching bands.

The Salem-area Star Trek club USS Destiny plans to participate in this year's parade. Salem resident Craig Martin, a member of USS Destiny, said members dressed in officer's uniforms as well as others from a separate Klingon club will be on the back of a flatbed truck for the event.

"I'm going to be in a 'Next Generation' commander's uniform because I'm the commanding officer of the club," Martin said.

"We try to interact with other groups doing the same kinds of things we are. And it's a good way to advertise for new members," he said.

"Last year, we just had bales of hay on the truck. This year, the Klingons thought it would be cool to have a table in the middle with peace talks going on, which sounds like a lot of fun to me."

[aveager](#).nul

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/18/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:01:35 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:07:51 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/18/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 58
May 18, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

FAS Membership Special Offer:
<http://www.fas.org/static/member-offer.jsp>

** CRS VIEWS GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO PHONE RECORDS
** SBU AND THE CHALLENGE OF INFORMATION SHARING
** RETHINKING INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS, CONT'D
** HISTORICAL DICTIONARY OF ISRAELI INTELLIGENCE

CRS VIEWS GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO PHONE RECORDS

The government's acquisition of telephone records of tens of millions of Americans, as reported last week in USA Today, raises a host of thorny legal issues. In a new report, the Congressional Research Service performed a preliminary assessment of those issues.

"The factual information available in the public domain with respect to any such alleged program is limited and in some instances inconsistent," the CRS authors caution, "and the application, if at all, of any possibly relevant statutory provisions to any such program is likely to be a very fact specific inquiry."

Having said that, the CRS explains that there are several statutes that may be pertinent and that could conceivably entail civil or criminal penalties for telephone companies that provide information to the government without statutory authorization.

"This [CRS] report ...summarize[s] statutory authorities regarding access by the Government, for either foreign intelligence or law enforcement purposes, to information related to telephone calling patterns or practices. Where pertinent, we will also discuss statutory prohibitions against accessing or disclosing such information, along with relevant exceptions to those prohibitions."

The Congressional Research Service does not make its products directly available to the public. But a copy of the latest report was obtained by Secrecy News.

See "Government Access to Phone Calling Activity and Related Records: Legal Authorities," May 17, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL33424.pdf>

SBU AND THE CHALLENGE OF INFORMATION SHARING

The widespread use of "Sensitive But Unclassified" (SBU) control markings is a major impediment to information sharing inside and

outside of the federal government, according to testimony last week from Thomas E. McNamara, the program manager for the Information Sharing Environment, who reports to the Director of National Intelligence.

"More than 60 different marking types are used across the Federal Government to identify SBU, including various designations within a single department," he observed.

And even "[when] different agencies ... use the same marking to denote information that is to be handled as SBU, a chosen category of information is often defined differently from agency to agency, and agencies may impose different handling requirements. Some of these marking and handling procedures are not only inconsistent, but are contradictory."

See his prepared testimony from a May 10 hearing of the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_hr/051006mcnamara.pdf

"There is, quite frankly, much [SBU] that has no legal basis and doesn't deserve a legal basis," he told the Subcommittee. "We should be getting that stuff out."

See "Congress urged to help make more 'sensitive' information public" by Chris Strohm, Congress Daily, May 11:

<http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0506/051106cdaml.htm>

An interagency working group completed an inventory of SBU procedures in March, and is due to develop recommendations for standardizing such procedures by next month.

RETHINKING INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS, CONT'D

As well established as the practice of intelligence analysis may be, researchers continue to ask elementary questions about what analysis is, how it is done, and how it can be done better.

"Intelligence analysis involves a complex process of assessing the reliability of information from a wide variety of sources and combining seemingly unrelated events. This problem is challenging because it involves aspects of data mining, data correlation and human judgment," one recent study performed for the Office of Naval Research observed.

The study focused on development of computer tools to support the analytical method known as Analysis of Competing Hypotheses (ACH), previously explored by Folker, among others (Secrecy News, 05/08/06).

See "Assisting People to Become Independent Learners in the Analysis of Intelligence" by Peter L. Pirolli, Palo Alto Research Center, Inc., Final Report to the Office of Naval Research, February 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/pirolli.pdf>

HISTORICAL DICTIONARY OF ISRAELI INTELLIGENCE

A "Historical Dictionary of Israeli Intelligence," published this month, is the third in a new series of reference works on major intelligence services, following volumes on British and U.S. intelligence.

"Mossad," the name of the Israeli foreign intelligence service, is probably the best known Hebrew word after "shalom," the preface suggests.

The new Dictionary, written by Israeli professor Ephraim Kahana, provides background, updated organizational charts, and other information on the Mossad and several other Israeli intelligence and security agencies.

The 424-page Dictionary provides an introduction to Israeli intelligence, along with entries on significant persons, operations and key historical episodes. All of the obvious topics are covered, from the capture of fugitive Nazi Adolf

Eichmann to the Jonathan Pollard case, as are other relatively obscure subjects, such as the defense security organization Malmab, and its querulous director Yehiel Horev.

The individual subject entries are mostly brief, and do not include sources or references. But the book includes a fine bibliography (at least for those who lack Hebrew) featuring hardcopy and online resources on Israeli intelligence.

See "Historical Dictionary of Israeli Intelligence" by Ephraim Kahana, Scarecrow Press, Inc., Lanham, MD, May 2006:

<http://tinyurl.com/zf6r4>

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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:10:21 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:02:07 -0400
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

Me too.

>Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled
>argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that
>form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle
>sightings.

I don't even find a jumbled argument here, just a statement - no science, no reasoning. I'm impressed also that the author invokes "Stoke's Law" to show that emitted radiation from an excited aerosol would have longer wavelength than the exciting radiation, so the latter must be shorter than visible light.

First there is no-one called "Stoke" - it's "Stokes' Law"; second, Stokes' Law is about hydrodynamic viscosity anyway, not optics, and the author should have cited the Stokes Shift instead; and thirdly, he then proceeds to infer that aerosol clouds could emit visible fluorescence if excited with "IR or UV bursts", as if these were interchangeable, when obviously IR is longer wavelength than visible!

I'm still searching ...

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 14:34:39 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:18:39 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 00:42:27 -0300
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 16:11:28 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

<snip>

>>To the incredible level of detail and precision observed - and
>>over a single night? With interwoven layers and no foot
>>prints? The crabwood glyph with line width varying to exactly
>>the right width to show shading differences, for example?

>People exacted the science of stomping down grass thousands of
>years ago. They threshed wheat and barley that way for
>centuries. So they were able to make a nice little circle in the
>crops. That's what I meant by," while we've had the technology
>for over 3 millenium-or more-to create crop circles."

Hi Don and Eleanor!

We should never underestimate the abilities or skills of our
ancient and even prehistoric ancestors.

Just after reading this post, I took a break for lunch and
randomly selected one the National Geographic magazines from the
ones from the mid-1940s to the present that I have stored in one
of the labs where I work. When I turned over the cover page of
the December 1992 issue I saw startled and impressed with what
caught my eye. It was a colour picture of what one may call a
"petrified" crop circle in a field on the Golan Heights that
dates back about 5000 years! It is known in Arabic as Rujum el-
Hiri. The outer circular ring of this massive glyph of five
concentric circles has a circumference of nearly 1500 feet!

I was able to find an image of this glyph on the web (see the
URL below).

<http://tinyurl.com/m7rrji>

>In the last ten years anyone with \$150.00 had the money to buy a
>GPS and certainly laser theolidites are easy to come by. String
>and planks are easy to find as well. Pre-planning "might" take
>care of the intricacies of some of these circles. Often we see
>the tractor lines going across the field and right through the
>glyph. There's a way in there.

<snip>

>I can't say that all of these circles are hoaxed or just plain
>anonymous artwork perhaps, but I'm certain that most are.

I agree with Don here. Just because crop circles are so amazing
beautiful and intricately detailed one suspects they must have
an "out of this world" connection does not mean they do. Unlike

most human abductions or cattle mutilations where aliens and/or UFOs are also reported, they are glaringly absent from all crop circle reports (with the exception of hoaxed accounts and the much simpler so-called "saucer nests" which are depressions or imprints of often witnessed landed UFOs).

Of course, everybody has a right to their own personal beliefs and I am not one to attack or attempt to shatter them but to quote an anonymous author, "You're entitled to your own opinion, but not your own facts.". The goal of everyone should be to move forward in our understanding, knowledge and the truth and not to dwell in fantasy and wishful thinking.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Re: Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 16:28:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:20:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure - White

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO->UpDates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 11:43:13 -0400
>Subject: Spongy ETs A Lost Tourism Lure

<snip>

>Amid the Galactic Costume Contest, Lights in the Night parade
>and a slew of huskers and vendors in the civic plaza, noted
>scientists and UFO experts will deliver guest lectures and
>workshops.

Wow. If I were either a noted scientist or UFO expert, a
festival like that is the _last_ place I would want to be seen
at!

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

UFO Researcher In Cairo

From: **Ahmed Ziady** <ziadfreemagazine.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 15:46:27 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:34:48 -0400
Subject: UFO Researcher In Cairo

[Non-Subscriber post]

Hello,

This is Ahmed Ziady. I'm researcher in many UFO matters for 10 years now and I want be your contact in Egypt.

I have 3 sites on the Web, where I have many articles about UFOs and very difficult cases like the airplane 990 Egyptian that down in 1999. I have many other cases.

www.ziadfreemagazine.com
www.ziad2freemagazine.com
www.ziadencyclopedia.com

my e-mail:

ziadfreemagazine.nul

my mobile:///012-3518739

Ahmed Ziady

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

UFOs 9/11 And Why The Uphill Battle

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 19:27:09 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 22:37:28 -0400
Subject: UFOs 9/11 And Why The Uphill Battle

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=6757267008400743688>

Here's another one of those 9/11 documentaries. If you look at the infrastructure of the goof ups you'll understand why the UFO debate will rage on until someone brave stands up and the public gets off their butts and exercises their power.

Can't keep a secret? You sure can.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Faccenda

From: Joe Faccenda <Uforth.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 19:46:40 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 22:43:59 -0400
Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs? - Faccenda

>From: Irene Rome <ikrom1.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 12:57:42 -0700
>Subject: Re: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 23:04:12 EDT
>>Subject: What Got You Hooked On UFOs?

>>Have to ask.

>I've since seen another UFO, a star-like object while I was on
>the highway, and another star-like object at home.
>At any rate, that was the beginning of my off and on
>relationship with UFOlogy.

>Life changing event? You bet. I don't know how
>'experiencers'/abductees survive with their knowledge.

>Reenee

All It does Reenee, is drive you to seek answers.

If after you have a had a sighting of an anomalous craft the
next step is usually to read books, or search the internet. And
if you are lucky end up on a site like UpDates.

I cannot praise this List highly enough not only for the
intellectual input from its many members, but also the
no-nonsense way discussions will strip away hyperbole and
conjecture, to seek if possible a true nugget of fact.

And no, I am not holding my breath!

Unfortunately even when you have had a close-encounter, it will
still be subject to interpretation, and, to a lesser or greater
degree, to credibility.

In the end it does not matter, I have long gone past the point
where i care if anybody believes me or not.

I look to the future and the hope that one day the 'Holy Grail'
of ufology will materialise, that a ufo will either land, or in
some way the occupants will communicate.

Even then very few can comprehend the enormity of disclosure,
the social upheavals, or the fundamental focus of everyone on
this planet.

Life changing event? if a UFO ever lands then we will all see
what 'Life changing' really means.....

All the best,

Joe Faccenda

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Charles Fort Books On-Line

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:14:24 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 22:47:11 -0400
Subject: Charles Fort Books On-Line

Unsure if everyone, especially new-subscribers, are aware that Charles Hoy Fort's books are on-line.

The weather data is of interest to weather folks.

<http://www.resologist.net/>

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

[fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash?

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:32:49 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 22:55:12 -0400
Subject: [fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash?

I believe Kelly speaks for me in my attitude towards UFO seekers and conspiracy theorists. These are oxymorons. Those who report UFOs are more worthy of study and conspiracists are not theorists.

Terry

I can attest that the Pentagon is huge, as I have been in it as a representative of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police when I was a civilian working on a special project on conflict management.

If I recall correctly, when I was there about 10 years ago, it was considered a small city where 26,000 people worked. So, there must have been lots of witnesses!

Since the Cold War was over then, one Colonel who was escorting me on a little tour showed me where "Ground Zero" was for a Soviet nuclear strike. I was standing right on it! Also, he said the Soviets never figured out what all the hoopla was when there were barbecues in the interior courtyard on Fridays. He said it caused great confusion amongst the spies who viewed satellite images. I'm sure the images are better now, judging by Google, than they were during the Cold War.

In any event, you can't keep a secret in a city like Washington, sorry. This is what I mean by that: I'm interested in most things Fortean, but find two fields off the track sometimes.

Those are Ufology and Conspiracy Theories. I read, and still do, a ton of stuff in both areas and have come to the conclusion that some of the researchers in those areas become what I call 'fact sick'. They become so convinced by whatever theory they believe in that it doesn't matter what anyone says, if it breaks their belief, whatever that may be, they don't listen and go back on their stacks of so-called 'facts' that they have compiled to justify their belief.

Basically, they don't see the forest for the trees. And, they have lost their critical thinking ability, so caught up they are in their own delusion.

Now, I am not saying that all Ufologists or conspiracy theorists are deluded, but the ones who I think are, seem attracted more to those fields of research than to other Fortean subjects, mainly, I believe, due to the paper trail, which they consider facts, even when proven to be hoaxes.

One example that springs to mind is the Alien Autopsy film, recently debunked, but there are still fact-sick people out there whose careers or reputations depend on it being a real event and so, instead of admitting that they studied and believed in a sham for a good number of years, they still try to say the latest revelation is just another conspiracy, and so on it goes.....

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

PRG Update 05-19-06

From: Stephen Bassett <ParadigmRG.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 00:47:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 22:59:56 -0400
Subject: PRG Update 05-19-06

Paradigm Research Group

PRG Update - May 19, 2006

UK Gary McKinnon Hacker Case

PRG has been following the case of computer hacker, Gary McKinnon, who is facing extradition to the United States for violating national security by hacking into government computers seeking information regarding UFOs and government cover-up. Recently he gave a fairly impressive accounting of himself in an interview to the BBC. See:

<http://tinyurl.com/faoot>

After some consideration PRG executive director, Stephen Bassett, has contacted Mr. McKinnon's solicitor, Karen Todner, and offered his services pro bono as an expert witness and consultant to counsel as regards the political, economic, scientific and technological implications of the extraterrestrial presence and the US Government imposed truth embargo. Further, he has offered to make available PRG's massive database of media, research and activist contacts to assist in the preparation of Mr. McKinnon's defense.

Mr. McKinnon has broken the law and should be punished. However, there is a real possibility the enormous pressure currently being exerted on the truth embargo may prompt the United States Government to overreact by seeking to punish Mr. McKinnon to an excessive degree. If asked, PRG will assist to help prevent this from happening.

UK MOD BS

A study by the Ministry of Defense in the United Kingdom has just emerged and concludes there is no substance whatsoever to the UFO reports of the past 60 years - all natural phenomena.

Based upon early returns from researchers in the UK who are reviewing the 1996-2000 UFO "study" by the UK Ministry of Defense, it has every appearance of being an attempt by the UK to create a Condon Report* type propaganda effort to counter the gathering momentum for disclosure developing at that time. When they were finished, they realized what an embarrassing piece of crap they had created and buried it. It came to light because outside researchers, some no fans of the extraterrestrial hypothesis, requested its release under the UK's equivalent to the US Freedom of Information Act.

If you like irony and think the comparison to the Condon Report is accurate, you will appreciate the name of the UK MOD report - "Project Condign." To add to that irony, the definition of "condign" is "adequate, deserved." In fact, the name is so ridiculous, it is tempting to think the whole thing is a UK Government joke. There is also the possibility the public report is a cover for a more comprehensive, classified report. This has been done before.

As regards media coverage, the contrast between the recently disgorged UK MOD UFO report and the 2000 French COMETA report is notable. The COMETA Report raised important points as to the validity of UFO phenomena and challenged the US to act.

The US press wanted nothing to do with the COMETA Report, made no effort to translate it, when it was translated and presented, wouldn't cover it. The exception was freelance journalist Leslie Kean - to her everlasting credit.

The UK MOD report has been all over the US media - Reuters, NY Times, Drudge, MSNBC, CNN, FNN, many smaller papers.

That the American press went from being a formidable force for understanding the world and challenging questionable government policy circa 1970-75 to a pathetic collection of overpaid useful idiots is one of the saddest and most dangerous political realities of the 20th Century.

* The Condon Report was headed by Prof. Edward U. Condon and based at the University of Colorado (a black mark the U of C will eventually have to account for) and released in 1968. It was an awful study but passable propaganda. For an excellent summary of the history of the Condon Report see the following article by W. Todd Zechel: www.paradigmclock.com/articles-zechel-1.html

New Publication - UFO Data Magazine
www.ufodata.co.uk

A new full color, 48 page magazine has debuted in the UK working to fill the vacuum left by the demise of UFO Magazine UK and the death of Graham Birdsall. It is UFO Data Magazine and is edited by Russel Callaghan.

New Documentary - UFO: The Greatest Story Ever Denied
www.theufomovie.com

This new documentary is produced by Jose Escamilla Media Works, LLC. If it is as good as its superb website, it is very good indeed.

Stanton Friedman and Michio Kaku - Together!
www.talkradionetwork.com

PRG Hall of Fame recipient, Stanton Friedman, will be the guest of theoretical physicist, Michio Kaku, on Kaku's new radio show Science Fantastic on Saturday, May 20, at 6-7 PM, EST. The show is syndicated on 90 stations and webcast.

Kaku appeared in one of the better segments on the "Peter Jennings Reports UFOs" special on Feb. 24, 2005. Seth Shostak of SETI will guest during the hour prior to Stanton. It would appear Kaku, who seemed to position himself in the Jennings special on the side of the ETH, is going to engage the issue. It is well known that a significant percentage of top scientists are in the closet regarding the UFO/ET issue. They know, but they fear to speak candidly. Is Kaku one of them?

Paradigm Research Group
E-mail: ParadigmRG.nul
URL: www.paradigmclock.com
Cell: 202-215-8344
4938 Hampden Lane, #161
Bethesda, MD 20814

3rd Annual Exopolitics Expo - The X-Conference
Hilton Gaithersburg - TBA 2006
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 09:19:26 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 23:04:21 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 10:13:50 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 13:37:28 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

Thanks Isaac

Yes you're quite right, it's unlikely that "sondhiu" has any connection to the author.

>Anyway, in case you still want to track down "sonhui379", I'd >simply note that the civil service usernames follow conventions >pretty similar to the rest of the world. Thus "sondhui379" may >be a combination of a surname, initial and then a number. I note >that "sondhu" is a surname (of Indian extraction I think) so >"sondhu i 379" may be a plausible breakdown.

Yes, this is what I already suggested to EMP the other day, except I believe it should be "Sondhi" and "U" as the initial.

The DI55 room number of the Condign originator is a blanked three-digit number.

The "379" could such a room number. It's always possible that even identifying the office location of the preparation/redaction could provide a clue.

It's a very long shot but I thought it worth mentioning.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 19](#)

Questions For Skeptics

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 23:23:40 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 23:23:40 -0400
Subject: Questions For Skeptics

Source: Las Vegas Weekly - Nevada, USA

<http://www.lasvegasweekly.com/2006/01/26/aws13.html>

Jan. 26 - Feb. 1

Questions For Skeptics

The problem with James Randi and his foundation on the paranormal, pseudoscientific and supernatural

By Skyllaire Alfvegren

Dogmatists of any stripe are fundamentally wounded, whether they're Islamic terrorists, Christian abortion-clinic bombers or magicians with an ax to grind.

Picture this: A little boy with an imagination and a sense of wonder begins futzing with a deck of cards, sleight of hand ... as that boy delves deeper into magic, it's revealed to be nothing more than a world of smoke and mirrors, of "cons" and "marks." Stage magicians, like lawyers and secret agents, make a living from deception, so perhaps they assume everyone else does, as well. From that perspective, the connection between stage magic and skepticism makes sense.

What's more important, what science knows or what it doesn't (yet)? What's more beneficial to scientific inquiry, an open mind or a sense of self-importance? These are questions that beg to be asked of the skeptical movement, which convenes in Las Vegas this weekend for The Amazing Meeting, a benefit for the James Randi Educational Foundation. (The conference takes place at the Stardust and features Murray Gell-Mann, Nadine Strossen, the Mythbusters, Penn & Teller, Mac King, Jamy Ian Swiss, Phil Plait, Julia Sweeney, and Michael Shermer.) After all, while it's true that opportunists profit from the murky worlds of the paranormal and the unknown, and that some people will believe anything, it's also true that scientists have falsified data to get grants or overlooked inconvenient phenomenon to maintain the status quo in their field.

Well, as iconoclastic writer Charles Fort once noted, "Witchcraft always has a hard time, until it becomes established and changes its name."

But let's not generalize. Let's examine the contributions made by Randi, the skeptical movement's leading figure, to science and objective thought.

Randi can be eloquent and is quite the showman; he is also wildly intelligent—he got a MacArthur genius grant in 1986. But according to his detractors, Randi's main qualities are his malice and hypocrisy. He's hell-bent on tearing apart anyone he deems a kook, including distinguished scientists and Nobel Prize-winners. This is amusing, as Randi has no scientific credentials whatsoever (although he did once write an astrology

column for a Canadian tabloid and host a paranormal-themed radio show).

In 1997, Randi threatened to fly to Sri Lanka to persuade Arthur C. Clarke to stop advocating cold fusion. (Clarke, a genuine scientific visionary, inventor of the communication satellite and award-winning author, received degrees, with honors, in physics and mathematics.) In 2001, on a BBC Radio program, Randi attacked Brian Josephson, Nobel Prize-winner and professor of physics at Cambridge University.

Why? Josephson was interested in the possible connections between quantum physics and consciousness. Randi also has a penchant for lawsuits—he once tried to sue a writer known for covering the UFO beat, simply because he printed some unflattering but verifiable information about the magician. Randi left the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP) because of all the litigation against him.

Charismatic psychic Uri Geller, whose abilities have been tested by a number of prestigious laboratories, has probably been Randi's biggest target. In the process of attempting to discredit the psychic, Randi has also attacked institutions, like Stanford, intrigued by Geller's alleged abilities. He defamed two eminent scientists, Harold Puthoff and Russell Targ, calling them "incompetent." At the time, author Robert Anton Wilson wryly observed, "Randi was not there, yet he claims to know what was going on [during the experiment] better than the two scientists who were supervising it. The only way he could know better ... is if he had 100 percent accurate telepathy."

Randi is probably best known for his infamous million-dollar challenge to "any person or persons who can demonstrate any psychic, supernatural or paranormal ability of any kind" under what Randi refers to as "satisfactory observing conditions."

Ray Hyman, a leading Fellow of CSICOP, has pointed out that Randi's challenge is illegitimate from a scientific standpoint. "Scientists don't settle issues with a single test ... Proof in science happens through replication." If Randi's challenge was legitimate, he would set up a double-blind experiment which he himself wouldn't judge. But considering his hostility toward scientists receptive to paranormal phenomena, this doesn't seem likely. His "challenge" is rigged, yet he can crow that his prize goes unclaimed because paranormal phenomena simply does not exist.

Compare this outlook to the philosophy adopted by followers of Charles Fort. Forteanism (a term coined by screenwriter Ben Hecht, who, along with Theodore Dreiser, H.L. Mencken and Oliver Wendell Holmes, was a member of the original Fortean Society, formed upon Fort's death in 1932) entertain the notion that anything is possible until proven otherwise.

Some are scientists, some are street musicians. They are neither gullible nor pompous, neither "true believers" in—nor coldly dismissive of—anything. And they have a sense of humor largely missing from Randi's crowd.

"In and of itself," says a man once denigrated by the skeptical movement, "skepticism has made no actual contribution to science, just as music reviews in the newspaper make no contribution to the art of composition."

The universe is full of mystery, as well as charlatans. It is up to the individual to weigh evidence objectively. Just don't use your intuition to do so, or you could be the skeptics' next target.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/19/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 11:40:24 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:27:26 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/19/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 59
May 19, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** DNI REPORTS "SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS" IN INTELLIGENCE REFORM
** THE HAYDEN CONFIRMATION HEARING
** SELECTED CRS REPORTS
** IN PRINT: IMAGINARY WEAPONS

DNI REPORTS "SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS" IN INTELLIGENCE REFORM

In an unusually informative new report to Congress, the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) advised that he "is making substantial progress in the implementation of the [Intelligence Reform Act of 2004].

The DNI outlined the actions he has taken to integrate the U.S. intelligence bureaucracy and alluded in passing to several new initiatives he has undertaken. For example:

"For the first time, the IC [intelligence community] is reassessing all of its relationships with foreign counterparts to determine whether new relationships may be beneficial and whether there are additional activities that need to be deconflicted."

And: "The ODNI is reviewing information disclosure policies and is working to improve training and awareness of information security procedures, implement audit technologies, and ensure that unauthorized disclosures are investigated."

"The ODNI will soon issue a community-wide directive on unauthorized disclosures."

"The ODNI has established a digital library of all new intelligence products produced by the community to bring together all available national intelligence on any given topic.... To ensure that analysis is based on all available sources, the ODNI is exploring ways to increase the capacity of analysts across the community to exploit the full range of classified data and openly available information relevant to national security."

"The analytic ombudsman recently reviewed IC tradecraft and assumptions on the recent Hamas victory in the Palestinian elections, and lessons learned from that exercise are already being put into place."

See "Report on the Progress of the Director of National Intelligence in Implementing the 'Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004'," May 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/dni/implement.html>

THE HAYDEN CONFIRMATION HEARING

"I do think we overclassify, and I think it's because we got bad habits," said Gen. Michael V. Hayden, the nominee to be the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

See the full transcript of his May 18 confirmation hearing before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_hr/051806transcript.pdf

SELECTED CRS REPORTS

Several noteworthy new reports of the Congressional Research Service obtained by Secrecy News that are not otherwise readily available in the public domain include the following.

"Nuclear Command and Control: Current Programs and Issues," May 3, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL33408.pdf>

"Iraqi Civilian, Police, and Security Forces Casualty Estimates," May 8, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RS22441.pdf>

"Social Unrest in China," May 8, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33416.pdf>

IN PRINT: IMAGINARY WEAPONS

The military subculture that pursues the development of fabulous, physically impossible weapons concepts at taxpayer expense is the subject of a new book by defense reporter Sharon Weinberger called "Imaginary Weapons."

Weinberger introduces the hafnium bomb, a hypothetical weapon that would supposedly harness the energy released from a nuclear transition within a hafnium isomer. It is a purely speculative notion that has been largely discredited, but one that attracted nearly cultish attention -- and millions of dollars -- within the defense establishment.

It is akin in its eccentricity, and lack of reproducibility, to "zero point energy," "psychic teleportation," and other notions that Weinberger terms "fringe science."

Fringe science, she contends, "has reached new heights under the Bush Administration. We have fewer and fewer scientific experts in the government, and an increasing unwillingness by the government to turn to outside scientific advisers."

"The real danger in this story is not the existence of fringe science, but of fringe science in government, particularly when it receives substantial funding or guides decision-making."

"I see this problem getting worse, not better. If the government doesn't take steps to shore up its scientific expertise, I think we are facing a future filled with imaginary weapons."

Her highly readable new book, filled with entertaining or disgusting anecdotes, has just been published.

See "Imaginary Weapons: A Journey Through the Pentagon's Scientific Underworld" by Sharon Weinberger, Nation Books, June 2006:

<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1560258497/002-6021113-5060015>

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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 15:41:48 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:28:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All? - White

>From: Gildas Bourdais <gbourdais.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 14 May 2006 15:54:39 +0200
>Subject: Re: Who Is Behind It All?

<snip>

>Eleanor, and all,

>It may be argued that there has been no lifting of secrecy so
>far,officially, from the US government.

In 59 years, the U.S. government has gone from discussing UFOs
publicly to total, seamless denial. That is a slight increase in
secrecy, not a "lifting."

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - White

From: **Eleanor White** <eleanor.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 15:54:02 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:30:22 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - White

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 00:42:27 -0300
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

<snip>

>I can't say that all of these circles are hoaxed or just plain
>anonymous artwork perhaps, but I'm certain that most are.

>I have enough trouble just keeping up with the UFO phenomenon.
>Crop circles are only of minor interest to me. Since they are in
>someone elses arena, I'll leave it to them.

>Do you have a URL for that helicopter-over-glyph incident?

Sorry - I don't. It was a TV documentary.

I have to say that now being retired from a career which included a number of technologies including a bit of surveying, and given the large number of crop glyphs I've seen, none of the possibilities you listed even approach explaining the more complex glyphs I've seen photos of. Maybe some of the more complex glyphs could be "stomped down" to that level of precision over a week or two in daytime, but never overnight, with woven stomped-down areas.

More than that, the footage of small lights and in one case a small "UFO" above a crop circle in England suggest at least some of these glyphs do have a UFO connection.

But, "that's just my take on it."

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

UK MOD/UAP Scientific Filter?

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 17:45:59 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:37:53 -0400
Subject: UK MOD/UAP Scientific Filter?

The ultimate way to filter unconventional flying objects from conventional ones, at this time in our history, is somewhat simple for people with the right instrumentation and detection systems - expensive government sources, usually.

Where in the report do they mention "should have pointed out or recommended at least." Right? They're scientists right? Can't miss these biggies

I'm not trying to make this complicated but as useful to read as possible for everyone. Therefore, it is not without loss of technical detail

1) ANY object escaping earth's gravitational field with a traceable HYPERBOLIC trajectory is, by definition, an object with it's own internal energy source. Since not many objects escape earth's gravitational field, the Space Command Network should find it easy to classify this as: Intelligent Design, Not Of Planetary Origin. An object captured and held by earth's gravitational field, has a parabolic trajectory (throw a rock up it comes down, etc). An object in earth orbit will have an elliptical path (throw a rock hard enough and it doesn't come down but falls at a rate that matches the curvature of the planet as it moves forward and it stays up there) wow simple math simple physics but not so simple detection equipment.

So, there is a one good UFO Filter Ta Da!

2) Any earth-based (in atmosphere) plasma will have a unique spectra which reveals the atomic composition of the atmosphere in which it is being driven (Oxygen, Nitrogen, Argon, etc.). In the rare event we can capture high resolution spectra from a fleeting event, it will be possible to classify this spectra even further or better.

Let's assume a high tech vehicle can also generate a plasma of the same sort, assuming electromagnetic fields, heat, and/or electric fields are present. Therefore, this is not an exclusive means for sorting the two: Real UFO vs Plasma. However, spectra will also reveal how much energy is being used to drive the emission (Can imply the energy density of the source and, if high enough, it can possibly be classified as Not Ours). Freely vibrating electrons stripped off there host atoms, can produce light waves, radio waves, X-rays and, if high enough, Gamma rays . and so, wavelengths not characteristic of the atoms present. All told, captured light spectra (EM Radiation of all kinds) from LITS can prove quite useful rather than traditionally not useful. But, once again, this would have to be conducted by government funded resources and is dependent upon their ability to locate events of sufficient length, magnitude, and triangulation means for the detectors present.

If you noticed spectrometry was attempted in the 1940's with the Green Fireball incidents. So, if scientist were involved then, where are they now any guesses? I'm absolutely positive that they would never let go of this subject!

Also, in the event, that UFOs have a fuel systems, light spectra could reveal the make and composition of the molecules

and atoms from exhaust's escaping from the rear of the craft. If it's ours, it will definitely have this right? a definite terrestrial signature too right?

In summary, EM emission can be a very useful tool but very difficult to capture coincidentally. EM emissions such as radio waves and micro waves (all caused from charged particles being accelerated) can be much easier to capture using radio receivers. However, we'd have to tie in the source of those waves (made audible by electronic radio receivers) with a physical observation a correlation has to be made or it's useless noise on the radio if you can't triangulate it to the source and photograph it right?

3) Radiation from landing sites: A simple Geiger counter won't work not if we want to prove the likelihood of non terrestrial based technology.

OK, radiation is coming from a source but we want to know what kind of source is emanating that radiation we want radiation from sources that are singularly unique (proof) . right? Once again we have to sort the radiation by energy rather than just say whether it is or isn't present (which is all a crude Geiger counter really does). With expensive radiation detectors (\$10,000+) we can sort and classify the radiation energy to such a high degree that we can tell what types of radioactive atoms might be present and what specifically is producing the unique radiation patterns being generated. If you can't sort the energy you can't see a pattern a unique signature we got it!

Why is that important? Well, if a source of radiation reveals elements that shouldn't be there then this is getting better right? Harder to dismiss as mumbo jumbo right?

Next, if the radiation is coming from atoms that are short lived and highly radioactive this usually means that some kind of source of radiation has transmuted the elements present from one form into another in other words, atoms will be there that can't possibly have been there before hand this is why trace cases can be Highly useful with the Right equipment. So, Remember Geiger Counters won't work. Repeat this again Geiger Counters won't work, again, again, and again. You got it.

4) Trajectory of UFOs: The path a particle takes through the atmosphere/space tells us quite a lot! If we can measure its timed path with sufficient accuracy, it can co-reveal such things as mass, force, energy, velocity, acceleration, charge all good stuff if we want to separate the conventional from the unconventional right?

Acceleration is how fast the velocity is changing from one moment to the next. The accelerations will indicate how much force (loosely $E^2=80=A6$ Energy when time is factored in) is causing these changes to it's flight path. If we actually knew the mass of the object, the force could be calculated very accurately and if we knew the force we could figure out the mass of the object what inertial changes are occurring, how big are they, and how quickly they progress.

If the amount of force over time indicates energy densities beyond our ability to control and maintain this becomes a useful piece of evidence. Please keep in mind that Any Time an object changes direction that deviates from it's initial path, is by definition being acted upon by a force either from inside (propulsive) or from outside (influenced).

Since we can't deduce (there are ways) the mass of an unknown object easily (a jet we can since we can find one parked omewhere and ask), we can't be certain of the amount of force being applied. However, we can offer some estimates since objects might be sufficiently large and metallic looking that we might give it some lower/upper boundary value for it's mass based upon it's size and volume. In that case, we can deduce that some UFOs probably change direction with such rapidity (force over a given small time interval will reveal energy consumption), that it can't possibly be of terrestrial make. By energy density we mean how much energy can we confine/extract from a given volume of space in other words, one horse power can't be expected to be generated from a mouse nor can we expect to produce the output from today's largest nuclear reactor from something constructed from the size of a ping pong ball. But,

the operating thought process here is that as we advance we will be able to tap, generate, and use higher and higher energy densities and produce useful work from their conversion into other more useful forms.

Energy Density becomes a useful concept in which to sort out theirs from ours got the idea great!

The highest energy densities probably ever produced by us, here on earth, is from Nuclear Powered rocket engines. But how can we maintain them, control them, and convert them to other forms of useful energy without initiating death from the radiation exposure? But, no problem we have super-duper astronauts, radiation shields, and robots.

5) Electromagnetic lift and energy conversion: If we could ionize the atmosphere around an object then push those ions off in certain directions using a controlled electromagnetic envelope, we could create propulsion and lift. We would also be able to control the airflow around the craft in such a way that the usual air separations that occurs, which are responsible for creating sonic booms and drag, is greatly muted/lessened in other words, pull and push the atmosphere around us so quickly that we would not create the usual high drag and subsequent noise we could go real fast with no sound! The other possibility is that we have a different type of propulsion system operating all together and we just want to get the atmosphere out of the way and out of the equation. So, creating a secondary electric/electromagnetic field just for a different application it's no problem I have a lot of energy at my comand so why not get the atmosphere out of the way I'm a UFO of intelligent design. Yippee!

In both cases, we would require a certain amount of energy being converted from some other form of system (what system could do that: Nuclear?) at every given speed/air density. So, again we might be able to calculate what those energy requirements are to be able to do that at a given speed across the cross-sectional surface of the object seen (again, what are the energy density requirements and energy conversion means) we might find that such requirements are quite beyond our current abilities both to achieve and convert once again proof of something unconventional perhaps?

6) Others are available

I want to see an intelligently designed UFO filter that correlates behavior of UFOs to these conventional and not so conventional Physics concepts/paradigms this is where the "action" is this is how you separate all the BS from real definitive studies.

Record good observations from witnesses, ask good questions, collect data, analyze it, then put it through the filter separate the good from the bad, and then ONLY ONLY ONLY study the left over good stuff.

Why study only the good stuff? "Because we've already agreed on the method by which we are separating, classifying, and filtering them." Without this, we'll continually argue because no one wants to take the time to study science and if we don't they'll pull the wool over our eyes Every Single Time and present all the bad ones as good ones confuse the two purposely hello!

Studying science doesn't leave out the fantastic, the improbable, the mysterious... it only gives us a better feeling about the "WOW" when we see it.

By the way, do you really think the media will develop scientifically enough to take on the multiplicity of required science backgrounds to tackle this field of endeavor properly ask their own questions instead of being spoon feed Bad Science that "Sounds" good rather than "IS" Good?

I will hopefully be able to change my e-mail address from diverge24/7 to converge24/7 someday certainly at some point?

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Our All-Time Favourite Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:47:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:47:18 -0400
Subject: Our All-Time Favourite Aliens

Source: The Winnipeg Sun - Manitoba, Canada

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/exy9>

Sat, May 20, 2006

Planetarium's UFO show worth a close encounter

Our All-Time Favourite Aliens
By Lindsay Ward

It had been a while since we'd sat back and mulled over our chances of encountering extraterrestrials. We think it was whenever they last re-ran that Simpsons Treehouse of Horror episode where those two green ET-octopus dudes abduct Homer and soak him in rum.

So, seeing as how The X-Files have been closed for years and sneaking into Area 51 is hardly worth getting shot at, the new Planetarium show, *Is Anybody Out There?* seemed like a viable source for an otherworldly fix.

While most Planetarium shows are exclusively made and played in Winnipeg, this joint production between Vancouver's HR McMillan Space Centre, Calgary's Telus World of Science, Planetarium de Montreal and our own space hub is opening around the country this weekend.

In Bill Nye fashion, the documentary avoids science-related snores by injecting corny humour like cute cartoon aliens singing Purple People Eater - which, like Spongebob, draws in the stoners and kiddies in one shot.

And to keep the rest of us interested, a plenitude of pop culture references (Alf, Marvin, campy '50s alien movies) and soundtrack artists (David Bowie, Pink Floyd, OLP) snazz up the graphically aided explanations and scientist testimonies - even though some of the testimonies are pretty snazzy themselves.

"We might in fact all be Martians," declares one expert after narrator Dave Kelly states life on Mars might have transferred to Earth back in the day; another pro makes the bold prediction we will find E.T. by 2025.

The show's sweetest eye candy is the Houghton Crater footage Manitoba Museum audiovisual specialist Hans Thater travelled to Nunavut to capture and, of course, the Planetarium's signature animated starry sky.

Yep, lots to see - but what about that title question? Sure, we learn extremophiles (organisms that can form and live in extreme temperatures) do exist and alien-government treaties don't but when the show's 36 minutes are up, we're still left wondering. But, really, isn't that the best part? Cue the X-Files theme song.

Is Anybody Out There? shows Saturdays and Sundays at 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. Admission is \$5.50 or \$20 for the family (up to four kids and two adults).

Lindsey Ward

1. E.T. (1982): If we still had a bike basket, he'd get dibs.
2. The original War of the Worlds Martians (1953): They're a heck of a lot freakier than the ones in last year's Tom Cruise remake.
3. ALF (1986 - 1990): The ultimate cute 'n' fuzzy space addition to any nuclear TV family.
4. The Coneheads (1993): 'Cuz nobody can - or wants to - consume mass quantities of vacuum lint like Jane Curtin. Mebs!
5. Signs' party crasher (2002): It took only seconds for the waiflike, bug-eyed creature to send a group of party-hatted kids into hysterics - and a teensy chill up our spine.

Is anybody out there?

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Light Up The Sky ET

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:57:16 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 06:57:16 -0400
Subject: Light Up The Sky ET

Source: Yahoo News - Sunnyvale California, USA

http://news.yahoo.com/s/zd/20060519/tc_zd/178371

Fri May 19 2006

Sebastian Rupley
PC Magazine

The search for other Earth-like planets, and extraterrestrial life, is heading in new directions.

Although it won't begin scouring space until at least 2013, NASA is moving ahead with its Space Interferometry Mission (SIM).

Once in orbit, scientists expect SIM spacecraft to probe for Earth-like planets through powerful optical interferometers, which combine light from two or more telescopes as if they were parts of one gigantic mirror.

Meanwhile, speaking of optical telescopes and aliens, Harvard University's Oak Ridge laboratory has rolled out its Optical SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) telescope, which will carry out a trillion measurements per second as it searches for possible laser communications from aliens.

The Columbus Optical SETI Observatory employs a similar telescope (shown in the inset).

Scientists have been listening to the universe for signs of life for 20 years, but the Optical SETI efforts propose that aliens might communicate via light. Many eyes are peeled.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Gulf Breeze Six Case Revisited

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 07:08:45 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 07:08:45 -0400
Subject: Gulf Breeze Six Case Revisited

Source: Philip Coppens' Site

<http://www.philipcoppens.com/gulfbreeze6.html>

13 April 2006

[Images & documents at site]

The Gulf Breeze Six

On July 9, 1990, six US military intelligence analysts from the 701st Military Intelligence Brigade at Augsburg, West Germany, at that time the biggest NSA (National Security Agency) listening post in the world outside the United States, deserted their posts, somehow convinced that the end of the world was nigh. It is one of the most extra-ordinary stories...

Philip Coppens

On July 20, 1990, the Northwest Florida Daily News ran "6 AWOL Soldiers Say They Aimed To Kill Antichrist", continuing: "Gulf Breeze - Six soldiers, reported by an unofficial military newspaper to be on a mission to kill the Antichrist, were charged Thursday with desertion from their intelligence unit in West Germany, Pentagon spokesman said." It was a most bizarre headline and one of the most bizarre stories... ever.

Eleven days earlier, Spc. Kenneth Beason, Spc. Vance Davis, Sgt. Annette Eccleston, Pfc. Michael Hueckstaedt, Pfc. Kris Perlock and Pfc. William Setterberg went AWOL =96 absent without leave from the 701st Military Intelligence Brigade. The group left their station in Germany, travelled to Chattanooga, Tennessee, where they bought a van, and drove to Gulf Breeze, Florida, at the time a noted UFO hotspot. Still, it was not initially clear whether the UFO sightings in the area were linked with their desertion, if only because most of these men had done their basic training at Curtiss Station in nearby NAS (Naval Air Station) Pensacola, which meant that they were familiar with the area.

Five days after their flight, on Saturday July 14, a broken taillight on the van resulted in a routine traffic stop, and Hueckstaedt, the driver of the van, was detained by police when a computer check indicated that he was wanted for desertion. The remaining five were later rounded up and taken to Fort Benning, Georgia, where they were kept in solitary confinement, incommunicado. Their fate =96 a possible execution =96 hung in the balance, until their families leaked their predicament to the press, resulting in reactions from Senators Casman and Dole. Surprisingly enough, three weeks after their arrest, instead of being severely punished by a military tribunal, they were discharged from Fort Knox =96 with full honours! Following Colin Powell's dissent to this incredible verdict =96 after all, they were deserters =96 this was withdrawn. Instead, they were reduced to the lowest rank and forfeited half a month's pay. Since,

military officials have refused to discuss the investigation.

What was going on? A Pentagon spokesman stated that the six were members of a group called "The End of the World", but this statement was later retracted, saying that there was no such group. When the case was declassified, 1400 out of 1600 pages were withheld.

The case is intriguing =96 to say the least. Some believed that these people were simply mad and that the Military merely wanted to sweep everything under the carpet =96 both parties were already sufficiently embarrassed. Others argued that the six were the subjects of an advanced military mind control experiment. After all, wasn't this the perfect test? Top =96 top top even =96 military security experts... wouldn't the military want to know whether there were certain things that would make such people desert? And before finding out whether this would work on the enemy, it surely had to be tested on the own troops? In an as real as possible setting...

Speculation was now rife. One trend had it that UFOs were at the core of the mystery. It was said that Beason was interested in UFOs and wanted to attend a UFO conference. The Mutual UFO Network (MUFON) did hold its 21st annual symposium in Pensacola on July 6-8, but as the group apparently only defected on July 9, this obviously would have been the worst organised trip ever. Furthermore, who would risk their life just to attend a UFO conference?

Still, one Stan Johnson, a Morristown photographer, said in a telephone interview with the Pensacola News Journals, that he had picked up Beason and Hueckstaedt on July 6 at the McGee-Tyson Airport in Knoxville, Tennessee =96 three days before the official version had them desert. Either Johnson was lying, wrong on dates... or the "official story" was wrong. Though Gulf Breeze Police Chief Jerry Brown stated the soldiers did not arrive in the area until July 9, Beason was said to have spent the night of July 7 with his sister and her husband, Caroly and Charles Reed, at their home in Talbott, Tenn., according to the Knoxville News-Sentinel. So... was the true purpose of their visit to attend the UFO conference? And if so, why did the official version change the dates? At best, it did not make sense... At worse, it was incomprehensible.

Vance Davis

A first hand account that could shed light on the story was provided in 1995, when Vince Davis published "Unbroken Promises". The book is probably one of the most mind-boggling works ever written, irrelevant of the fact whether it is the total truth, or an "enhanced version" of it. If the mind boggles already, jaws drop when you read the Davis book.

Davis states that as a teenager, he had enrolled in Silva Mind Control courses that were held in Alex Merklinger's school in New York, and mastered techniques of self-hypnosis through active imagination. During one of his trances, he met a green-skinned, yellow-clad alien female named Kia, who, over one night, corrected his flat-footedness. Davis said that Kia "told me that she came from a planet forty-five light years away from Earth, that had been destroyed by another race. Her race, the Kiaseions, were telepaths that were enroute to Earth to assist the Alliance in protecting the human race. They were scheduled to arrive by late 1992. The Kiaseion civilization had been reduced to five spacecraft carrying about three thousand people per ship [...] Her husband had been killed, and she had taken his place as Commander of this small armada, with her two grown sons in charge of two of the remaining ships." Kia became Vance's guardian.

Nothing unusual so far, if at least you are familiar with what many other channelers have stated about their contacts. But Davis held the "toppest" security clearances in the country.

But what caused them to go AWOL? "Ouija board sessions."

According to Davis, the Ouija board put the six soldiers in touch with an entity that named herself Safire, and others, including those presenting themselves as the Old Testament prophet Zechariah, Mark and Timothy of New Testament, and the Blessed Virgin Mary herself.

Between December 1989 and July 1990, the Ouija-summoned spirits gave the group a series of predictions of coming world events which, Davis claims, were passed along to military authorities upon their arrest, together with the copious notes that were taken by the group during the eight Ouija sessions. This at least suggests that the story was true and not fabricated by the group upon their arrest: they could provide documents that Ouija sessions were at the basis of their obsession to arrive in Florida.

When some of Safire's prophecies, both minor and significant, started to come true, one stating the exact dynamics and the number of casualties of a mayor earthquake in Iran (292,236 deaths), it convinced the six that they were dealing with genuine trans-human encounters. They felt that they were chosen to act as instruments of God's will =96 their oath to the military "obviously" seemed to be of less importance than following the orders of God. They asked Safire how to carry out their divine mission. Safire instructed them to flee the military, regardless of consequences, because they were needed to help lead the world through an impending cataclysm. So they did.

Davis states that in 1989, he "began to sense that the lines of demarcation between the physical world and the spiritual one were beginning to blur." It is here that we need to introduce Beason, who was even more instrumental in the group's flight. He believed in reincarnation and believed that he had been sacrificed to the gods in a previous life. He also believed that the US government was in cahoots with aliens and that evidence for this could actually be found in Augsburg, the NSA site where they worked. It was also Beason who knew Anna Foster, at whose house in Gulf Breeze most of the groups would later be hiding =96 and arrested. He was in love with her.

This explains the setting of the desertion, but not the reason. Was it true that they had come to Gulf Breeze to see UFOs? To attend a UFO conference? Davis states that Safire warned them of a coming war. Mankind was about to make an evolutionary step, which is why many alien entities were in orbit, on or under the earth =96 and/or in telepathic contact with the likes of him. There were two alien groups: the Alliance, the good guys, who believed in free will, and "the Others", who were abducting people and performing medical experiments on them. Safire "confirmed" to the group that the US government was in cahoots with the aliens, as they had suspected all along.

On an eschatological level, she stated that 1998 would be the date for the false Messiah to make his appearance; the year was three times his number (666). She told them to leave Europe, as there was (in the early 1990s) going to be a US-European conflict, which would make it hard for the group to continue their learning =96 and would endanger the role they were told they would play during the upcoming evolutionary step. They would leave Europe asap, hide out, before beginning their new life. Their choice for a hide out fell on Gulf Breeze. Not because of UFOs, but because they knew the area and Anna lived there.

When they deserted, each left a copy of the letter dictated by the spirits, in the hope that the letter might make its way into the hands of the president =96 so that he would know of the dire times ahead. But despite the fact that the survival of the world was at stake, it seems that destiny still had time to have love play its game. Davis had had visions of his "Soul Mate" when he was a teenager. It is when they arrived at Anna's house, that Davis saw his "Soul Mate": it was Anna's roommate, Diana, whom he recognised from the visions more than a decade before.

If the spirit world was guiding them, leading them away from harm, why were they eventually captured? "Safire had told us that Gulf Breeze would be safe until Friday. Then we would stop in Texas to pick up our stuff, and head for the mountain states to begin the rest of our lives, and prepare for what was to come." But love made Davis and Beason stay longer, and hence they did not leave on the Friday they "should" have left. "Fate" then played its card through a defective taillight and the rest was history.

What is at the bottom of this story? At its most basic level, it shows that certain NSA operatives were dabbling with alien-Christian eschatology =96 and went AWOL as a consequence. But is

that all there is to it? We only have Davis' word and his interpretation for it, but he does suggest that they may have been part of an experiment =96 as some observers noted at the time when their story hit the press.

First, early on, when Davis was on his way over to Ft. Meade, there was a woman on his bus who told him his name and said that "God showed me that you will help change the world." It was a prophecy =96 at a time when Safire had not yet appeared on the scene and "confirm" his divine mission.

Davis also had an intriguing career. He noted that he had his initial posting in Ft. Meade, which was rare. "I had done work in psychic research back at Fort Meade, and was surprised at the seriousness with which our military approached this subject. I realized then that my fast-track to NSA was probably due to my Silva Mind Control background." It suggests that Davis was followed =96 if not singled out =96 by the NSA early on.

Fast forward to their desertion. In the book, Davis states that "what we didn't realize at the time was that the government had known of our plans and had an operative on the plane with us, just as Safire had told us. And they lost us when we arrived in Atlanta, just as she had assured us they would." But the "best evidence" that they were indeed monitored is how the people at Anna's house were arrested. Hueckstaedt swore that he did not tell the authorities where his fellow deserters were hiding out. Still, the authorities were able to quickly round them up. It suggests that someone knew where they were =96 and if that is indeed the case, Davis' notion that the government knew that they were about to desert and followed them during their desertion, makes sense.

As bizarre as the story is, there is an even more bizarre twist, which seems to highlight that if all of this is true, it can't possibly be true for all soldiers or NSA personnel. Davis claims that when he joined the NSA, he was "retrained in history". He states: "What I learned was why history happened, who history was, why or when history was. The dates in the book are not all that accurate. Those are accepted dates not factual dates. To give an example. The founding of this country did not occur. The founding fathers were already meeting many years before the advent, the war against England, occurred. There was already a plan in place for the founding of new country. It was not just a spur because British soldiers shot someone or the stand-back. It was the series of events that happened over the period of 60 to 70 years. And they have been planning for the long time." Such teachings seem bizarre, if only because they serve no real purpose for NSA personnel, except to provide this recruit with a conspiratorial outlook on history.

Where it goes off the wall is what Davis was talking about next. To cut a longish story short, he was claiming that there were "buildings" at White Sands which were "not ours", suggesting they were not human =96 and very old. But he then jumps onto UFOs, stating that in the 1960s, a new word was introduced for them: AVC, or Alien Visitation Craft. And listen to this: "the human race was not created, born, linked to the apes, we are survivors of a great war. The human race as we see ourselves today, even our ancient relatives, were basically put on this planet and cut-off from the rest of the Universe." And: "We have a special gene, that cannot be copied, cannot be manipulated. They have tried. We were told that is called the Jesus gene." We can only wonder why an NSA operative is "required" to "know" this, in the unlikelihood that any of this would be true to begin with. There is no "need to know" and as such, should not be told. Worst, if true, we have a picture in which the NSA "educates" its new recruits that we are all alien descendents, and then allows them play with the Ouija board, only to have some of them go off half across the world, in the belief that the world is about to end. Though it seems that this fate befell Davis and co., it seems unlikely this is the fate of every NSA recruit. Hopefully.

'Logic' =96 which does not really come into this story, but somehow needs to be applied to keep a reasonable level of sanity, I would suggest =96 suggests that something else was going; that this group was singled out and became the victim of an experiment, which their pre-joining interests made them predisposed towards, and which "someone" carefully remoulded to see to test out a hypothesis. If this is true, then the scenario was successful, and when the test was concluded, they were

rounded up, brought in... and allowed to tell their story, so that the public disclosure of their story would serve part of the exercise as well.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

The Roswell Case: Meeting Jesse Marcel, Jr.

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 07:22:50 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 07:22:50 -0400
Subject: The Roswell Case: Meeting Jesse Marcel, Jr.

Source: The Portland Freelancer - Bill McDonald's Blog

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/xnht>

Friday, May 19, 2006

The Roswell Case: Meeting Jesse Marcel, Jr.

No matter how you feel about UFOs, the Roswell case is a part of American history.

The man in the picture is Jesse Marcel, Sr. He was the Intelligence Officer at Roswell Army Air Field, who went out to the ranch owned by Mac Brazel to check out the debris.

Last night I talked with Jesse Marcel, Jr. at my producer-friend Paul David=92s Roswell screening at the Kennedy School.

Incidentally, Paul made a brief appearance in the movie as the autopsy photographer, and a picture of him in the role made it to the pages of Time Magazine in July of 1997.

The movie was nominated for a Golden Globe and it was excellent with a great cast including Martin Sheen.

The film was one thing but to have a real-life participant in the incident there was tremendous.

Jesse Marcel, Jr. spoke briefly to the crowd. He maintains that his father brought some of the material home and showed it to him and his mother. He says his father believed it was a crash of a space ship, and that the military ordered him to cover it up.

The weather balloon story has never really made sense, as that would have been readily determined by someone like the intelligence officer.

To me this has the feel of a local event that was reported before the powers that be could shut it down.

Jesse=92s father became the fall guy forced to take the ridicule for the original UFO story that went out on the radio and newspaper wires, only to be retracted a little later.

Imagine this on a family level.

You=92re going along and all of a sudden you are in the middle of this great mystery.

I shook hands with Jesse Marcel, Jr. and felt a thrill thinking about him handling this debris, whatever it was.

Jesse Marcel, Jr. went on to be a doctor in Montana where he still lives.

I found him to be completely credible =96 just another case of a seemingly rational, stable, normal American telling a story that is very hard to get your mind around.

I also got a real rush when I asked him, "When was the last time you went back to Roswell?"

He said he was a few years ago, but when I first said the word "Roswell", a serious look passed over him. There was a flicker of pain.

This was a gigantic, life-changing event for his immediate family back in 1947 and he has continued to deal with it ever since.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Condign And Meteors

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:39:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 07:33:00 -0400
Subject: Condign And Meteors

Dear List

Some first thoughts on the Condign meteor plasma theory.

The author has assembled "an idea for an idea" out of what is really a collection of rather loosely related facts and guesses rather than presenting a well-defined theory. He/she references some speculative papers.

The specific original theory here is the idea that there is a neglected category of meteors in between those that ablate totally in the upper air and those that impact as meteorites. These are supposed to reach the troposphere with enough energy to deposit stable plasmoids which have roughly neutral buoyancy and can scoot about for some time under the influence of electric fields in the atmosphere. As far as I can make out, there is no specific reference cited in support of this and problems are not clearly enough identified or addressed.

For example, recombination times are very short. Normally, trail ionisation in the air disappears in a second or two once the meteor head has passed and the direct ram heating source is removed. When the meteoroid finally ablates away the heat source obviously vanishes completely and there's nothing to maintain the plasma against recombination. Heat conduction to the surrounding air would then cool the plasma very rapidly and it's hard to see how it could survive, and even if it did there needs to be a good reason why this would not be an amorphous neutral hot plasma with positive buoyancy that would just float straight up and dissipate.

On the other hand there are related arguments against all BL plasma models too, yet BL does occur - sprites, elves and jets also - so plainly there are mechanisms not understood and the report seems to suggest that some of these mechanisms might apply also to these meteor plasmas. Eg in the literature there are models of so-called dusty plasmas, or filamentary BL-type plasmas laced with silicon dioxide "fluff" etc, which might help overcome the self-confinement and stability problems of traditional free-floating plasma theories. So the idea seems to be that the meteor plasma is doped with fine particulates of meteoritic residue that would alter its properties in an analogous way. These particles embedded in the neutral plasma would be charged, from friction and (if conducting) by electromagnetic induction during fast passage through the earth's magnetic field, possibly giving the plasma an overall net charge.

There's a lot of speculative stuff out there in the BL-related world about knots of microscopic plasma flux tubes, etc etc., and some of these ideas suggest how a plasma ball might include localised hot conductive regions or channels of high electron density in a larger volume of averagely cool and averagely weakly-ionised air. If something similar could be shown to work with Condign's meteor-dusted plasmas then it might be possible to argue that they are relatively cool and have small enough positive buoyancy to be shepherded around by local electric fields as suggested.

But in any case the principal evidence offered for this meteor theory is a statistical correlation between report frequency and meteor shower dates, but this is a rather shaky piece of work (as offered) because report frequency is based on the entire report population for 1996 (the only year actually studied), in which a priori KNOWNs outnumber UNKNOWNs by a factor 10, presumably including reports of meteors. There was a +0.62 correlation between UFO report rates and the meteor Zenithal Hourly Rate. The conclusion is that "there is a strong possibility that meteor activity accounts for some UAP reports". Not controversial. But then the report reasons that

1. Very few people reported meteors per se as UFOs because so few of the reports mentioned "tails" or "trails" or described an object as "meteor-like", so the public in general are very good at knowing what meteors look like and didn't report them.
2. The inference is that what they did report must be some other phenomenon physically associated with meteors,
3. ergo this is statistical evidence for orphaned meteor plasmas.
4. Examination of all individual UFO reports for 11 peak dates graphed in 1996 showed only 27 "meteor-like" reports, consistent with 1).

But Point 4) does not clearly support 1) and 2). Only 27 "trail" type reports out of "1014 UAP events" (2.7%) sounds significant, but this is 1014 "reported for [the whole of] 1995 and 1996", which is not the sample referred to as the 11 peak dates in 1996. (The figure of 1014 is itself anomalous, since the report's Fig 1 "Number of Annual UAP reports 1959-1996" indicates that a total of approximately 930 reports were received in 1995 and 1996 combined; approximately 80 or so extra reports appear to have been "found" for the purposes of this study). In fact these peak dates are approximately identifiable (no proper tabulated figures are given) from the graph in Fig.18 (ch3 p.53) as representing a total of about 205 reports or about 1/5 of the total given.

In other words about 13% of the reports on these peak dates had identifiably meteor-like characteristics. Allowing for the fact that the information given in the reports is acknowledged to be typically poor and incomplete, so that absence of a mention of a trail might be expected to occur in some cases where a trail was in fact seen, this is not an insignificant fraction.

Furthermore, point 2) makes the mistake of jumping from a statistical correlation to a physical association. If for example there was a rash of publicised sightings caused by a bright meteor then the background report-rate (real-time and retrospective) may be indirectly stimulated by it, amplifying the apparent number of events (of all kinds) witnessed at or around the same time. In summary the report doesn't satisfactorily show that the correlation claimed between meteor rates and KNOWNs+UNKNOWNs can't be explained by a combination of the factors affecting reporting at times when unusual numbers of meteors are seen, and doesn't necessarily tell us anything about the physics of UNKNOWNs.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Charles Fort Books On-Line - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 04:29:51 -0700
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 07:36:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Charles Fort Books On-Line - Hatch

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:14:24 -0700
>Subject: Charles Fort Books On-Line

>Unsure if everyone, especially new-subscribers, are aware that
>Charles Hoy Fort's books are on-line.

>The weather data is of interest to weather folks.
><http://www.resologist.net/>

Hi Terry:

Great site! I was unaware of it.

Too bad Fort himself is so hard to read.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 07:38:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:02:07 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

>Me too.

>>Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled
>>argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that
>>form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle
>>sightings.

>I don't even find a jumbled argument here, just a statement - no
>science, no reasoning. I'm impressed also that the author
>invokes "Stoke's Law" to show that emitted radiation from an
>excited aerosol would have longer wavelength than the exciting
>radiation, so the latter must be shorter than visible light.

>First there is no-one called "Stoke" - it's "Stokes' Law";
>second, Stokes' Law is about hydrodynamic viscosity anyway, not
>optics, and the author should have cited the Stokes Shift
>instead; and thirdly, he then proceeds to infer that aerosol
>clouds could emit visible fluorescence if excited with "IR or UV
>bursts", as if these were interchangeable, when obviously IR is
>_longer_ wavelength than visible!

>I'm still searching ...

As a youth I worked in a general store which included a grocery
store and meat counter. One of my boss's stock sayings was: "No
matter how you slice it, it's still baloney."

You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: [fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash? -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 08:17:12 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 09:24:54 -0400
Subject: Re: [fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash? -

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:32:49 -0700
>Subject: [fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash?

>I believe Kelly speaks for me in my attitude towards UFO seekers and
>conspiracy theorists. These are oxymorons. Those who report UFOs are
>more worthy of study and conspiracists are not theorists.

Terry and Kelly,

Your points are valid. All the more reason to just take in facts and report them as is - good and bad - study them from a skeptical vantage point, but don't throw out the baby with the bath water. Otherwise, you may never get a Nobel Prize with that attitude. Realistic attitudes with a creative curiosity are the backbones of science. Always stay on center ground and admit to your mistakes, but be mature and proactive if you venture beyond some of the acceptable variables. But, get past it, otherwise it's all retroactive and essentially worthless.

Also, we must all keep in mind that conspiracies are often confused for cover-ups. Which is worse? Cover-ups cover blunders, cover-ups hide facts, cover-ups hide the truth regardless of whether there was anything truthful in the first place. And, once a cover-up ensues, conspiracy-like behavior can easily be mistaken for the desperate acts of men organized to the drums of similar purpose.

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 08:45:37 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 09:30:38 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Golubik

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:02:07 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
>>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

>>>>Me too.

>>>>Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled
>>>>argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that
>>>>form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle
>>>>sightings.

>>>>I don't even find a jumbled argument here, just a statement - no
>>>>science, no reasoning. I'm impressed also that the author
>>>>invokes "Stoke's Law" to show that emitted radiation from an
>>>>excited aerosol would have longer wavelength than the exciting
>>>>radiation, so the latter must be shorter than visible light.

>>>>First there is no-one called "Stoke" - it's "Stokes' Law";
>>>>second, Stokes' Law is about hydrodynamic viscosity anyway, not
>>>>optics, and the author should have cited the Stokes Shift
>>>>instead; and thirdly, he then proceeds to infer that aerosol
>>>>clouds could emit visible fluorescence if excited with "IR or UV
>>>>bursts", as if these were interchangeable, when obviously IR is
>>>>_longer_ wavelength than visible!

>>>>I'm still searching ...

>As a youth I worked in a general store which included a grocery
>store and meat counter. One of my boss's stock sayings was: "No
>matter how you slice it, it's still baloney."

>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>- Dick

One of the hallmarks of creativity is to be able to take in the sum

total of something, realize the immediate insanity of it, and not get caught up too unnecessarily in the fine details that rattle around in a Hollow container devoid of any shape or final meaning.

However, some like to get caught up in the insanity of something and we call them comedie - though they're just as brilliant. :)

I'm not attacking anyone here and value all opinions greatly and we all fully realize our dilemmas. It's unfortunate that once again we have to expend a lot of resources to countermand the appearance of good science from the vantage point of (Media defined) repressed ufological dreamers. More power to you guys.

The filter in which they couch their arguments is too narrow, but the degree to which they overanalyze their narrow mindedness is an impressive display but yet it does not justify their limited input.

Yes Dick, I agree so far. But will wait final judgment until I get through the entire report. But, I can't tell you how many times I've laughed!

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 14:17:37 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 09:33:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Koi

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:02:07 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 21:17:00 +0100
>>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

>>>>Me too.

<snip>

>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

Hi Dick,

You may be surprised to learn that most, if not all, of the
people that have e-mailed me to endorse my criticisms of the
Condign Report are "self-styled skeptics".

Most skeptics would say they dislike sloppy thinking as much as,
if not more than, you.

I don't know any skeptics ("self-styled" or otherwise) that
would endorse (or even simply fail to criticise) some features
of the Condign Report, e.g. the misrepresentation in the
conclusions section of the actual results of the statistical
analysis.

Admittedly, this has not been a universal reaction from
skeptics. One self-styled skeptic on another Forum has said that
by posting a "_massively_ long list of alleged flaws" in the
Condign Report, I've shown that I'm a "pro-UFOer" that "believes
aliens are in our skies".

One particularly surprising comment addressed to me by that
skeptic was that "you thought the government made their secret
studies; SECRET, for the express reason of hiding knowledge of
Aliens". This allegation was completely baseless, given that I
had merely presented several quotes relating to the downsides to
secrecy and all those quotes were from the Condign Report
itself, the Condon Report, Carl Sagan and other prominent

skeptics...

I think the explanation for the comments from that particular skeptic is apparent from his eventual statement that "I haven't got time to read your list of so called flaws at the moment".

All the best,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:23:58 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 17:24:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 08:45:37 EDT
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>However, some like to get caught up in the insanity of something
>and we call them comedie - though they're just as brilliant. :)

>The filter in which they couch their arguments is too narrow,
>but the degree to which they overanalyze their narrow mindedness
>is an impressive display but yet it does not justify their
>limited input.

>Yes Dick, I agree so far. But will wait final judgment until I
>get through the entire report. But, I can't tell you how many
>times I've laughed!

Since you agree that any detailed comment is only a waste of
time on the part of narrow-minded comedians I won't expect to
hear anything more from you on this subject.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:26:59 -0300
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 17:26:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc - Ledger

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 19 May 2006 15:54:02 -0400
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 00:42:27 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

><snip>

>>I can't say that all of these circles are hoaxed or just plain
>>anonymous artwork perhaps, but I'm certain that most are.

>>I have enough trouble just keeping up with the UFO phenomenon.
>>Crop circles are only of minor interest to me. Since they are in
>>someone elses arena, I'll leave it to them.

>>Do you have a URL for that helicopter-over-glyph incident?

>Sorry - I don't. It was a TV documentary.

>I have to say that now being retired from a career which
>included a number of technologies including a bit of surveying,
>and given the large number of crop glyphs I've seen, none of the
>possibilities you listed even approach explaining the more
>complex glyphs I've seen photos of. Maybe some of the more
>complex glyphs could be "stomped down" to that level of
>precision over a week or two in daytime, but never overnight,
>with woven stomped-down areas.

>More than that, the footage of small lights and in one case a
>small "UFO" above a crop circle in England suggest at least some
>of these glyphs do have a UFO connection.

Sometime last year a documentary videographer showed how he
hoaxed "lights" over a field which then formed a crop circle as
a couple of "lights" flew over it. The lights were two white
colored birds which he superimposed over an existing glyph.

That's what you have to look out for.

There's a need for some people to do his. I call it the AR
syndrome.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:39:00 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 17:28:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 17 May 2006 20:02:07 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>>I'm still searching ...

>As a youth I worked in a general store which included a grocery store and meat counter. One of my boss's stock sayings was: "No matter how you slice it, it's still baloney."

>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

You must be right. After all, it was so blatantly obvious that this report contained nothing but worthless pseudoscience that half the people on this list were telling us so right off, with nothing to go on but some newspaper headlines. And as ufologists we all know, don't we, that anything which looks like 90% baloney to Joe Soap at first glance is 100% not worth anyone's time. Who cares about detail? Anyway it's just another 465-page secret MoD UFO study - dime a dozen, nothing to be learned by critiquing that. Just chuck it in that Menzelian trash can and let's get on with the next saucer fleet video.

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 13:35:59 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 17:31:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Maccabee

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

>>Me too.

>>>Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled
>>>argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that
>>>form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle
>>>sightings.

>>I don't even find a jumbled argument here, just a statement - no
>>science, no reasoning. I'm impressed also that the author
>>invokes "Stoke's Law" to show that emitted radiation from an
>>excited aerosol would have longer wavelength than the exciting
>>radiation, so the latter must be shorter than visible light.

<snip>

>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

I don't think we're wasting our time. The objective is to find
out if there is any 'science', and, if not, to be able to
demonstrate there isn't.

To the general public it may appear to be good science and hence
worthy of worldwide publicity as "the" solution to the UFO/UAP
mystery. However, if it can be shown to be lousy science....
then the public can be informed that it is not 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 20](#)

Unplugged On UFOs Trailer

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <syturria.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 18:27:25 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 17:35:10 -0400
Subject: Unplugged On UFOs Trailer

The trailer for David Sereda's new documentary Dan Aykroyd
Unplugged On UFOs, is on-line:

<http://www.daufo.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 21](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 22:59:12 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 09:38:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:23:58 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 08:45:37 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>>However, some like to get caught up in the insanity of something
>>and we call them comedie - though they're just as brilliant. :)

>>The filter in which they couch their arguments is too narrow,
>>but the degree to which they overanalyze their narrow mindedness
>>is an impressive display but yet it does not justify their
>>limited input.

>>Yes Dick, I agree so far. But will wait final judgment until I
>>get through the entire report. But, I can't tell you how many
>>times I've laughed!

>Since you agree that any detailed comment is only a waste of
>time on the part of narrow-minded comedians I won't expect to
>hear anything more from you on this subject.

Easy Martin. A sense of humor is always good when dealing with
bureaucratic obtuseness.

I also think the Condign report is humorous in its blindness and
failure to address the subject in any meaningful way, but I
think it is a waste of time to endlessly deconstruct the report.

If you care to spare the time, fine, as your observations are
worthwhile.

It's just that the whole report is silly and totally irrelevant,
and it is not all that clear, yet, that it is influencing anyone
who didn't already believe that UFOs were a lot of nonsense.

- Dick

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 21](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 23:10:31 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 09:41:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:39:00 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>>As a youth I worked in a general store which included a grocery
>>store and meat counter. One of my boss's stock sayings was: "No
>>matter how you slice it, it's still baloney."

>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>You must be right. After all, it was so blatantly obvious that
>this report contained nothing but worthless pseudoscience that
>half the people on this list were telling us so right off, with
>nothing to go on but some newspaper headlines. And as ufologists
>we all know, don't we, that anything which looks like 90%
>baloney to Joe Soap at first glance is 100% not worth anyone's
>time. Who cares about detail? Anyway it's just another 465-page
>secret MoD UFO study - dime a dozen, nothing to be learned by
>critiquing that. Just chuck it in that Menzelian trash can and
>let's get on with the next saucer fleet video.

Martin,

I'm not sure exactly what has lit your fuse and set you off, but
I had already responded to your comments to Victor before seeing
this little diatribe.

With nothing to go on but newspaper headlines? Sorry, you got
that wrong. As I said plainly I read the Executive Summary very
carefully and it was obvious from that, that this was a piece of
pseudoscience. If you want to spend your time wallowing in it,
go to it! That's your decision. You are entitled to disagree
with me, if you wish, about it being a total waste of time.

However, I have lived through several other prior
pseudoscientific reports of the same ilk including the Condon
report (a.k.a, the Condom report), possibly before you were
born. So I am applying knowledge and experience, not simply
responding to newspaper headlines.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 21](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 23:16:48 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 09:42:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 13:35:59 -0400
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

>>>>Me too.

>>>>Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled
>>>>argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that
>>>>form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle
>>>>sightings.

>>>>I don't even find a jumbled argument here, just a statement - no
>>>>science, no reasoning. I'm impressed also that the author
>>>>invokes "Stoke's Law" to show that emitted radiation from an
>>>>excited aerosol would have longer wavelength than the exciting
>>>>radiation, so the latter must be shorter than visible light.

>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>I don't think we're wasting our time. The objective is to find
>out if there is any 'science', and, if not, to be able to
>demonstrate there isn't.

>To the general public it may appear to be good science and hence
>worthy of worldwide publicity as "the" solution to the UFO/UAP
>mystery. However, if it can be shown to be lousy science....
>then the public can be informed that it is not the solution.

Bruce,

You have a point in that it may appear to be good science to the
general public. Or even to important people who are operating
under a gross misconception about the serious evidence. But to
whom and in what manner will you be able to show that it is
lousy science? Surely you don't expect the network news media to
pay any attention, or scientific journals. So I consider it a
waste of [your] time, but if you don't, that's your decision.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 21](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 22:51:11 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 09:48:12 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Friedman

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 13:35:59 -0400
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

>>>>Me too.

>>>>Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled
>>>>argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that
>>>>form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle
>>>>sightings.

>>>>I don't even find a jumbled argument here, just a statement - no
>>>>science, no reasoning. I'm impressed also that the author
>>>>invokes "Stoke's Law" to show that emitted radiation from an
>>>>excited aerosol would have longer wavelength than the exciting
>>>>radiation, so the latter must be shorter than visible light.

><snip>

>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>I don't think we're wasting our time. The objective is to find
>out if there is any 'science', and, if not, to be able to
>demonstrate there isn't.

>To the general public it may appear to be good science and hence
>worthy of worldwide publicity as "the" solution to the UFO/UAP
>mystery. However, if it can be shown to be lousy science....
>then the public can be informed that it is not the solution.

As responsible scientists familiar with much of the UFO Evidence,
I think it is not appropriate to fall into the trap of the
debunker who dismisses out of hand or without studying the
evidence.

We are being asked about the UK Volume.

Unlike the Author, we should do our homework, time consuming as
it is. Criticism without familiarity is hardly scientific.

Which reminds me Dick, that I have long been meaning to thank
you for your dismissal of the Braxton County Monster book
without having read it.

Because of that attack Frank Feschino and I, with help from others such as Barry Greenwood and Dr. David Rudiak, dug out loads of evidence that indeed there were dogfights between UFOs and interceptors.

Older books such as by Keyhoe and Ruppelt and, as a matter of fact, your UFO Evidence, were very helpful as well. I covered some of this in my 2005 MUFON paper Government UFO Lies, which is on my website at:

<http://www.stantonfriedman.com>

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 21](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

From: Paul Anderson <paulanderson.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 22:07:14 -0700
Fwd Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 09:52:47 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 May 2006 14:13:21 -0300
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>The beginning of these crop circles stems from - and should not
>be confused with - the earlier trace cases that were attributed
>to landing impressions made by some object which had settled in
>a field or a swamp or wooded area. Ted Phillips has hundreds of
>these.

Hi Don,

But how do we know that the earliest reported crop circles and some of the trace cases, are not simply the same phenomenon? I'm talking about the earliest known flattened and swirled, simple circles and rings. These shouldn't be confused though, with other types of trace cases, where the plants or soil are just depressed, missing or 'burned' appearing.

People also seem to often forget, or overlook, the fact that these simpler flattened formations have had the same basic characteristics for decades and even centuries, and that these same types are still often reported today on the prairies of Canada and the US as well as elsewhere. The descriptions are usually virtually identical to those reported from many years ago, even often in the same geographic locations.

Like many other researchers now, I think that most of the current crop formations (primarily the majority of the more complex ones) are human-made, but there is a core phenomenon that has been around for a very long time. This does include formations of varying complexity, although I would say primarily simpler ones.

Paul

--

Canadian Crop Circle Research Network
<http://www.cccrn.ca>

The Prairie Circular
<http://www.theprairiecircular.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 21](#)

'UFO' Crashes Off KwaZulu-Natal Coast

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 10:00:28 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 10:00:28 -0400
Subject: 'UFO' Crashes Off KwaZulu-Natal Coast

Source: iAfrica.Com - Cape Town, South Africa

<http://iafrica.com/news/sa/694256.htm>

21 May 2006

'UFO' Crashes Off KZN Coast

Sun, 21 May 2006

Port Shepstone rescuers are monitoring a mysterious situation in which "numerous" eye-witnesses reported an unidentified object crashing into the sea, the National Sea Rescue Institute (NSRI) said on Saturday.

Eddie Noyons, NSRI Shelley Beach Station Commander, said eye-witnesses reported that an unidentified object, possibly an aircraft, had crashed into the sea behind the breaker line off-shore of the Port Shepstone High School.

Police, rescue craft and a fixed wing aircraft were alerted to the scene to investigate.

"Following a full-scale search of the area covering 12 square nautical miles nothing has been found."

"There are no reports of activity in the area that may be related to this incident and there are no aircraft reported to be overdue or missing," said Noyons.

He said numerous eye-witnesses - including teachers and pupils attending a sports event at the highschool, and other by-standers including local fishermen - were convinced they had seen an aircraft go into the water, including seeing smoke and water exploding.

Interviews with the witnesses revealed that some also reported seeing flames.

"Some reported seeing something, an unidentified object, splash into the sea causing a ripple effect of waves," Noyons said.

Due to the number of eye-witnesses with similar reports, it was presumed that weather activity in the area at the time might have given the impression of something falling into the sea.

"We will continue to monitor the situation which remains a mystery," he said.

SAPA

[UFO UpDates thanks Greg Boone 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 21](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 09:04:43 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 10:12:21 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Lehmborg

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 22:59:12 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:23:58 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip

> ...a sense of humor is always good when dealing with
>bureaucratic obtuseness.

>I also think the Condign report is humorous in its blindness and
>failure to address the subject in any meaningful way, but I
>think it is a waste of time to endlessly deconstruct the report.

>If you care to spare the time, fine, as your observations are
>worthwhile.

>It's just that the whole report is silly and totally irrelevant,
>and it is not all that clear, yet, that it is influencing anyone
>who didn't already believe that UFOs were a lot of nonsense.

Right... and I shan't allow those alluded to the self-
confirming balm of faux-reinforcement for their errors and
ignorances, lightly. I will sneer even more vociferously at
those who trifle to sneer even if it is a result of their
confusion and fear. It's my job forgetting these embrace
their ignorance gladly.

Moreover, if these can continue to sneer after a careful
reading of your book, Sir - et sig al - that is proof
positive of the abject invalidity of their cowardly positions
and no more time needs be spent in the most distracted
consideration of their dodgy, likely self-serving, two-color-
puddle-deep sensibilities.

These better just buckle up! N'est ce pas?

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 09:01:54 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 08:40:22 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Olson

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:39:00 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>You must be right. After all, it was so blatantly obvious that
>this report contained nothing but worthless pseudoscience that
>half the people on this list were telling us so right off, with
>nothing to go on but some newspaper headlines. And as ufologists
>we all know, don't we, that anything which looks like 90%
>baloney to Joe Soap at first glance is 100% not worth anyone's
>time. Who cares about detail? Anyway it's just another 465-page
>secret MoD UFO study - dime a dozen, nothing to be learned by
>critiquing that. Just chuck it in that Menzelian trash can and
>let's get on with the next saucer fleet video.

Regardless of the MoD report's merits, you're still performing a service, Martin. Some UFO researchers have to read it, just as they had to read those awful USAF novels. Not to do so would, at a minimum, expose us to charges of prejudice.

Jeff

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

YouTube.Com UFO Videos

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 12:19:33 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 08:44:20 -0400
Subject: YouTube.Com UFO Videos

I was browsing around at Youtube.com and saw these particular videos of supposed UFOs. One is the Phoenix Lights, so you know that one.

What's amazing is that people from around the world can now post their UFO footage all over the web. Can't stop all of them!

It's going to be a chore separating the real from the bogus but things could be worse

<http://tinyurl.com/mjgjq>

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=oZUyGugBPLw&search=flying%20saucer>

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=Z3CdTdrKfGY&search=flying%20saucer>

http://youtube.com/watch?v=5mVzCyp_RR0&search=flying%20saucer

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Aliens: Worlds of Possibilities

From: **Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo** <ufomiami.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 12:31:10 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 08:53:00 -0400
Subject: Aliens: Worlds of Possibilities

To our Friends and Associates...

Aliens: Worlds of Possibilities

May 27, 2006 through September 4, 2006

Place: Museum of Discovery and Science
401 SW 2nd Street
Fort Lauderdale
Florida 33312

954-712-1175

This interactive, out-of-this-world exhibit takes visitors on a voyage from planet Earth into the far reaches of our solar system and beyond, to answer that famous question, "Are we alone?"

Through hands-on exhibits you will discover what life on other planets might look like and why.

Explore outer space, operate a replica of the Mars Pathfinder, and calculate how much you would weigh on other planets.

Take a peek at the world with alien eyes using an infrared camera.

Look through a telescope at a star field, see a real piece of a Martian meteorite, and experience a close encounter with giant robotic aliens.

This exhibit was developed by Pacific Science Center in partnership with the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Institute (SETI) and was made possible through the support of the National Science Foundation.

I'm going to participate on opening day, Sunday May 28 at 2:00 p.m.

I will present the William Orti'z Case; a deaf-mute boy that, at the age of 13, had a Close Encounter with aliens. One of them gave him a message using telepathic and sign-language. Ortiz insists they were spoken words not thoughts. There were eight words in his message:

"Out", "See", "Learn", "Love", "World", "In", "Secret" & "Stop".

Ortiz do not remember the sequence of the words because it happened too fast. Therefore, we doesn't know exactly what the alien was trying to tell him. Can you help us?

If so, write a message with the 8 words the alien communicated to him, and send it to us.

Hoping to see you 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 17:16:51 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 08:58:24 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 22:51:11 -0300
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 13:35:59 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>>The more I read of the Condign report the less impressed I am.

>>>>>Me too.

>>>>>Working paper 18 on aerosols and sonoluminescence is a jumbled
>>>>>argument for there being an opaque region between plasmas that
>>>>>form a triangle... i.e., the cause of the dark triangle
>>>>>sightings.

>>>>>I don't even find a jumbled argument here, just a statement - no
>>>>>science, no reasoning. I'm impressed also that the author
>>>>>invokes "Stoke's Law" to show that emitted radiation from an
>>>>>excited aerosol would have longer wavelength than the exciting
>>>>>radiation, so the latter must be shorter than visible light.

>>>>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>>>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>>>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>>>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>>>>>I don't think we're wasting our time. The objective is to find
>>>>>out if there is any 'science', and, if not, to be able to
>>>>>demonstrate there isn't.

>>>>>To the general public it may appear to be good science and hence
>>>>>worthy of worldwide publicity as "the" solution to the UFO/UAP
>>>>>mystery. However, if it can be shown to be lousy science...
>>>>>then the public can be informed that it is not the solution.

Stan, you really think the general public is even aware of this
report? And how exactly do you propose to inform them that it is
junk science, via the network news? Scientific journals? Oh,
yeah, by giving 10,000 lectures at colleges, I forgot.

>As responsible scientists familiar with much of the UFO Evidence,
>I think it is not appropriate to fall into the trap of the
>debunker who dismisses out of hand or without studying the
>evidence.

You talkin' to me? The evidence is overt and clear: it is a pseudoscientific study.

>We are being asked about the UK Volume.

By whom?

>Unlike the Author, we should do our homework, time consuming as
>it is. Criticism without familiarity is hardly scientific.

>Which reminds me Dick, that I have long been meaning to thank
>you for your dismissal of the Braxton County Monster book
>without having read it.

And where did you get that quite false opinion and what gives you the right to engage in slanderous insinuation of that sort? I damn well did read the book, and it is outrageous for you to suggest otherwise. Especially so since you obviously did not read it before writing a laudatory introduction or foreword. In fact, you later admitted that you were not aware of some of the content. The book is full of outright falsehoods, errors, and wild speculation. You may defend that tripe to your heart's content, but you are dead wrong to do so.

>Because of that attack Frank Feschino and I, with help from
>others such as Barry Greenwood and Dr. David Rudiak, dug out
>loads of evidence that indeed there were dogfights between UFOs
>and interceptors.

Everyone knowledgable about UFO history knows that during 1952 there were "dogfights" between jets and UFOs, but nothing even close to the large scale warfare with extnsive casualties portrayed in this book. You are engaging in sophistry here, and your failure to acknowledge your error is sad.

For just on example out of many dozens, the author has jet interceptors taking off from Keesler AFB, Miss., to chase a UFO. Well, my friend, Keesler is a training base, not a fighter-interceptor base. I know; I was stationed there and I also currently know the Keesler AFB historian with whom I have collaborated on a [non-UFO] book. The author's history of Air Force bases, fighters, etc., is pure fiction.

>Older books such as by Keyhoe and Ruppelt and, as a matter of
>fact, your UFO Evidence, were very helpful as well. I covered
>some of this in my 2005 MUFON paper Government UFO Lies, which
>is on my website at:

????

Yes, Stan, there were fighter jet-UFO chases and encounters in 1952. There was no interplanetary war as described in the book. I'm beginning to woinder now whether you have in fact ever read the book yourself even after its many ridiculous statements were pointed out to 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](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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 19:35:14 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 09:39:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 22:59:12 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:23:58 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>I also think the Condign report is humorous in its blindness and
>failure to address the subject in any meaningful way, but I
>think it is a waste of time to endlessly deconstruct the report.

Endlessly deconstruct? Dick, the world has only known about the
damn thing for a week and most people are still struggling to
even read it - those who can be bothered. Very few substantive
comments at all have been made on this List - the few that have
attract almost immediate criticism from you as a waste of time.
Your threshold of satiety is set way too low here.

>If you care to spare the time, fine, as your observations are
>worthwhile.

Really? How can they be simultaneously worthwhile and a waste of
time?

>It's just that the whole report is silly and totally irrelevant,

Oh is that all? Well I prefer more measured responses to
specific identifiable issues when it comes to science. It's a
limited and imperfect document obviously; but hey, I've got news
for you - so is every other damn document in this game. But
totally irrelevant?

As a UFO historian you should be alive to the historical
significance of this report, and the context(s) and
motivation(s).

Obviously, a military intelligence report exists in a political
context and even a serious attempt at analysis on some level can
be serving a canny political function on another. Like the
Grudge report, the Robertson Panel report, the Condon Report etc
etc. There's some silliness in all of them, but anyone who
thinks he's going to understand UFO history _without_ detailed
study of them is wasting his time.

>and it is not all that clear, yet, that it is influencing anyone
>who didn't already believe that UFOs were a lot of nonsense.

Those are the sort of people who go in a lot for attitudes like
"bah, the whole thing is a silly waste of time". Don't join
them, beat them.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 20:20:05 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 09:44:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 23:10:31 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:39:00 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

><snip>

>>>As a youth I worked in a general store which included a grocery
>>>store and meat counter. One of my boss's stock sayings was: "No
>>>matter how you slice it, it's still baloney."

>>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>>You must be right. After all, it was so blatantly obvious that
>>this report contained nothing but worthless pseudoscience that
>>half the people on this list were telling us so right off, with
>>nothing to go on but some newspaper headlines. And as ufologists
>>we all know, don't we, that anything which looks like 90%
>>baloney to Joe Soap at first glance is 100% not worth anyone's
>>time. Who cares about detail? Anyway it's just another 465-page
>>secret MoD UFO study - dime a dozen, nothing to be learned by
>>critiquing that. Just chuck it in that Menzelian trash can and
>>let's get on with the next saucer fleet video.

>Martin,

>I'm not sure exactly what has lit your fuse and set you off, but
>I had already responded to your comments to Victor before seeing
>this little diatribe.

What lights my fuse is being told, ex cathedra, from your lofty
knowledge and experience, that you know what this report
"represents" - you know everything worth knowing about its
content, background, context, motivation(s) etc etc - and we who
are attempting to actually read and critique the damn thing (and
never mind the related documents yet to emerge) are all wasting
our time - without offering the ghost of a fact or a syllogism.

This comes off like a blinkered knee-jerk response which belongs
to that very "debunker" mindset which you yourself castigate!
Why can't you see that?

>With nothing to go on but newspaper headlines? Sorry, you got
>that wrong.

No I didn't. Go back and read the List posts.

>As I said plainly I read the Executive Summary very
>carefully and it was obvious from that, that this was a piece of
>pseudoscience.

As I said plainly - if hyperbolically - "half the people on this
List" started slagging off Condign on the basis of news stories.
That you, on the other hand, bothered to finish the Summary is I
suppose commendable.

>If you want to spend your time wallowing in it,
>go to it!

Wallowing. So when you said my comments were worthwhile, that
was just what - hot air?

>That's your decision. You are entitled to disagree
>with me, if you wish, about it being a total waste of time.

Why, thank you. I do.

>However,I have lived through several other prior
>pseudoscientific reports of the same ilk including the Condon
>report (a.k.a, the Condom report), possibly before you were
>born.

Should I be flattered to think my prose youthfully jaunty, or
offended at the condescension? If it means anything my memory of
1968 is all too vivid thank you.

>So I am applying knowledge and experience, not simply
>responding to newspaper headlines.

Knowledge and experience _inform_ judgements based on
dispassionate analysis; they are not substitutes for them.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

No Sign Of 'Crashed UFO' Off South African Coast

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 17:25:05 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 09:47:00 -0400
Subject: No Sign Of 'Crashed UFO' Off South African Coast

<http://tinyurl.com/r4jb9>

Multiple witnesses see this thing crash and the authorities
can't find it?

Somebody call Freddy, Thelma, Shaggy, Daphne and Scooby Doo.

A mystery is afloat.

I want to hear whomever is behind this say those magic words:

"I'd have gotten away with it too if weren't for those kids and
that dog!"

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:00:06 -0400
Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

The Current Situation: If We Can Defend Humanity, Let's Do So

There is much credible scientific research published with accurately deduced conclusions. I list the following, not because they are the only ones worth considering, but because they are reliable, concisely expressed, and made freely available for public review. These also make it easy for someone like me to consolidate into a consistent whole.

In his standardizing works, Stanton Friedman (Thanks, Stan!) has determined the following:

"As a nuclear physicist who has had a serious interest in flying saucers since 1958, [he has] reached four major conclusions:

1. The evidence is overwhelming that Planet Earth is being visited by intelligently controlled extraterrestrial spacecraft. In other words, some UFOs are alien spacecraft. Most are not.
2. The subject of flying saucers represents a kind of Cosmic Watergate, meaning that some few people in major governments have known since July, 1947, when two crashed saucers and several alien bodies were recovered in New Mexico, that indeed SOME UFOs are ET. As noted in 1950, it's the most classified U.S. topic.
3. None of the arguments made against conclusions One and Two by a small group of debunkers such as Carl Sagan, my University of Chicago classmate for three years, can stand up to careful scrutiny.
4. The Flying Saucer story is the biggest story of the millennium: visits to Planet Earth by aliens and the U.S. government's cover-up of the best data (the bodies and wreckage) for over fifty years.

"The problem is not that there is not enough evidence to justify [his] conclusions; but that most people, especially the noisy negativists, are unaware of the real, non-tabloid evidence."

<http://stantonfriedman.com/>

Dr. David M. Jacobs' research has also brought us much information. (Thanks, John Velez!) Speaking of the motives of the TRUFO pilots, (Thanks, Dr. Maccabee!), Dr. Jacobs writes:

"The common goal is the physiological exploitation of humans for the purposes of their breeding program [for the purpose of creating a race of human/alien hybrids]. One must keep in mind that people are physically missing from their normal environments, other people some times see them being abducted, and they [the abductees] often desperately wish that they are never abducted again.

We now have thousands of - alien - abduction cases. We know a tremendous amount about them. We know that when an abductee

describes the shape of a certain instrument, what that instrument is used for even though the abductee does not. People do not tend to talk in terms of symbols. They describe real events that have befallen them.

We know that they - i.e., human/alien hybrids - are not here - i.e., living on Earth. My guess is that the majority of them live on some other planet or wherever. I also think that a significant number of them reside on UFOs where there task is to assist in the abduction and breeding program. It is also important to say that the abduction phenomenon takes place in real time without any time-space alterations as far as we can see. But you have to remember that we are dealing with a superior technology."

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/aic/davejacobs.html>

Aliens are piloting the TRUFOS and abducting and exploiting human beings for their own purpose and benefit. We can conclude that the aliens hate humans and should be seen as enemies.

With all this in mind, shouldn't we humans unite to defend our people and our planet, to the best degree possible? With all our flaws as a people, including recent regional suffering and personal hardships, even including the quibbling squabbles on this list, speaking of all humanity, I still choose humanity.

The aliens are attacking individuals in secret. Space-based defense systems won't combat that. And aluminum hats only help those who sell the foil. Since the attacks are individual, does the defense have to be? I have no idea if such a defense is even possible. But if an appropriate program can be developed, it should be. And since secrecy is so important to the aliens, exposure of some type might be a good line for development. (Thanks, again, Dr. Jacobs!)

If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it. What say ye all?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

From: Paul Anderson <paulanderson.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 23:31:19 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:01:18 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 00:42:27 -0300
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>People exacted the science of stomping down grass thousands of
>years ago. They threshed wheat and barley that way for
>centuries. So they were able to make a nice little circle in the
>crops. That's what I meant by," while we've had the technology
>for over 3 millenium-or more-to create crop circles."

There's a big difference between threshing and intricate,
complex multi-layering... it also does not account for the other
physical anomalies often found, including the large expulsion
cavities we've found in thick cattle corn stalks, as I've
mentioned before, as one example (large holes up to almost an
inch in diameter, sometimes many on a single stalk and hundreds
in a given formation). Plus many others.

>In the last ten years anyone with \$150.00 had the money to buy a
>GPS and certainly laser theolidites are easy to come by. String
>and planks are easy to find as well. Pre-planning "might" take
>care of the intricacies of some of these circles. Often we see
>the tractor lines going across the field and right through the
>glyph. There's a way in there.

The tractor lines are mostly in Europe. Many or even most fields
here in Canada and the US also, don't have them, as has also
been discussed before.

>Do you have a URL for that helicopter-over-glyph incident?

It's discussed here, under Equipment Failure:

<http://www.bltresearch.com/otherfacts.html#equip>

--

Canadian Crop Circle Research Network
<http://www.cccrn.ca>

The Prairie Circular
<http://www.theprairiecircular.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

From: Paul Anderson <paulanderson.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 23:45:59 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:03:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 14:34:39 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Star Dreams The Newly Updated Crop Doc

>I was able to find an image of this glyph on the web (see the
>URL below).

><http://tinyurl.com/m7rrj>

Very interesting, although I'm not sure if it has any direct
connection to crop circles?

>I agree with Don here. Just because crop circles are so amazing
>beautiful and intricately detailed one suspects they must have
>an "out of this world" connection does not mean they do. Unlike
>most human abductions or cattle mutilations where aliens and/or
>UFOs are also reported, they are glaringly absent from all crop
>circle reports (with the exception of hoaxed accounts and the
>much simpler so-called "saucer nests" which are depressions or
>imprints of often witnessed landed UFOs).

While 'standard' type UFOs have been mostly absent from crop
circle reports - but no, not absent from all of them, there are
a few exceptions - what about the BOLs (Balls Of Light) which
have been witnessed and filmed many times now in the UK?

Speaking of which, I just received a new DVD, done by a
researcher in Norway, which has some excellent, clear clips of
some of these in it. These sightings are still fairly common in
the UK, and well known in the crop circle research community.

--

Canadian Crop Circle Research Network
<http://www.cccrn.ca>

The Prairie Circular
<http://www.theprairiecircular.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

From: **Tim Shell** <tshell.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:06:37 -0400
Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

I thought I'd share this with the List.

Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine. I recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in 1965 of his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of them. You can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are necessary to correctly view the stereo effect):

<http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

A very nice study was done on the photos by Druffel, Wood, and Kelson a few years back, and I thank them for their nice, big, easy-to-see scans.

In any event, the more photographically savvy of this List will understand how I was able to construct this stereographic image using the original photos. Heflin very conveniently took a pair of the photos a slight horizontal distance apart, and with some color filtering and a few other adjustments, I was able to create the analoglyphic image.

I was hoping that the image would show a nice, big saucer, hovering somewhere a few hundred yards away from the truck.

Unfortunately, it seems to show a much smaller object, maybe a few inches across, hanging a few feet from the top of the truck.

As I mentioned in another forum, I suppose it's possible that the saucer could have moved in a precise lateral motion between the time the first photo was taken and the second photo. But the top part of the saucer appears to be the same size, which allows you to line it up distance-wise, even though it's tilted at a different angle. And for the saucer to have only tilted and moved exactly laterally with respect to the camera, no higher or lower, and no closer or farther away, would have been extremely unlikely.

I know there are some good photo analysts here. Much better than I. I'm only a hobbyist. But I do know that knowing the true size of something in this photo - the mirror mount, for instance, or the 1/2 inch nut on top of the mirror - all the rest of the distances and sizes of anything in the photo can be determined.

Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think. Give me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we looking at a small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a big thing flying over a field?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

No Sign Of ZA 'UFO'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:38:43 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:38:43 -0400
Subject: No Sign Of ZA 'UFO'

Source: News24.Com - Cape Town, South Africa

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/iz06>

21/05/2006

No Sign Of 'UFO' - NSRI

Port Shepstone - There is no sign of an apparent "UFO" that was reported to have crashed into the sea off Port Shepstone on the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast.

National Sea Rescue Institute spokesperson Craig Lambinon says nothing has been found yet, despite an extensive search over an area covering 12 square nautical miles.

The mysterious object that "crashed" into the sea behind the breaker-line off-shore of Port Shepstone High School about 12:20 on Saturday, has raised a frenzy of interest worldwide.

The number of readers who have clicked on the report carried by News24 reached more than 30 000 by 18:00 on Sunday afternoon.

Lambinon said on Sunday evening: "Witnesses said they thought they saw an unidentified object, possibly an aircraft, crash into the sea, but absolutely nothing has been found.

"Police and the NSRI offices in Shelley Beach and Port Edward responded to the call that something had crashed into the sea.

Some even saw flames

"Margate air traffic control also searched the area with a fixed-wing aircraft.

Numerous witnesses, including pupils and teachers at a school sports event, and fishermen were convinced they saw an aircraft go into the water.

"They saw smoke and water exploding. Some even saw flames.

"Some reported seeing an unidentified object splash into the sea causing a ripple of waves," said Lambinon.

"A reliable source, who was on a hill overlooking the sea about 2km away, said he saw something crash into the sea.

"The object trailed smoke behind it, and even after it had crashed the column of smoke hung in the air for several minutes.

"It caused a big splash when it hit the water and bobbed up and down," said Lambinon, quoting one of the witnesses.

'It might have been the weather...'

"There are no reports of activity in the area that may be

related to this incident and there are no aircraft reported to be overdue or missing.

"The number of witness reports leads us to presume that weather activity in the area at the time may have given the impression of something falling into the sea.

"We will continue to monitor the situation, which remains a mystery," said Lambinon, adding: "If there ever was something...".

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Husband Has Secret That's Out of This World

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:55:16 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 10:55:16 -0400
Subject: Husband Has Secret That's Out of This World

Source: WTVF-TV - Nashville, Tennessee, USA

<http://www.newschannel5.com/content/news/19443.asp>

5/20/2006

Husband Has Secret That's Out of This World

If opposites attract, it was only a matter of time before Sherrie and Sandy Nichols collided. Early on, though, Sandy worried a little secret could unravel everything.

"Two people couldn't be more opposite. We like different movies, different books, different TV shows, different music, but somehow it works. It really works," wife Sherrie said.

There were surprises along the way.

Every since childhood, Sandy says he has woken up with scratches all over his body.

"There's blood on the pillows, scratches there," he said.

It's the work, he believes, of aliens who run tests on him in his sleep.

"I believe I'm being abducted by aliens, by ETs, you might say. I basically feel like a lab rat," he said.

He knows it sounds unbelievable, which is why he took so long to tell his wife.

"I felt she'd feel I was crazy," he said.

Sherrie is a fraud investigator and a former nurse. She believes in aliens like she believes in the tooth fairy.

"My thought was: There has to be a logical explanation," she said.

However, she can't explain the marks on her husband. She is certain of one thing, though.

"There is no way he is doing this to himself," she said. "I know something is going on, but I don't know what it is."

"You'll never get anything else out of her, and I'm happy as a clown to just get that," he said.

The thing about a marriage between two opposites is how often both sides end up better off.

For Sandy it's a chance for a life that's normal. For Sherrie, call it a appreciation for the paranormal.

"It's interesting; it really is," she said. "No, it's never dull

around here."

See: <http://www.alienresearchgroup.com/> -ebk]

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Search For Crashed ZA 'UFO' On Hold

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 11:25:38 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 11:25:38 -0400
Subject: Search For Crashed ZA 'UFO' On Hold

Source: iAfrica.Com

<http://iafrica.com/news/sa/397549.htm>

Mon, 22 May 2006

Search For Crashed 'UFO' On Hold

PORT SHEPSTONE--The search for an unidentified object which crashed into the sea at Port Shepstone on Saturday has been put on hold because of rough weather conditions, the National Sea Rescue Institute (NSRI) said on Monday.

"The search was called off on Sunday and will only resume once the sea is calm. At the moment the sea is not conducive to diving," said NSRI Shelley Beach Station Commander Eddie Noyons.

"Rescue workers were unable to find oil slicks or petrol or any signs of a wreckage. We are not yet sure what it was that crashed into the sea."

The search for the unidentified object began on Saturday after witnesses reported that an object, possibly an aircraft, had crashed into the sea behind the breaker line off-shore of the Port Shepstone High School, said Noyons.

Police, rescue craft and a fixed wing aircraft were alerted to the scene to investigate.

Full-scale search

"Following a full-scale search of the area covering 12 square nautical miles nothing had been found.

"There are no reports of activity in the area that may be related to this incident and there are no aircraft reported to be overdue or missing," said Noyons.

He said numerous witnesses =97 including teachers and pupils attending a sports event at the high school, and other bystanders including local fishermen =97 were convinced they had seen an aircraft go into the water, including seeing smoke and a water plume.

Interviews with the witnesses revealed that some also reported seeing flames.

"Some reported seeing something, an unidentified object, splash into the sea causing a ripple effect of waves, " Noyons said.

Was it just the weather?

Due to the number of witnesses with similar reports, it was presumed that weather activity in the area at the time might have given the impression of something falling into the sea.

"We are not sure what it was as we are still unaware of any missing aircraft, but will continue the search for the unidentified object in about two or three days. The sea was upside down yesterday (Sunday) and is still not conducive today (Monday)," said Noyons.

Sapa

[Thanks to Greg Boone 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 22](#)

Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 11:36:28 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 11:36:28 -0400
Subject: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

Source: Raiders News Update - Salem, Oregon, USA

<http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

Monday, May 22, 2006

RNU Exclusive

Col. Jesse Marcel Jr., On & Off The Record
By Thomas Horn
Senior RNU News Reporter

RNU.com =96 (Raiders News Update) =96 A new book by Col. Jesse Marcel Jr. - Roswell: It Really Happened - claims that the famous Roswell UFO event actually occurred, including the recovery of an extraterrestrial craft. Col. Marcel's famous father, Maj. Jesse Marcel Sr. was the lead military investigator into the crash of 1947 and is finally vindicated according to this book.

Without a doubt the 1947 Roswell, N.M. event is the paramount story of western extraterrestrial folklore. Some think whatever really happened there will never be known. The U.S. government says it was a simple case of misidentification. But as most people know, this wasn't the military's first position.

On July 8th, 1947 the Roswell Daily Record carried the RAAF release:

RAAF Captures Flying Saucer On Ranch in Roswell Region. The intelligence office of the 509th Bombardment group at Roswell Army Field announced at noon today, that the field has come into possession of a flying saucer.

Then something happened. The following day the newspaper featured a retraction by the RAAF:

An examination by the army revealed last night that mysterious objects found on a lonely New Mexico ranch was a harmless high-altitude weather balloon - not a grounded flying disk.

The contrast of statements by highly trained personnel set in motion the greatest cover-up in American history, says Col. Jesse Marcel, who is admittedly the only civilian alive to have handled the UFO 'debris' from the Roswell crash site. I set down recently with Col. Marcel and he shared information with me, on and off the recorder. I heard things I had never heard before from ufology's legendary friend. Marcel is almost 70 years old now, a soft spoken, gentle man who comes across as ultimately believable.

When I asked Jess, as he prefers to be called, if his father - the Intelligence Officer at Roswell Army Air Field at the time of the Roswell event - could have been mistaken about what was recovered during the field investigation, he answered without

hesitation, "No way," he said, and then proceeded to tell me why.

When later I pressed about Mogul Balloons and Operation Paperclip as alternative theories, he shared at length the number of times he had joined honest investigators in a side by side comparison with his drawings and material examples and how each time not a single correspondent to what his father had brought home from the ranch that night could be found.

Getting to the big questions, I offered, "But of course whatever happened at Roswell, surely it could be explained as top-secret terrestrial technology, right?" As cool as silky water, he looked at me and replied, "Tom, what I saw was not of this earth. Though it was material, I held it in my hands, and the pieces were as light as a feather."

I gave Jess greetings from Stanton Friedman, who together with Bill Moore had brought the Roswell cover-up to international light many years ago, and then I said, "So you, like Stan Friedman, believe the Roswell debris were most likely a physical technology?" Jess smiled and told me how Friedman was such close family friend.

I'm not sure he ever did get around to answering my question about technology. But Col. Marcel, like his father before him, is a career military man (he had just returned from Iraq where as an ear, nose and throat specialist he was busy patching up soldiers).

Over the years he's participated in field investigations of crashed known craft, and is very familiar with many hardware components. To this day he has never seen anything resembling the Roswell artifacts.

Marcel then proceeded to tell me an intriguing story about an incident that had happened some years ago, when he was scheduled to be in Washington, DC. To this day he doesn't know how the participants knew where he would be at that particular time.

When he arrived at his motel, there was a message waiting for him on the phone in his room. It was from a man we'll call Mr. "X". He wanted to meet with Marcel the following day, at 1:PM in a certain room at the Capital building. Marcel felt uneasy, but agreed to go to the meeting.

On arrival, he was ushered into the office of Mr. "X", who got right down to business. "X" wanted to talk to Marcel about Roswell, and he asked if Jess would be more comfortable "in a secure room." When Marcel explained that he wouldn't be saying anything he hadn't said before, "X" pressed the idea of the secure room, explaining, "Well, maybe I want to tell you something you don't already know."

Leaving the office, they proceeded to the secure room where no listening devices existed, in an area Jess described as "the dungeons of the Capital building."

They sat at a table where Marcel noticed a book about Alien Abductions, UFO technology and Roswell. "X" tapped on the book with his finger and said outright, "This is not fiction."

The mysterious government insider continued talking for a while and then asked Marcel if he knew where the material recovered from the Roswell ranch was being kept. Jess found the question curious and said, "No. Don't you?" "X"'s answer was as curious as the question, so Marcel responded with a inquiry of his own:

"If extraterrestrial activity is real, and you guys know it, when is the government planning Official Disclosure of what really happened at Roswell?"

"If it was up to me," "X" said, "we'd be doing it now."

Following a story like that, I just had to ask Col. Marcel if he personally knew of other members of the government and military who also are anticipating a future moment when the representatives of the world's religions and leaders of nations will stand in the well of the United Nations and say, "We have an announcement to make. We are in contact with extraterrestrial intelligence."

Marcel grew silent for a moment, then looked at me and whispered, "Yes."

Suddenly the phone rang, and Col. Marcel had to leave the building.

Editors note: The full transcript and audio file of Col. Jesse Marcel Jr. and Tom Horn's interview will be available at RaidersNewsUpdate.com later this week.

Permission to repost is freely granted with this copyright attachment: Copyright 2006 <http://www.RaidersNewsUpdate.com>

[UFO UpDates thanks Tom Horn 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 16:15:57 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 10:42:45 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 20:20:05 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 23:10:31 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:39:00 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>As a youth I worked in a general store which included a grocery
>>>>store and meat counter. One of my boss's stock sayings was: "No
>>>>matter how you slice it, it's still baloney."

>>>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>>>You must be right. After all, it was so blatantly obvious that
>>>this report contained nothing but worthless pseudoscience that
>>>half the people on this list were telling us so right off, with
>>>nothing to go on but some newspaper headlines. And as ufologists
>>>we all know, don't we, that anything which looks like 90%
>>>baloney to Joe Soap at first glance is 100% not worth anyone's
>>>time. Who cares about detail? Anyway it's just another 465-page
>>>secret MOD UFO study - dime a dozen, nothing to be learned by
>>>critiquing that. Just chuck it in that Menzelian trash can and
>>>let's get on with the next saucer fleet video.

>>Martin,

>>I'm not sure exactly what has lit your fuse and set you off, but
>>I had already responded to your comments to Victor before seeing
>>this little diatribe.

>What lights my fuse is being told, ex cathedra, from your lofty
>knowledge and experience, that you know what this report
>"represents" - you know everything worth knowing about its
>content, background, context, motivation(s) etc etc - and we who
>are attempting to actually read and critique the damn thing (and
>never mind the related documents yet to emerge) are all wasting
>our time - without offering the ghost of a fact or a syllogism.

>This comes off like a blinkered knee-jerk response which belongs
>to that very "debunker" mindset which you yourself castigate!
>Why can't you see that?

<snip>

Martin,

This exchange with you has now become a total waste of time for

me, and ends right here as far as I am concerned. We obviously are talking past each other, not communicating. I see no contradiction between your ability to make "worthwhile comments" and "wasting your time," you do. Not to labor the point too much, but I have made all sorts of worthwhile comments for 45 years that fall on deaf ears, and thus have been a waste of my time.

As I have now said about three times, it is entirely your decision (yours, Bruce, Stan, etc.) if you want to spend a lot of time on it. Based on my knowledge and experience, the Executive Summary was enough for me. I don't think the world is breathlessly waiting for scientific ufologists to critique the report.

I have never doubted that you and others are capable of presenting good critiques of it. I just doubt the value of spending much time and energy on it, and said so. It is my opinion, like it or lump it. But at least understand it and stop over-reacting to it.

- Dick

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 10:45:05 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>Aliens are piloting the TRUFOS and abducting and exploiting
>human beings for their own purpose and benefit. We can conclude
>that the aliens hate humans and should be seen as enemies.

Oh, we can conclude all this, can we? I strongly doubt we can
conclude any of it!

<snip>

>If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and
>exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it.
>What say ye all?

What say ye all?

TRUFOS? Now here's a messed-up word if there ever was one - one
which I'm sure will catch on and get used rather than getting
lost like it should. A perfect word for the saucer cultists!
Let's not go here again, but UFO simply stands for unidentified
flying object so anything in the air that's not unidentified is
a true UFO, whether mundane or anomalous. But I'm sure you mean
it to identify the spaceships that you're convinced are coming
here - which would make it a perfect word for all ufology if
you could state with certainty it has been proven some UFOs are
extraterrestrial spacecraft.

Bottom line: all of your conclusions (in your entire post) are
premature! Some, if not most, of your conclusions are
extremely premature and even sound paranoid!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/22/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 12:40:31 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 10:55:47 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/22/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 60
May 22, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE SHUTS COURTHOUSE DOORS
** GROOM LAKE-RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DATA FOUND ONLINE
** PENTAGON'S BLACK BUDGET SOARS TO COLD WAR HEIGHTS
** SOME OTHER SECRECY NEWS

STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE SHUTS COURTHOUSE DOORS

The state secrets privilege has been invoked by the Bush Administration with greater frequency than ever before in American history in a wide range of lawsuits that the government says would threaten national security if allowed to proceed.

In virtually every case, the use of the privilege leads to dismissal of the lawsuit and forecloses the opportunity for an injured party to seek judicial relief.

Most recently, a lawsuit brought by Khaled El-Masri, a German citizen who alleged that he was kidnapped by the CIA and tortured over a five month period, was dismissed after the CIA invoked the "state secrets" privilege.

The dismissal was not based on a finding that the allegations against the CIA were false.

"It is in no way an adjudication of, or comment on, the merit or lack of merit of El-Masri's complaint," wrote Judge T.S. Ellis, III in a May 12 order.

In fact, "It is worth noting that ... if El-Masri's allegations are true or essentially true, then all fair-minded people... must also agree that El-Masri has suffered injuries as a result of our country's mistake and deserves a remedy," he wrote in the order dismissing the case.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/statesec/elmasri051206.pdf>

"Yet, it is also clear from the result reached here that the only sources of that remedy must be the Executive Branch or the Legislative Branch, not the Judicial Branch," he suggested.

But in this case the executive branch is the alleged perpetrator of the offense, and the legislative branch has no procedures for adjudicating allegations such as El-Masri's, even if it had an interest in doing so. That's what courts are for.

Terrorists can kill people and destroy property. But they cannot undermine the rule of law, or deny injured parties access to the

courts. Only the U.S. government can do that.

The state secrets privilege has been invoked lately in a remarkable diversity of lawsuits. See this selection of case files from recent state secrets cases:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/statesec/index.html>

Tom Blanton of the National Security Archive reflected on the growing use of the state secrets privilege and how it relates to the larger climate of secrecy in "The lie behind the secrets," Los Angeles Times, May 21:

<http://tinyurl.com/mkd78>

Recently introduced legislation would "provide protection from frivolous government claims of state secrets," the Project on Government Oversight noted:

http://pogoblog.typepad.com/pogo/2006/05/state_secrets_.html

Wired News today published documents pertaining to the alleged role of AT&T in NSA warrantless surveillance related to another lawsuit in which the state secrets privilege has been invoked. See:

<http://www.wired.com/news/technology/0,70947-0.html>

GROOM LAKE-RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DATA FOUND ONLINE

When workers at the secret Groom Lake ("Area 51") aircraft test facility in Nevada filed a lawsuit in the early 1990s alleging that they had been injured by fumes from open-pit burning of chemical waste associated with stealth aircraft development, the government blocked the lawsuit by insisting that all information regarding the chemical waste was classified.

So it came as a surprise to researcher Stephen I. Schwartz when he discovered that some of this information had been published online by the Air Force in a document cleared for public release.

Specifically, a safety manual intended for emergency responders identifies the "hazardous byproducts of burning wreckage" of an F-117A stealth fighter.

"It's a textbook case of how the government, in this case the Air Force, wields classification rules unevenly and withholds information illegally when its disclosure would prove embarrassing or costly," said Stephen Schwartz, the former publisher of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

A copy of the document he found, entitled "F-117A Safety Supplement: Aerospace Emergency Rescue and Mishap Response Information," U.S. Air Force Technical Manual, 19 May 2005 (see esp. pages 9-10) is available here (2.3 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/othergov/dod/safety.pdf>

The story was reported in "Warnings for emergency responders kept from Area 51 workers" by Keith Rogers, Las Vegas Review-Journal, May 21:

<http://tinyurl.com/gog4w>

Attorney Jonathan Turley, who represented the Groom Lake workers, told the Review-Journal that as a result of the latest revelations he is "looking at the possibility of renewed litigation related to Area 51."

PENTAGON'S BLACK BUDGET SOARS TO COLD WAR HEIGHTS

The Department of Defense budget request for 2007 includes about \$30.1 billion in classified or "black" spending, according to a new analysis by the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.

"In real (inflation-adjusted) terms the \$30.1 billion FY 2007 request includes more classified acquisition funding than any

other defense budget since FY 1988, near the end of the Cold War, when DoD received \$19.7 billion (\$29.4 billion in FY 2007 dollars) for these programs," wrote author Steven Kosiak.

A copy of "Classified Funding in the FY 2007 Budget Request" is available from the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments here:

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

The study was reported in "Classified military spending reaches highest level since Cold War" by Drew Brown, Knight-Ridder Newspapers, May 19:

<http://www.realcities.com/mld/kashington/14623031.htm>

SOME OTHER SECRECY NEWS

Pressure to adopt "sensitive but unclassified" control markings on information that does not qualify for classification is growing, along with opposition to such controls, among some academic researchers who study terrorism-related topics.

See "Scientific Openness: Should Academics Self-Censor Their Findings on Terrorism?" by Yudhijit Bhattacharjee, Science, May 19:

<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/312/5776/993b>

"The secrecy that has become such a hallmark of the Bush administration did not begin with Sept. 11, as the White House often suggests. It began in the earliest days of January 2001, as the administration was taking shape," according to a National Public Radio account.

See "From the Start, Bush White House Kept Secrets" by Don Gonyea, NPR Weekend Edition, May 21:

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5420680>

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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 15:02:20 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:00:22 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Friedman

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 17:16:51 +0000
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 22:51:11 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>Stan, you really think the general public is even aware of this
>report? And how exactly do you propose to inform them that it is
>junk science, via the network news? Scientific journals? Oh,
>yeah, by giving 10,000 lectures at colleges, I forgot.

>>As responsible scientists familiar with much of the UFO Evidence,
>>I think it is not appropriate to fall into the trap of the
>>debunker who dismisses out of hand or without studying the
>>evidence.

>You talkin' to me? The evidence is overt and clear: it is a
>pseudoscientific study.

>>We are being asked about the UK Volume.

>By whom?

>>Unlike the Author, we should do our homework, time consuming as
>>it is. Criticism without familiarity is hardly scientific.

>>Which reminds me Dick, that I have long been meaning to thank
>>you for your dismissal of the Braxton County Monster book
>>without having read it.

>And where did you get that quite false opinion and what gives
>you the right to engage in slanderous insinuation of that sort?
>I damn well did read the book, and it is outrageous for you to
>suggest otherwise. Especially so since you obviously did not
>read it before writing a laudatory introduction or foreword. In
>fact, you later admitted that you were not aware of some of the
>content. The book is full of outright falsehoods, errors, and
>wild speculation. You may defend that tripe to your heart's
>content, but you are dead wrong to do so.

>>Because of that attack Frank Feschino and I, with help from
>>others such as Barry Greenwood and Dr. David Rudiak, dug out
>>loads of evidence that indeed there were dogfights between UFOs
>>and interceptors.

>Everyone knowledgeable about UFO history knows that during 1952
>there were "dogfights" between jets and UFOs, but nothing even
>close to the large scale warfare with extensive casualties
>portrayed in this book. You are engaging in sophistry here, and
>your failure to acknowledge your error is sad.

>For just one example out of many dozens, the author has jet
>interceptors taking off from Keesler AFB, Miss., to chase a UFO.

>Well, my friend, Keesler is a training base, not a fighter-
>interceptor base. I know; I was stationed there and I also
>currently know the Keesler AFB historian with whom I have
>collaborated on a [non-UFO] book. The author's history of Air
>Force bases, fighters, etc., is pure fiction.

>>Older books such as by Keyhoe and Ruppelt and, as a matter of
>>fact, your UFO Evidence, were very helpful as well. I covered
>>some of this in my 2005 MUFON paper Government UFO Lies, which
>>is on my website at:

>????

>Yes, Stan, there were fighter jet-UFO chases and encounters in
>1952. There was no interplanetary war as described in the book.
>I'm beginning to wonder now whether you have in fact ever read
>the book yourself even after its many ridiculous statements were
>pointed out to you!

Dick you made derogatory comments on UFO UpDates about the
Feschino book well before you had read it. Check the files "Send
me a copy and I'll read it" you said... just as your comments
about the MOD report were made with your having, at most, read
the summary.

Over the past 3 weeks I have done more than 10 hours of radio
programs. These reach a great many people. Often I was asked
about the MOD Report. Fortunately I had Isaac Koi's and Martin
Shough's comments as well as several newspaper articles. These
reach far more people than my lectures.

I got my first copy of the Condon Report from KDKA radio in
Pittsburgh and had read just about all of it before doing the
Contact radio show and numerous other interviews. Our group got
a very fair response from the press because we could be specific
rather than merely lambasting Condon and cohorts and because we
had established our legitimacy earlier. We could note the
information that wasn't included and the fact that many cases
were unexplained.

As was noted in detail on the radio program with Errol a few
weeks back (did you hear it?), it turned out that the publisher
of the book made more than 100 changes in what he was supposed
to publish. I saw the draft. My publisher had done no such
things. We regretted the failure to stick to what was supposed
to be published. That will be changed. I think you need a bigger
gray basket.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: No Sign Of ZA 'UFO' - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 15:18:39 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:04:38 -0400
Subject: Re: No Sign Of ZA 'UFO' - Ledger

UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>Source: News24.Com - Cape Town, South Africa
><http://tinyurl.co.uk/iz06>

>21/05/2006

>No Sign Of 'UFO' - NSRI

>Port Shepstone - There is no sign of an apparent "UFO" that was
>reported to have crashed into the sea off Port Shepstone on the
>KwaZulu-Natal South Coast.

It's time to dig out the satellite decay logs. Could have been something like that or a meteor, possibly.

>National Sea Rescue Institute spokesperson Craig Lambinon says
>nothing has been found yet, despite an extensive search over an
>area covering 12 square nautical miles.

You have to look underwater for man made space junk and evidence of meteorite impacts.

>The mysterious object that "crashed" into the sea behind the
>breaker-line off-shore of Port Shepstone High School about 12:20
>on Saturday, has raised a frenzy of interest worldwide.

Frenzy, eh?

<snip>

>"Margate air traffic control also searched the area with a
>fixed-wing aircraft.

They did nothing of the sort. Air Traffic Control, controls air traffic, they don't have their own aircraft. Probably some civilian agency was contacted and asked to have a look.

>Numerous witnesses, including pupils and teachers at a school
>sports event, and fishermen were convinced they saw an aircraft
>go into the water.

Good opportunity for triangulation and possible discovery of bottom trauma or debris or even a hint of a crater.

>"They saw smoke and water exploding. Some even saw flames.

Again, a good guess would be a decayed satellite of booster or some such, or a fireball type meteor/meteorite.

>"Some reported seeing an unidentified object splash into the
>sea causing a ripple of waves," said Lambinon.

>"A reliable source, who was on a hill overlooking the sea about
>2km away, said he saw something crash into the sea.

>"The object trailed smoke behind it, and even after it had
>crashed the column of smoke hung in the air for several minutes.

>"It caused a big splash when it hit the water and bobbed up and
>down," said Lambinon, quoting one of the witnesses.

The bobbing up and down is a bit anomalous.

>'It might have been the weather...'

>"There are no reports of activity in the area that may be
related to this incident and there are no aircraft reported to
be overdue or missing.

>"The number of witness reports leads us to presume that weather
>activity in the area at the time may have given the impression
>of something falling into the sea.

Humbug. More likely something fell into the sea.

>"We will continue to monitor the situation, which remains a
>mystery," said Lambinon, adding: "If there ever was
>something...".

This likely being a meteor/fireball or a satellite seen by
hundreds makes one wonder why this 'expert' is doubting such a
potentially prosaic incident. A bit pompous, don't you think?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 21:30:19 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:08:40 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine. I
>recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in 1965 of
>his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of them. You
>can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are necessary to
>correctly view the stereo effect):

><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

>A very nice study was done on the photos by Druffel, Wood, and
>Kelson a few years back, and I thank them for their nice, big,
>easy-to-see scans.

>In any event, the more photographically savvy of this List will
>understand how I was able to construct this stereographic image
>using the original photos. Heflin very conveniently took a pair
>of the photos a slight horizontal distance apart, and with some
>color filtering and a few other adjustments, I was able to
>create the analglyphic image.

>I was hoping that the image would show a nice, big saucer,
>hovering somewhere a few hundred yards away from the truck.

>Unfortunately, it seems to show a much smaller object, maybe a
>few inches across, hanging a few feet from the top of the truck.

>As I mentioned in another forum, I suppose it's possible that
>the saucer could have moved in a precise lateral motion between
>the time the first photo was taken and the second photo. But the
>top part of the saucer appears to be the same size, which allows
>you to line it up distance-wise, even though it's tilted at a
>different angle. And for the saucer to have only tilted and
>moved exactly laterally with respect to the camera, no higher or
>lower, and no closer or farther away, would have been extremely
>unlikely.

>I know there are some good photo analysts here. Much better than
>I. I'm only a hobbyist. But I do know that knowing the true size
>of something in this photo - the mirror mount, for instance, or
>the 1/2 inch nut on top of the mirror - all the rest of the
>distances and sizes of anything in the photo can be determined.

>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think. Give
>me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we looking at a
>small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a big thing flying
>over a field?

Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing them.
This came out during a UK ITV show aired in May 1968. Yet I have
never seen any other mention of this, either by believers in the
photos or by skeptics. If British TV can discover this titbit of
info, why couldn't knowledgeable UFO investigators? Therefore
the answers to your questions are, with reasonable certainty: No
you got it right, and yes it is a small model.

And his tale of having mysterious visits by NORAD agents is BS,
pure and simple. See also Condon Report p. 437-455.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:09:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>Source: Raiders News Update - Salem, Oregon, USA

><http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

>Monday, May 22, 2006

>RNU Exclusive

>Col. Jesse Marcel Jr., On & Off The Record
>By Thomas Horn
>Senior RNU News Reporter

<snip>

>The mysterious government insider continued talking for a while
>and then asked Marcel if he knew where the material recovered
>from the Roswell ranch was being kept. Jess found the question
>curious and said, "No. Don't you?" "X"'s answer was as curious
>as the question, so Marcel responded with a inquiry of his own:

Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - White

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 17:06:07 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:11:35 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - White

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

<snip>

>But if an appropriate program can be developed, it should be.

Scientists willing to help develop such a countermeasure program would do well to listen to, and possibly study, the ongoing advanced technology torture programs being experienced by hundreds of sane people, instead of labelling us as "tin foil beanie types" fit only for jokes.

We can offer constant access to technology effects which are on a par with the abductors' equipment, hence a chance to attempt countermeasures against frequent or continuous use of abductor-class technology, as opposed to only being able to work during the relatively rare and short abductions.

>If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and >exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it.
>What say ye all?

I say Bravo!

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

UK National Archives Global Search

From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 23:07:03 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:12:57 -0400
Subject: UK National Archives Global Search

The UK's National Archives website now has an upgraded search facility. Its new "global search" provides more of a 'one stop shop' than was previously the case:

http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/search/quick_search.aspx

Type in "UFO", "unidentified flying object", "flying saucer", etc, and you should be able to access details of UFO-related material more easily than was previously the case.

Happy hunting!

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 23](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Ole Henningsen <oleh.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 14:25:58 +0200
Fwd Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:54:45 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>I thought I'd share this with the List.

>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine. I
>recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in 1965 of
>his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of them. You
>can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are necessary to
>correctly view the stereo effect):

><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

<snip>

>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think. Give
>me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we looking at a
>small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a big thing flying
>over a field?

Hello Tim.

A nice and interesting study and quite different from other studies of this kind.

Its difficult to judge from the photo, but I favour the fishing pole myself.

Kind regards and thanks for sharing this with the List.

Ole
Denmark

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Space Aliens From Luxemburg A Horror Story

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:01:41 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:01:41 -0400
Subject: Space Aliens From Luxemburg A Horror Story

Source: Free Market News Network - Pompano Beach, Florida

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/b93s>

Monday, May 22, 2006

Space Aliens From Luxemburg: A Horror Story

Let us imagine that tomorrow morning, when you flip on CNN, you see Wolf Blitzer being jostled by surging crowds. Everyone is running, staring at the sky in fear. "Space aliens have landed in Luxemburg!" cries Wolf, wide-eyed and almost hysterical, "and they have a message for all mankind!"

There is a burst of static, and then you see a drooling, bulging-eyed monstrosity gripping prepared notes in its slimy sea-green tentacles.

"Citizens of Earth!" it gurgles, "we bring good news! We see that, all over the world, citizens live under the slavery of what you call 'governments'. Millions of you are unjustly imprisoned, billions are stolen from you through taxation, and government-owned WMDs threaten the very survival of the planet! This is a moral abomination, and we have come to put a stop to it!"

Well! you think, munching your toast, this might bring my property taxes down a bit!

The alien continues: "We are fully dedicated to freeing your from the monstrous moral evil of these governments, and we have decided to start with the United States of America!"

Although you are not a great fan of the US government, a strange sense of foreboding rises in your stomach. Sure enough, the slaving alien continues:

"Freedom does not come cheap, of course; sacrifices must be made. As we dislodge your existing government, there will be suffering =96 but no matter! Freedom is worth every tear, every sacrifice!"

Well that=92s interesting, you think, stirring your cereal slowly. I don=92t see how they=92re going to be sacrificing anything, but let=92s see what they mean=85

"We will use a two-phased approach to set you free," gurgles the alien, squinting into the camera with at least a dozen eyes. "First, we will impose economic sanctions, designed to force your leaders to relinquish their ill-gotten power. As part of this process, we will use ray shields to block international trade, ground your airplanes, and irradiate your food and medicine." Two of the alien=92s eyes dart down to check some figures. "Based on prior experience, we calculate that this phase will cause the deaths of no more than 5-6 million of your children. Also, about 13% of your newborns will die before

reaching the age of 5. But we are willing to make that sacrifice, because we believe it=92s worth it. For freedom!"

The space alien frowns and flips some pages. Your mouth hangs open.

"We shall keep these sanctions in place for thirteen or so years. If, after that time, your leaders have not given up their power, we will move on to stage 2. In stage 2, we will directly invade your country, in order to overthrow your existing government and replace it with a better government. This will also entail some suffering. We imagine that approximately 20-30 of your cities will be destroyed, just over a million of you will be killed, about 8 million will be wounded, and tens of millions of you will be rendered homeless. About 50% of you will lose your jobs. Most of your roads, bridges, electrical and water systems will be obliterated. Your food supply will be largely destroyed. But don=92t worry =96 our goal it to replace your existing leaders with new leaders, and we believe that is worth all the blood, sweat, tears and deaths you will experience!"

With a clatter, your cereal bowl falls to the floor, spraying milk all over your legs. Your pregnant wife wanders into the room and asks what on earth is going on.

"Wake the kids!" you whisper hoarsely. "We=92ve got to get out of here!"

But the space aliens from Luxemburg are as good as their word. There is no escape. Shimmering purple ray shields spring up around the borders, preventing anyone from entering or leaving the country. The aliens set up 'no fly zones=92 which is pretty much the entire US airspace. Several times a day, heat-rays slice down from buzzing spaceships, burning alive hundreds of citizens as they huddle in their homes screaming with terror.

Every now and then, the space aliens drop leaflets explaining their actions.

"Citizens of America," they read, "we are not angry with you! We are only angry with your political leaders that subjugate you! Be patient as we work to remove your leaders! We cannot allow them to continue to wield their WMDs =96 we shall save you from their evil!"

However, you notice, the leaders don=92t seem to be harmed at all by the alien sanctions. In fact, their wealth and power seem to grow. As the economy dies, however, your life =96 and the life of your neighbours =96 becomes an unrecognizable medieval hell. There is almost no medicine, clean running water, or electricity. Children and the old die like flies, and are buried in empty stadiums. Dysentery and cholera run rampant. People flee the cities to live in tent communities. After your wife gives birth, your baby dies within a few weeks.

As the sanctions wear on, frightening rumours begin to circulate =96 rumours so horrifying that they can scarcely be believed. One rumour says that the very political leaders that the space aliens claim to hate were in fact funded, sponsored and installed by the space aliens to begin with! Another says that the very same WMDs that the aliens claim to be horrified by were given to your leaders by the space aliens in the first place!

Finally, after thirteen long years =96 after millions of children have died and an entire generation has grown up knowing only despair, poverty, death, disease and hopelessness =96 the day finally arrives.

Invasion!

Endless fleets of spaceships flash across the skies over America, turning cities into flames. They claim to be aiming for the leaders, but instead over a million men, women and children get burned up in their own homes, screaming and burrowing for shelter.

The war is relatively short, since electromagnetic rays disable almost all the US defense systems. The space aliens take over the burning wreckage of Washington, and immediately impose rigid curfews. Because some Americans =96 perhaps those whose children or wives were murdered by the sanctions or the fleets of

spaceships =96 have formed an underground rebellion against the occupation, alien troops start invading homes and dragging men and women into concentration camps without trial.

One night, your door is kicked in and your eldest son is dragged away. His screams are muffled by the black bag over his head, and you stand there helpless, sick with hear. The next morning, you drift around your tent city, asking questions. Most people turn away, terrified that you are an informer for the aliens. But a few tell you terrible stories about the concentration camps. Hushed voices tell tales of torture. And rape. And murder. And you slowly find out that more than a quarter of a million Americans have been dragged into these gulags without trial or access to lawyers. No one knows what becomes of them.

Every day, your wife lines up in front of one of these sprawling camps, hoping for a chance to find out about your son. She is told nothing. He could be alive or dead =96 there is no way to tell. You are desperate to find him, but are terrified that if your wife keeps asking, she will disappear too.

Then, one sweltering summer day, New York is encircled by spaceships. From blaring loudspeakers, all the women and children are told to flee the city. Any men who try to escape are beaten and turned back. The aliens turn off New York=92s water and electricity. After about 2 million people flee New York, the space aliens burn it to the ground with their heat rays. Hospitals are targeted. The screams of the dying can be heard from across the river.

As the occupation grinds on, there seems to be no end in sight. The aliens, who said that their mission was to free Americans, are now building permanent military bases and have installed a puppet government that they control.

One evening, as you sit with the remnants of your family in front of your ragged tent, starving and terrified, you hear a tinny voice coming from a neighbour=92s radio. One of the alien leaders is complaining that Americans seem "ungrateful" for their liberation. "I guess there are just some bad apples," he sighs, "who hate us for our innate goodness."

And as you close your eyes and try to sleep, you think of your son, missing for years, picturing him bruised and broken in some airless cell, and wonder if he is better off alive or dead.

[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](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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

E.T Hunters Swarm To The Northwest

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:06:38 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:06:38 -0400
Subject: E.T Hunters Swarm To The Northwest

Source: The Manchester Evening News - Lancashire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/onnwx>

Wednesday, 17th May 2006

E.T Hunters Swarm To The Northwest
Simon Donohue

UFO-hunters will hit Altrincham in their hundreds for a seminar on the unexplained next month. Here, Stuart Miller tells Simon Donohue how he yearns for a close encounter.

He approaches from the sun, blinding us further with his luminous yellow jacket and commands our attention while taking a good look at our faces.

"I need to take a look at your cards," he demands inexplicably, before adding, "Sorry, wrong gentlemen!" Advertisement your story continues below

"Yeah right," I say to Stuart Miller, Cheshire's foremost commentator on the ongoing search for extra terrestrial life. "That guy may look like a city centre construction worker, but I've seen The X Files!"

Like Mulder and Scully before us, Miller and I sit at pavement caf=E9 where we can watch for men in dark glasses and discuss plans for a major gathering of ufologists.

Stellar cast

To those interested in the unexplained, the speakers who will address the conference on Ufology And The Paranormal at Altrincham Masonic Hall represent a stellar cast.

Nick Redfern's book, *Body Snatchers In The Desert*, was the "most realistic explanation of Roswell"; Neil Morris will provide the truth of Ant and Dec's Alien Autopsy film; while Paul Kimball will assess the career of Canadian ufological icon Wilbert Smith.

These are the type of men who wear the fact that they have suffered special branch surveillance as a badge of honour.

On the other hand, Miller, 53, a father of four daughters, who lives in Bowdon and publishes the extra terrestrial e-zine, *uforeview*, is disappointingly down to earth.

"I have been interested in UFOs since my mid-teens, but didn't take an active interest until 10 years ago," says the man so tall he'd terrify ET.

"There is no question that intelligent extra terrestrial life

exists," he adds without fear of ridicule. "If you just look at it from a mathematical point of view, there has to be something out there."

Coffee and tea arrive in pots so large they could easily conceal surveillance equipment.

E-zine

Unfazed, Miller presses on, telling me that he came to publish his own UFO e-zine after providing book reviews for the now-defunct UFO Magazine.

Each edition of uforeview is "read" by 20,000 people, but Miller would still like to see it published on paper.

"Every couple of years there are reports that fewer people are interested in ufology," he says. "It really winds us up when people say there are fewer sightings of UFOs. That's complete and utter rubbish."

Even so, Miller just happens to be pushing tickets at a time when the men in white coats seem to have produced conclusive proof that flying saucers don't exist.

Electricity

A request made via the Freedom Of Information act revealed that scientists working for the Ministry Of Defence on Project Condign had concluded that it was not alien saucers which have been buzzing the British countryside but "plasmas of gas" illuminated by charges of atmospheric electricity.

"I'd say that nothing has yet been fully explained," insists Miller between sips of latte. "The real issue is whether intelligent life extra terrestrial has been here. There is evidence that ET has visited us at some point. It is an old adage in UFO circles that the volume of evidence, if transferred to a criminal case, would be enough to secure a conviction."

Miller believes the British authorities have softened their attitude towards UFO hunters.

But the Americans are different, he says, and particularly since September 11. What do they have to hide?

"I think Orson Welles did the world an enormous disservice when War Of The Worlds was broadcast live on American radio, causing mass panic," adds Miller. "There is a fear that there might be panic if proof of extra terrestrial life was provided." Given that possibility, why are the people who read uforeview committed to proving the existence of other life forms?

"To just look inwards at ourselves, here on this planet, is to have a very restrictive point of view," Miller suggests.

"People these days treat ufology much more seriously and are less inclined to laugh.

"My wife and daughters are sceptical but they do not treat me as some idiot who would embarrass them."

Even so, Miller, who believes in a higher being if not a God, says he imagines that non-human life forms might already be here.

"Perhaps they have revealed themselves to us in ways which we would be most comfortable with," he adds, "either through our own minds, or from somewhere above this planet."

Dream

He answers the most important question with almost religious zeal.

"No, I have never seen a UFO myself," he says. "But it is my dream to meet an intelligent being from another planet.

"If the authorities do have proof of life on other planets, I can think of no good reason why they shouldn't tell us. I think it is man's right to know."

We part and I return to the office. Once again, a man in a luminous jacket crosses my path.

He could just be a builder enjoying a lunch break. But maybe, just maybe, he's one of the few who do know more than they're letting on.

* For further information about the June 10 seminar visit www.uforeview.net

Copyright 2006 Manchester Evening News. If you wish to use this article for commercial purposes please contact our syndication department.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:38:40 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:09:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Source: Raiders News Update - Salem, Oregon, USA

>><http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

>>Monday, May 22, 2006

>>RNU Exclusive

>>Col. Jesse Marcel Jr., On & Off The Record

>>By Thomas Horn

>>Senior RNU News Reporter

><snip>

>>The mysterious government insider continued talking for a while
>>and then asked Marcel if he knew where the material recovered
>>from the Roswell ranch was being kept. Jess found the question
>>curious and said, "No. Don't you?" "X"'s answer was as curious
>>as the question, so Marcel responded with a inquiry of his own:

>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>truth).

Eugene the book isn't finished yet. The story is not a new one.
I was also interviewed at the Capitol Location as was Walter
Haut. Let's not jump to conclusions. There was a conference of
Roswell-related people across from DC sponsored by the Fund.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:40:40 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:12:53 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>>The mysterious government insider continued talking for a while
>>and then asked Marcel if he knew where the material recovered

>>from the Roswell ranch was being kept. Jess found the question

>>curious and said, "No. Don't you?" "X"'s answer was as curious
>>as the question, so Marcel responded with a inquiry of his own:

>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>truth).

I think it's unfortunate to simply dismiss Jesse's book without
looking at it, but I have no illusion that it will provide any
new keys to unlocking this mystery. I would have to read it
with the understanding that Jesse isn't a writer and the co-
author may actually shape how it's presented.

The trip to Washington that Jesse took was fairly well known at
the time and I'm surprised you don't remember it. If memory
serves, this was part of Kent Jeffries' effort to dig into the
Roswell event. Unfortunately, I don't believe the hypnotic
regression provided any new details.

Does Mr. X exist? I can say that people are fairly strange at
times in DC and If I see Jesse at an event I'll probably ask for
a description of the event.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02:28 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:18:57 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 21:30:19 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin >Top Hat UFO

>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine.
>>I recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in
>>1965 of his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of
>>them. You can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are
>>necessary to correctly view the stereo effect):

>><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

>>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think.
>>Give me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we
>>looking at a small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a
>>big thing flying over a field?

>Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing
>them. This came out during a UK ITV show aired in May 1968.
>Yet I have never seen any other mention of this, either by
>believers in the photos or by skeptics. If British TV can
>discover this titbit of info, why couldn't knowledgeable UFO
>investigators?

Chris,

While you are on the subject of British TV, can you offer any
knowledge about the producers of this documentary [See URL
below]. Perhaps Mantour Productions-but I doubt it. The URL was
posted by Greg Boone. Maybe you have seen this documentary
yourself? It sounds like Roger Moore's voice doing the voice
over.

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=Z3CdTdrKfGY&search=flying%20saucer>

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

From: Tom Horn <tomhorn.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 09:23:42 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:21:57 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Source: Raiders News Update - Salem, Oregon, USA

>><http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

>>Monday, May 22, 2006

>>RNU Exclusive

>>Col. Jesse Marcel Jr., On & Off The Record

>>By Thomas Horn

>>Senior RNU News Reporter

><snip>

>>The mysterious government insider continued talking for a while
>>and then asked Marcel if he knew where the material recovered
>>from the Roswell ranch was being kept. Jess found the question
>>curious and said, "No. Don't you?" "X"'s answer was as curious
>>as the question, so Marcel responded with a inquiry of his own:

>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>truth).

Just for the record, Jesse did not give the person he met at the
Capital building the name Mr. "X", I did, because I needed
something to refer to besides redundantly saying "the source".

Secondly, Stanton Friedman verified to me that not only did this
meeting happen but that Stanton met similarly.

Tom Horn

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:48:54 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:24:02 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Kaeser

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

<snip>

>TRUFOS? Now here's a messed-up word if there ever was one - one
>which I'm sure will catch on and get used rather than getting
>lost like it should. A perfect word for the saucer cultists!
>Let's not go here again, but UFO simply stands for unidentified
>flying object so anything in the air that's not unidentified is
>a true UFO, whether mundane or anomalous. But I'm sure you mean
>it to identify the spaceships that you're convinced are coming
>here - which would make it a perfect word for all ufology if
>you could state with certainty it has been proven some UFOs are
>extraterrestrial spacecraft.

>Bottom line: all of your conclusions (in your entire post)
>are premature! Some, if not most, of your conclusions are
>extremely premature and even sound paranoid!

The term "trufos" was created by Bruce Macabee a few years ago to distinguish between sightings that have fairly simple prozaic explanations and those that appear to behave in a very unusual and "not easily explainable" fashion. Obviously this second group is thought to be only a small percentage of sightings, but it makes sense to have some way of defining poor sightings from good ones.

Communication relies on everyone understanding the terminology used, and you can either accept this term or not. But this really has nothing to do with identifying the object as an alien craft, but only that it behaved in an unexplainable manner. You've equated this to a "true believer" term, and that's really short sighted, IMO.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:41:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:27:11 -0400
Subject: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

Listfolk:

As one who's read much of it, I have found - and I'm hardly alone, of course - that much, maybe even most, academic writing on the UFO phenomenon and attendant controversies is mediocre at best, awful at worst. We are also all too aware, moreover, of the dreary pelicanist argument that "UFOs are folklore", as if that were not merely an observation of a partial truth but a sort of comprehensive explanation.

Thus, I am pleased to draw your attention to an excellent paper in the current (119: 184-202, Spring 2006) issue of the venerable Journal of American Folklore: William J. Dewan's 'A Saucerful of Secrets': An Interdisciplinary Analysis of UFO Experiences.

Dewan, previously unknown to me, has clearly done his homework, and he writes from an informed, insightful perspective. He is influenced, as he acknowledges early on, by his colleague David Hufford, whom I've often mentioned on this List (he's arguably the most important thinker on anomalies since Fort) more than once. He correctly summarizes Hufford's argument:

"Hufford states that most academic theories have assumed that folk beliefs - especially beliefs concerning the supernatural [academese for anomalies] - are false or unfounded, 'nonrational,' and 'non-empirical.' Hufford's experience-centered approach directly contradicts this assumption by proposing that much folk belief about the supernatural is actually reasonable and rationally developed from experience. In other words, he argues against the assumption that all spiritual belief relies entirely on faith."

Consequently, Dewan supports the view that "UFO encounters are often based on real, sometimes bizarre experiences that both inform and are formed by existing cultural traditions and mental schemas." Like Hufford, he argues for an "experience-centered approach" which listens to and takes witness testimony seriously, then tracks its fallout in culture and society as well as in personal interpretation as experiencers struggle to understand what they have seen or undergone and to put it into a framework that makes sense to them.

This is, in short, anything but the usual reductionist, disbelief- tradition approach. Dewan points out that UFO experiences, cross-cultural, reasonably stable phenomena in themselves, have both deeply anomalous and purely social aspects, and sometimes elements of both as personal experience and broader culture interact, and that all are equally worthy of study. The assertion is so eminently sensible that it's a wonder how few academic inquirers seem to have gotten to it over decades of otherwise empty bloviation on the UFO question.

One hopes that Dewan will expand his inquiries into a full-length book. In the meantime, we have this fine scholarly contribution to ufology's ongoing conversation.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:30:49 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:30:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Hall

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 15:02:20 -0300
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 17:16:51 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

<snip>

>>>Which reminds me Dick, that I have long been meaning to thank
>>>you for your dismissal of the Braxton County Monster book
>>>without having read it.

>>And where did you get that quite false opinion and what gives
>>you the right to engage in slanderous insinuation of that sort?
>>I damn well did read the book, and it is outrageous for you to
>>suggest otherwise. Especially so since you obviously did not
>>read it before writing a laudatory introduction or foreword. In
>>fact, you later admitted that you were not aware of some of the
>>content. The book is full of outright falsehoods, errors, and
>>wild speculation. You may defend that tripe to your heart's
>>content, but you are dead wrong to do so.

<snip>

>>For just on example out of many dozens, the author has jet
>>interceptors taking off from Keesler AFB, Miss., to chase a UFO.
>>Well, my friend, Keesler is a training base, not a fighter-
>>interceptor base. I know; I was stationed there and I also
>>currently know the Keesler AFB historian with whom I have
>>collaborated on a [non-UFO] book. The author's history of Air
>>Force bases, fighters, etc., is pure fiction.

<snip>

>Dick you made derogatory comments on UFO UpDates about the
>Feschino book well before you had read it. Check the files "Send
>me a copy and I'll read it" you said... just as your comments
>about the MOD report were made with your having, at most, read
>the summary.

Check a little further and you will see that I based my
derogatory comments on the book description given by the
publisher on its web site, and said so. The descrption included
damning quotes and comments. Did you ever read what was on the
web site? Later when I read the book it turned out to be even
worse than portrayed by the publisher, outright science fiction
fantasy!

>Over the past 3 weeks I have done more than 10 hours of radio
>programs. These reach a great many people. Often I was asked
>about the MOD Report. Fortunately I had Isaac Koi's and Martin
>Shough's comments as well as several newspaper articles. These
>reach far more people than my lectures.

I'll take your word for it. But popular audiences are not my

measure of progress. Get a critique in a major newspaper or magazine or in a science journal (you and I bnoth know this is not going to happen) and I will give you, or Martin, or Bruce 100 points. Preaching to the choir and to pop audenices, 5 points.

<snip>

>As was noted in detail on the radio program with Errol a few >weeks back (did you hear it?)

No.

>it turned out that the publisher >of the book made more than 100 changes in what he was supposed >to publish. I saw the draft. My publisher had done no such >things. [Not sure what this means.] We regretted the failure to >stick to what was supposed to be published. That will be changed.

>I think you need a bigger gray basket.

>Stan Friedman

Is this then, finally, an admission that the book contains outrageous wild-eyed highly speculative and counter-to-fact information?

Why, knowing this as you apparently did, would you then promote the book at every opportunity without criticizing it one bit, at least that I have ever seen? When I criticized the book, you attacked me. Now you appear to be saying that I was right after all, except you don't elaborate on the 100 changes you say that the publisher made implicitly without the knowledge or approval of the author.

You can't have it both ways, Stan. The book that was published is science fiction fantasy and not deserving of approval or support, which you gave it.

Also, your gray basket runneth over with crap if you are suggesting that the book in its present belongs in one of those. To me, just about the entire UFO subject belongs in a gray basket.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 00:36:36 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:33:41 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>I thought I'd share this with the List.

>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine. I
>recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in 1965 of
>his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of them. You
>can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are necessary to
>correctly view the stereo effect):

><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

>A very nice study was done on the photos by Druffel, Wood, and
>Kelson a few years back, and I thank them for their nice, big,
>easy-to-see scans.

<snip>

If this has never been done before, you should be complimented for trying... it is still very useful... and should be attempted with images as a routine. Whenever, I take photos of scenery, I always take two images slightly apart, so that when I show someone, I can recreate the grandeur (Great at the Grand Canyon). There is also a simple technique that can be used, so that no stereoglasses are required. I may be able to describe how to do that if anyone is interested.

Because the Object changes attitude so drastically from one image to the next, the brain can't latch onto it and perceive it as a unitary single object (I see that you tried to get them at the same location so that they overlap). But, try blinking your eyes back-n-forth while wearing your glasses and you can see the sequence of movement of the object and the change in position the shooter took as the image of the side of the car in that very same image also shifts. Also, the relative size of the mirror changes too... which (seemingly?) lends credence to that person's shift in response to the change of the object being photographed. I'm not sure which image is first in the sequence or whether the size of each image has been adjusted somewhat... if so, please let us know before we settle on what is actually taking place and in what order.

By the way, if you switch, the order of the images, this will also affect how the object/car is perceived because it switches the foreground with the background. In other words, that which should be in front is pushed back and that which should be in back is pushed forward, creating an inverted perception. Why does this happen? Because, the right eye looks at an object at a distance from the from slightly the right side and the left eye sees things slightly from the left side, if you switch that order the perception is opposite to how it was actually seen and/or photographed.

Also, if the degree of parallax is greater in the photograph than what the human eyes could normally perceive (greater than with the limited distance we have between our eyes), then the

object could be perceived as though it was a flat cutout being suspended in front of a flat skyline so we have to be cautious sometimes in how we interpret stereographs which can exaggerate normal human perception.

Also, since both the driver and the Object shift at the same time, it may be difficult to do measurements since both things conflict to an uncertain degree in providing a single solution from a common reference angle. Though, it may be possible to counter that with an actual experimental setup which tries to recreate the predicament.

It's also possible to calculate distance in a photograph using other techniques that take into account how an object changes shade from, let's say, pure black. Let's take a pure black sheet of paper and start moving it farther and farther away from you. As it moves farther away, it will pick up scattering of light from different parts of the lens/atmosphere so that it will begin to turn lighter the farther it gets away from you. Thus, an estimate of distance can be achieved in proportion to how much whiter its becoming (much detail left out, but I think we all got the idea). Artists use this technique to create the appearance of distance and depth.

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:43:39 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:56:58 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 21:30:19 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine. I
>>recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in 1965 of
>>his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of them. You
>>can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are necessary to
>>correctly view the stereo effect):

>><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

<snip>

>>I was hoping that the image would show a nice, big saucer,
>>hovering somewhere a few hundred yards away from the truck.

>>Unfortunately, it seems to show a much smaller object, maybe a
>>few inches across, hanging a few feet from the top of the truck.

>>As I mentioned in another forum, I suppose it's possible that
>>the saucer could have moved in a precise lateral motion between
>>the time the first photo was taken and the second photo. But the
>>top part of the saucer appears to be the same size, which allows
>>you to line it up distance-wise, even though it's tilted at a
>>different angle. And for the saucer to have only tilted and
>>moved exactly laterally with respect to the camera, no higher or
>>lower, and no closer or farther away, would have been extremely
>>unlikely.

>>I know there are some good photo analysts here. Much better than
>>I. I'm only a hobbyist. But I do know that knowing the true size
>>of something in this photo - the mirror mount, for instance, or
>>the 1/2 inch nut on top of the mirror - all the rest of the
>>distances and sizes of anything in the photo can be determined.

>>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think. Give
>>me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we looking at a
>>small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a big thing flying
>>over a field?

>Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing them.
>This came out during a UK ITV show aired in May 1968. Yet I have
>never seen any other mention of this, either by believers in the
>photos or by skeptics. If British TV can discover this titbit of
>info, why couldn't knowledgeable UFO investigators? Therefore
>the answers to your questions are, with reasonable certainty: No
>you got it right, and yes it is a small model.

>And his tale of having mysterious visits by NORAD agents is BS,
>pure and simple. See also Condon Report p. 437-455.

>CDA

Such poppycock! Someone said it on TV; wow, that sure proves it! Speaking as the person who supervised the original investigation of the case for NICAP, I believe this to be an outright falsehood. Let the person who made this claim swear a statement about what he bases this "finding" on and how he knows it. Our investigators practically lived with Heflin and checked him out thoroughly, and no model building hobby was found, nor any evidence of fraud.

Also, Mr. Shell or some of the "sophisticated" photoanalysts on the List need to explain how on earth you can prove anything about size from an artificially constructed 3-D photo. That also sounds highly suspect to me.

The original photoanalysts, by the way, included Dr. Robert Nathan of JP (NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory), a pioneer in the use of computerized photoanalysis. He found no evidence of a hoax.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:56:11 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:58:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Hall

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Source: Raiders News Update - Salem, Oregon, USA

>><http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

>>Monday, May 22, 2006

>>RNU Exclusive

>>Col. Jesse Marcel Jr., On & Off The Record
>>By Thomas Horn
>>Senior RNU News Reporter

>>The mysterious government insider continued talking for a while
>>and then asked Marcel if he knew where the material recovered
>>from the Roswell ranch was being kept. Jess found the question
>>curious and said, "No. Don't you?" "X"'s answer was as curious
>>as the question, so Marcel responded with a inquiry of his own:

>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>truth).

Eugene,

I don't think you are being fair to Jesse Marcel, Jr., who is as
straight a guy as you ever want to meet. The fact that he is
writing a book is good news to me; it should be a worthwhile
contribution.

As for the mysterious government insider, "mysterious" no;
"government insider" yes. We know all about him. He is an aide
to a senior Member of Congress who happens to believe in UFOs
(or is a UFO nut as some would categorize him).

Aides like this guy often pretend to be "in the know" about
important government matters. Obviously he was fishing for
information from Marcel and trying to impress him. The reverse
also holds true. One aide who disbelieves in UFOs said that if
they existed, he would know about it. Just like some ufologists,
they tend to have giant egos, and they like to play power games.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:10 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:01:03 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine. I
>recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in 1965 of
>his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of them. You
>can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are necessary to
>correctly view the stereo effect):

><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

<snip>

>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think. Give
>me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we looking at a
>small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a big thing flying
>over a field?

The problem with stereo photography is that pictures from the
"left and right cameras" have to be taken simultaneously unless
one can be positive that the object of interest is stationary.
If it is known to be stationary then one can use a single camera
at two locations separated by several inches or more and get
stereo. Even if you had found a "nice big saucer" many yards
away it would not be proof because you couldn't prove that he
had not faked the parallax by moving the object a small distance
sideways between exposures.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

TRUFOS [was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So]

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:07 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:04:37 -0400
Subject: TRUFOS [was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So]

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>Aliens are piloting the TRUFOS and abducting and exploiting
>>human beings for their own purpose and benefit. We can conclude
>>that the aliens hate humans and should be seen as enemies.

>Oh, we can conclude all this, can we? I strongly doubt we can
>conclude any of it!

>What say ye all?

>TRUFOS? Now here's a messed-up word if there ever was one - one
>which I'm sure will catch on and get used rather than getting
>lost like it should. A perfect word for the saucer cultists!
>Let's not go here again, but UFO simply stands for unidentified
>flying object so anything in the air that's not unidentified is
>a true UFO, whether mundane or anomalous. But I'm sure you mean
>it to identify the spaceships that you're convinced are coming
>here - which would make it a perfect word for all ufology if
>you could state with certainty it has been proven some UFOs are
>extraterrestrial spacecraft.

TRUFO = Truly unexplained or, better yet, truly unexplainable
UFO.

UFO, following Condon is the object/phenomenon not identified by
the witness and perhaps not in an initial investigation by the
analyst.

However, some UFO cases/sightings defy conventional explanation
even after extensive analysis. Some of these cases fail
identification because of a lack of information or evidence.
Following the Battelle Memoria/USAF study published in 1955
(Blue Book Special Report #14), these are called Insufficient
Information cases (II). After rejecting the II cases (I claim
that) there still are unexplainables.

Skeptic/debunkers would deny this. They would argue that all
unexplainable cases are cases of insufficient information.

The really interesting unexplainables are those with lots of
information such as shape, duration, dynamics, etc., which set
the object/phenomenon apart from known stuff.

Observation: one may not be able to determine whether or not a
proposed explanation for such a case is correct. However, one
can decide whether or not a proposed explanation is convincing.

I claim that there are sightings for which all proposed
explanations can be shown to either just plain wrong (e.g.,

proposed explanation physics/dynamics is contradicted by reported physics/dynamics) or, if not provably wrong, then at least the proposed explanations are very unconvincing.

In the "strictest terms" TRUFO does not automatically mean ET. It basically refers to any phenomenon not known to science, whether the phenomenon gives no indication of being a result of intelligence or if it does seem to be of intelligent origin;

But, obviously, here is where the bone of contention lies.... where the "rubber meets the road"... intelligence.

From the point of view of conventional science it is "OK" to propose that there is a new phenomenon that is unintelligent. This is the core of the Condign report which suggests that all unexplainable UFO sightings... and the writer(s) does say there are such sightings and takes them seriously... are some new form of plasma. And the conventional scientific community has a big ho-hum response. It's OK to suggest a flaky explanation as long as it is an unintelligent phenomenon that is being suggested.

But... if the writer had proposed Other Intelligence (e.g., ET) as a solution... he would really have his gonads in the meat grinder. Counter explanations would be coming out of the academic woodwork as numerous scientists would propose their own "better" explanations.

(He probably wouldn't have been allowed to write the report.)
(Note in passing: like Klass before him (or them) in Klass' first book, the Condign writer(s) accepts the idea that some sightings are TRUFOS (!)).

So:

TRUFO = phenomenon/object unexplained after extensive investigation: the sighting details contradict all proposed explanations and it appears that further research will not turn up an explanation in terms of conventional phenomena.

SOME TRUFO reports also contain details of description (shape, dynamics, duration, etc.) which suggest they result from intelligence and not simply "dumb phenomena." This subclass of TRUFOS could be evidence of ET or any other form of Other Intelligence (OI)

Perhaps I should invent yet another term to be even more explicit to differentiate it from "dumb phenomena": TRUFO/OI

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

UFO Abductions And John Mack

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 22:44:46 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:08:17 -0400
Subject: UFO Abductions And John Mack

I commend to the attention of everyone on this List who has an interest in UFO abduction reports the recent article by Budd Hopkins titled John Mack, UFO Abductions And Transformative Experiences. The article appears in Intruders Foundation Special Report No. 8, February 2006. He has captured my outlook perfectly and expressed it much more eloquently than I have been able to do.

In the process Budd, for whom I have great respect, is fairer to John Mack than I could be, presenting a much softer view of Mack's anti-Western science, pro New Age biases, while quite properly focusing on Mack's human qualities and the warm relationship he had with Mack.

As I have said before, Budd (the artist) has acted much more scientifically than many or most scientists when it comes to application of scientific method to UFOs. His comparison and contrast of his own background and intellectual outlook with that of Mack is extremely interesting. Hopefully someone will be able to post the article on UFO Updates. - Dick Hall

See:

www.IntrudersFoundation.org

IFCentral.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 16:32:07 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:12:56 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>Aliens are piloting the TRUFOS and abducting and exploiting
>>human beings for their own purpose and benefit. We can conclude
>>that the aliens hate humans and should be seen as enemies.

>Oh, we can conclude all this, can we? I strongly doubt we can
>conclude any of it!

Eugene: I'm not sure I understand what standards you use for
conclusions. Would you please explain those?

>>If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and
>>exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it.
>>What say ye all?

>What say ye all?

>TRUFOS? Now here's a messed-up word if there ever was one - one
>which I'm sure will catch on and get used rather than getting
>lost like it should. A perfect word for the saucer cultists!
>Let's not go here again, but UFO simply stands for unidentified
>flying object so anything in the air that's not unidentified is
>a true UFO, whether mundane or anomalous. But I'm sure you mean
>it to identify the spaceships that you're convinced are coming
>here - which would make it a perfect word for all ufology if
>you could state with certainty it has been proven some UFOs are
>extraterrestrial spacecraft.

>Bottom line: all of your conclusions (in your entire post) are
>premature! Some, if not most, of your conclusions are
>extremely premature and even sound paranoid!

Thanks for taking the time to respond Eugene. Please let me know
what standards you use for making conclusions. I'd then be able
to respond with more thought to your 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 16:46:53 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:15:10 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 17:06:07 -0400
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>But if an appropriate program can be developed, it should be.

>Scientists willing to help develop such a countermeasure program
>would do well to listen to, and possibly study, the ongoing
>advanced technology torture programs being experienced by
>hundreds of sane people, instead of labelling us as "tin foil
>beanie types" fit only for jokes.

>We can offer constant access to technology effects which are on
>a par with the abductors' equipment, hence a chance to attempt
>countermeasures against frequent or continuous use of abductor-
>class technology, as opposed to only being able to work during
>the relatively rare and short abductions.

>>If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and
>>exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it.
>>What say ye all?

>I say Bravo!

Thanks for your support Eleanor! I'm impressed with the serious research I've reviewed, including those by many who post to this List. Their conclusions seem sound to me.

I think most of them, those well-supported deductions from thoroughly vetted people, are worth taking seriously. I believe these inferences should be acted on for the benefit of humanity.

I'm not sure of the level of tacit involvement or even collusion on the part of our governments. But I have faith in grassroots movements of the ordinary, 'common people'.

[[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: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Celestial Secrets Reveals Fatima Cover-Up

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:19:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:19:29 -0400
Subject: Celestial Secrets Reveals Fatima Cover-Up

For Immediate Release

May 23, 2006

New Book Celestial Secrets Reveals Fatima Cover-Up

Authors say Jesuits Conspired to Conceal Alien Contact at Fatima in 1917

VICTORIA, BC =96 A new book by the world=92s leading historians of the Fatima incident reveals how the Jesuits conspired to conceal the alien origin of the famed apparitions.

The Fatima incident was the most exceptional religious event of the 20th century. In 1917, three Portuguese children encountered a radiant woman, who told them three secrets about the fate of the Earth. During =93The Miracle of the Sun,=94 the solar orb was seen to dance in the sky by thousands of awestruck onlookers who flocked to Fatima.

The apparitions were presumed to be a case of divine intervention in human affairs, a sign from Heaven that the world war then raging in Europe would soon come to an end.

Fatima entered both church dogma and popular culture as the most celebrated Marian apparition of all time. A shrine sprang up at Fatima that drew millions of believers, and a widespread myth developed that the prophecies of Fatima would one day be fulfilled.

In 1978, Portuguese historians Joaquim Fernandes and Fina d=92Armada were given unprecedented access to the original records of the Fatima incident, which had been held secretly by the Catholic Church at the Sanctuary of Fatima since 1917.

In Heavenly Lights =96 a work published last year that the Fortean Times (UK) hailed as =93priceless=94 =96 Fernandes and d=92Armada explored the many intriguing links they found in the archives between the apparitions of Fatima and the worldwide UFO phenomenon.

In July, Fernandes and d=92Armada publish their powerful new book about the enigmatic Fatima incident, which has been debated by believers and skeptics since its occurrence.

Celestial Secrets: The Hidden History of the Fatima Cover-Up (EcceNova Editions; July 1, 2006; \$19.95) tells the fascinating tale of how a cosmic =93cover story=94 concocted by the Jesuits in 1941 has shaped our modern view of the events at Fatima in 1917.

The historians show that the Fatima incident did not involve visitations by the Virgin Mary, as the Jesuits purported. Rather, Fatima was the first major close encounter case of the 20th century. The entities encountered by the children were not deities descending from Heaven but alien beings visiting our planet from =93elsewhere=94 in the vast Cosmos.

Investigative journalist Jim Marrs was so impressed by this exposé of the Fatima cover-up that he wrote a Foreword to it in which he states that Celestial Secrets is the best researched, the most detailed, and the most comprehensive look at the Fatima apparitions ever published. Fatima, it seems, was an early episode in the Cosmic Watergate.

About the Authors

Joaquim Fernandes is Professor of History at the University Fernando Pessoa in Porto, Portugal. He directs the Multicultural Apparitions Research International Academic Network (Project MARIAN). His research interests include the history of science and the comparative anthropology of religion, with an emphasis on anomalistic phenomena.

Fina Armada holds a Master's degree in Women's Studies. She has written five books about the Fatima incident, all based on original documents held in the archives. She has also co-authored three books with Fernandes and hundreds of articles. Her research interests include phenomenology, local history, the history of women, and the era of Portuguese discovery.

About the Book

Celestial Secrets: The Hidden History of the Fatima Cover-Up
By Dr. Joaquim Fernandes and Fina Armada

Translated by Alexandra Bruce
Edited by Andrew D. Basiago
Foreword by Jim Marrs

EcceNova Editions
Publication Date: July 1, 2006
Price: US \$19.95, CAD \$24.95, £11.99
Pages: 276

ISBN: 0-9735341-8-4 (978-0-9735341-8-4)

For Publisher's Summary, Author Information, Jacket Photo, Excerpt, and Contact Details visit:

www.eccenova.com

and follow the link to the Media Kit.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So -

From: Carol Buckallew <clbuckallew.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 19:21:48 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:24:47 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So -

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>Aliens are piloting the TRUFOS and abducting and exploiting
>>human beings for their own purpose and benefit. We can conclude
>>that the aliens hate humans and should be seen as enemies.

>Oh, we can conclude all this, can we? I strongly doubt we can
>conclude any of it!

<snip>

>Bottom line: all of your conclusions (in your entire post)
>are premature! Some, if not most, of your conclusions are
>extremely premature and even sound paranoid!

I strongly doubt you can conclude anything not having
had any of these things happen to you, setting in your
arm chair deciding what is or isn't true. What people see
and experience and who's doing what is what's true, you
ought to try it sometime then see what you have to say,
maybe it will be your turn next.

Carol

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

George Fawcett's New Book

From: **George Fawcett** <fawcett28092.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 21:23:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:30:11 -0400
Subject: George Fawcett's New Book

New 2005 UFO Book

A Special revised & enlarged book by George D. Fawcett,
veteran UFO investigator and researcher for 62 years (1944-2006)

Highly Illustrated Book Covering Two Special Studies:

Human reactions to UFOs & ufonauts (their occupants)

and

what we have learned from UFO repetitions
(How UFOs affect machines, soil samples, animals, humans,
plants, tracking instruments, etc.)

This unique book also includes "Highly Recommended Lists of UFO
Organizations and Publications"

UFO Repetitions - A Challenge to Scientific Investigations (25
Things that Happen with UFOs and Their Occupants Each Year on a
Global Basis)

Cost: \$10.00 plus \$2.00 postage & handling (per copy)
Autographed as requested

Order from:

George D. Fawcett
602 Battleground Road,
Lincolnton,
North Carolina 28092
704-735-5725

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

The National 2006 UFO Conference Sydney Oz

From: Diane Harrison <aufor.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:30:53 +1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:33:23 -0400
Subject: The National 2006 UFO Conference Sydney Oz

Hi Everyone,

A pictorial view of the National 2006 UFO Conference hosted by UFO South Western Sydney of the UFOlogist Magazine Awards & the Australia UFO Research Network awards courtesy of the Editor UFOlogist Magazine Robert Frola.

<http://www.ufologistmagazine.com>

A trip to the Blue Mountains with Jamie.

<http://www.aufor.com/2006NationalConference.html>

We all had a great time! We are now looking forward to next year's 2nd International Scientific & Metaphysical Symposium being hosted by AUFORN & UFOESA on the 2nd & 3rd June 2007 we hope to see you there.

<http://www.aufor.com/sydneyconference2007.html>

Warmest Regards

Diane Harrison/Frola

The Australian UFO Research Network
<http://www.aufor.com>

UFOlogist Magazine
<http://www.ufologistmagazine.com>

Coming Conference 2007
The 2nd International Scientific &
Metaphysical Symposium
<http://www.aufor.com/sydneyconference2007.html>

P.O Box 738
Jimboomba, 4280
Australia.

Tel/Fax 07 55487205

Report a UFO Free Call Hotline
1800 77 22 88

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Shurinov Slams Mantle & Stonehill Book

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:39:24 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:39:24 -0400
Subject: Shurinov Slams Mantle & Stonehill Book

Shurinov Slams Mantle & Stonehill Book

<http://boris-shurinov.info/ufst-sufol/sufol.htm>

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Secrecy News -- 05/24/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 10:49:59 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 14:52:26 -0400
Subject: Re: Secrecy News -- 05/24/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 61
May 24, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** NEW FISA COURT JUDGE APPOINTED
** HOUSE INTEL COMMITTEE TO HOLD HEARING ON LEAKS
** CANADA VIEWS TERRORIST THREAT TO TRANSPORTATION

NEW FISA COURT JUDGE APPOINTED

District Judge Roger Vinson of the Northern District of Florida this month became the newest member of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court.

Judge Vinson was named by the Chief Justice of the United States to a seven year term on the FISA Court, effective May 4. He replaces Judge Michael J. Davis, whose term on the Court expired this month.

The FISA Court, established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, provides judicial authorization for electronic surveillance and physical searches that are conducted within the United States for foreign intelligence and counterterrorism purposes.

Judge Vinson's appointment has not been previously reported, but it was confirmed for Secrecy News yesterday by Shelly Snook, media liaison and assistant to the chief judge of the D.C. District Court.

The current membership of the eleven-member FISA Court and of the three-member FIS Court of Review is available on the Federation of American Scientists web site here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/doj/fisa/court2006.html>

HOUSE INTEL COMMITTEE TO HOLD HEARING ON LEAKS

The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence announced that it will hold a hearing on Friday May 26 on "the Media's Role and Responsibilities in Leaks of Classified Information."

There is no legislation on leaks currently before the Committee, and there are no governmental witnesses testifying at the hearing. See:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/05/hpsci052306.pdf>

In an invited statement for the record, I attempted to put the issue into a larger context and to illustrate the fact that some

leaks serve a constructive purpose.

"I believe it is an error to focus on unauthorized disclosures as if they were an isolated phenomenon, without consideration of the corrupted state of the classification system and the difficulties faced by whistleblowers who seek to comply with official procedures," I wrote.

"From my own perspective, it seems likely that the benefits of leaks in preserving constitutional values greatly outweigh their risks to national security." See:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_hr/052606aftergood.pdf

The suggestion by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales last weekend that the government might prosecute reporters who publish classified information was critiqued by Jacob Sullum of Reason Magazine in "When Speech Is Outlawed, Only Outlaws Speak," May 24:

<http://www.reason.com/sullum/052406.shtml>

House Intelligence Committee chairman Rep. Pete Hoekstra has been an outspoken critic of classified leaks.

"Each year, countless unauthorized leaks cause severe damage to our intelligence activities and expose our capabilities," he said in a speech last year.

"The fact of the matter is, some of the worst damage done to our intelligence community has come not from penetration by spies, but from unauthorized leaks by those with access to classified information."

CANADA VIEWS TERRORIST THREAT TO TRANSPORTATION

"On 12 November 2002, Osama Binladen issued a public statement which specifically targeted Canada for the first time for its collaboration with the United States in attempting to dismantle Al Qaida," a 2002 Canadian intelligence report noted.

With that statement in mind, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) conducted classified studies on the terrorist threat to Canadian transportation systems. Two of those classified studies have now been declassified and released in redacted form.

The declassified studies were obtained under Canada's Access to Information Act by former Canadian intelligence officer and author Stephane Lefebvre, who provided copies to Secrecy News.

At least some of the many redactions seem silly, for example: "Surface transportation presents a [adjective deleted] degree of vulnerability to terrorist attacks," one study begins. The missing word is probably not "low" or "negligible."

See "International and National Terrorist Threats to Surface Transportation," CSIS Study #2002-3/26 (redacted) (3 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/world/canada/csis/transport.pdf>

and "The International Terrorist Threat to Maritime Transportation," CSIS Study #2003-4/02 (redacted) (2.7 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/world/canada/csis/maritime.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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sqp/index.html
email: saftergood@fas.org
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:13:05 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 14:53:59 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:48:54 -0400
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>TRUFOS? Now here's a messed-up word if there ever was one - one
>>which I'm sure will catch on and get used rather than getting
>>lost like it should. A perfect word for the saucer cultists!
>>Let's not go here again, but UFO simply stands for unidentified
>>flying object so anything in the air that's not unidentified is
>>a true UFO, whether mundane or anomalous. But I'm sure you mean
>>it to identify the spaceships that you're convinced are coming
>>here - which would make it a perfect word for all ufology if
>>you could state with certainty it has been proven some UFOs are
>>extraterrestrial spacecraft.

>Communication relies on everyone understanding the terminology
>used, and you can either accept this term or not. But this
>really has nothing to do with identifying the object as an alien
>craft, but only that it behaved in an unexplainable manner.
>You've equated this to a "true believer" term, and that's really
>short sighted, IMO.

First, to make sure nobody is confused about my previous post,
there was a typo in it that I should point out - although most
people probably caught it and understood what I meant anyway.
Where I wrote "so anything in the air that's not unidentified is
a true UFO" should have been written either "that's
unidentified" or "that's not identified" instead of being
doubled up on like it was.

Yes, I'm familiar with how the term 'TRUFO' came to be.

I don't like the word simply because it's inaccurate. And
unnecessary! A UFO is something which is unidentified. If it's
explainable then it's an IFO. If it remains unexplainable then
it's a UFO. You don't need a word like TRUFO. An anomalous
(behaving in an unexplainable manner) flying object is covered
by the term UFO. It's either a UFO or it's not. It's either a
UFO or an IFO. TRUFO is not necessary and represents overkill.
You don't need to add the 'TR' to 'UFO' to cover the core of
truly unexplainable and anomalous objects. They're UFOs! You
don't need multiple terms here to explain a single thing (that
core of anomalous objects). The term 'UFO' already does the job
fine!

It's not even necessary (or proper) to use the term 'TRUFO' to
separate UFOs into strangely behaving ones and ones which remain
unidentified but don't do much of anything strange. Do all
manifestations produced by the phenomenon have to act in strange
ways? Can the phenomenon not produce a nocturnal light, or
formation of lights, that just moves through the sky without
doing falling-leaf descents or high-speed right angle turns? Who
are we to say it can't or doesn't?

If you want to refine the 'core group' (unidentifieds/anomalies) further, such as into various groups like objects that apparently are structured craft controlled by intelligence that doesn't seem to be human (vehicles with non-human pilots), then 'UFO' is not restrictive enough and another term is required - but then you are getting into the "true believer" territory. Simply because, despite what many believe, we haven't yet determined the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon. To say that only certain categories of UFOs - like apparently structured craft piloted by non-human pilots, or only strangely behaving flying things in the sky - are 'true UFOs' or represent the true UFO phenomenon (when we don't really know what the UFO phenomenon is) is premature and a presumptuous way to proceed.

I know witnesses who experienced an intense flash of light right in front of them while walking through an empty field in the dark. There were no entities or strangely behaving flying things, in fact there were no flying things or other manifestations at all. Just the intense flash of light. Can you say this anomaly wasn't part of the UFO phenomenon, that is, whatever is behind UFOs? What about beams of light coming down from the sky but with no craft visible? Strange non-human entities sighted but no UFOs around? Vivid dreams of UFOs/aliens that include impossible elements (nazi uniforms) but with other supportive evidence? Bigfoot with UFOs? Bigfoot without UFOs? Where do you draw the line and say the phenomenon behind UFOs isn't active here?

Until we know for sure what the UFO phenomenon is - and we have to include all the phenomenon throws at us, not just the 'spaceship variety' and the 'strangely behaving flying thing variety' - then the term 'UFO' is adequate enough and to break it down any further at this point is improper. Those that already have their minds made up that we are being visited in souped-up nuts and bolts spaceships either won't see or agree with my position on this. For this group, TRUFO is a more restrictive term that fits and describes the category they have prematurely concluded exists as nuts and bolts alien spacecraft, and they are true believers in this category. But this applies, in a slightly more general sense, to anyone who attempts to limit 'true UFOs' to any narrow group of manifestations.

Personally, I think the spectrum of true 'UFO manifestation' covers far more than apparent nuts and bolts spacecraft and strange flying things in the sky (and I'll proceed based on this until I'm sure it doesn't), so I don't use a more restrictive term. The term 'UFO' is completely adequate. At this point, the terms 'IFO' and 'UFO' suffice! When, and only when, we really know what a 'true UFO' is, then let's start limiting - then let's start calling things 'true UFOs' and using terms like 'TRUFO.'

IFO and UFO. Don't need any more terms right now!

I agree with you, however, that to proceed we need mutually accepted and understood terms or we can't communicate. That's a given! I don't believe - for the reasons stated above - that the term 'TRUFOS' should be in our vocabulary, at least at this stage of the game. If we are looking simply for a word to distinguish the misidentifieds (mundanes overlooked and still labelled UFOs) from the ones that aren't mundane (and I think this is your point) then - again for the reasons stated above - the term 'TRUFO' is not the one for the job.

There may come a time (I strongly doubt it) when we've determined that the only manifestations caused by the UFO phenomenon are flying objects - things that 'fly' and are 'objects' - and then we can start referring to 'true unidentified flying objects' and use the term 'TRUFO.'

For now, I don't know what would be the best term to represent the core of anomalies. I use 'AAE' (Alleged Anomalous Event) or 'AAO' (Alleged Anomalous Object) - shortening them to 'AEs' or 'AOs' in conversation. (I don't assume, restrict, or accept anything on face value, just gather/collate data.)

Works for me!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: UFO Abductions And John Mack - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:17:28 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 14:55:39 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Abductions And John Mack - Friedman

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 22:44:46 +0000
>Subject: UFO Abductions And John Mack

>I commend to the attention of everyone on this List who has an
>interest in UFO abduction reports the recent article by Budd
>Hopkins titled John Mack, UFO Abductions And Transformative
>Experiences. The article appears in Intruders Foundation Special
>Report No. 8, February 2006. He has captured my outlook
>perfectly and expressed it much more eloquently than I have been
>able to do.

>In the process Budd, for whom I have great respect, is fairer
>to John Mack than I could be, presenting a much softer view of
>Mack's anti-Western science, pro New Age biases, while quite
>properly focusing on Mack's human qualities and the warm
>relationship he had with Mack.

>As I have said before, Budd (the artist) has acted much more
>scientifically than many or most scientists when it comes to
>application of scientific method to UFOs. His comparison and
>contrast of his own background and intellectual outlook with
>that of Mack is extremely interesting. Hopefully someone will be
>able to post the article on UFO Updates. - Dick Hall

>See:

>www.IntrudersFoundation.org

>IFCentral.nul

I fully agree with Dick's comments. Budd's article about John
was excellent and on target.

I shared some stages with John and found that he had basically
started from the assumption that one couldn't get here from
there so there had to be other explanations.

Budd has often been more scientific than many so-called
scientists.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 14:57:30 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 00:36:36 EDT
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Also, the relative size of the
>mirror changes too... which (seemingly?) lends credence to that
>person's shift in response to the change of the object being
>photographed. I'm not sure which image is first in the sequence
>or whether the size of each image has been adjusted somewhat...
>if so, please let us know before we settle on what is actually
>taking place and in what order.

There may be no certain way to know the order of the Heflin photos since the original polaroids are lost, but I believe the order recalled by the witness was as given in the Condon report (plates 42-44 - profile through left part of front windshield in shot #1, oblique underside view through right side window in shot #2, profile view through right side window in shot #3) and as described by Hartmann from interviews with Heflin in 1967, 2 years after the event.

I have a few observations to make, based on the copies I have. These need to be checked on a good set of complete full-frame images with known consistent scaling. If possible.

The above picture order suggests the camera shifting back or to the right as the witness leans closer to the side window between #2 and #3. The camera has clearly moved slightly towards the mirror. The angular size of the mirror increases, the parallax of the mirror and its mounting changes, more of the bush and horizon is revealed behind the mirror and the reflection shifts to show an area of the truck side closer to the cab. This is consistent with the UFO ("UAP"!?) having turned back on itself, changing heading from about SE (between #1 and #2) to NE between #2 and #3, and Heflin leaning to his right to keep the object in view as it drifted to his left towards the post of the windshield.

This is the course indicated in Hartmann's Fig.9. But it is arguably not quite as suggested in Heflin's Sept 1965 written NICAP statement, where he said that the object began to move off NE after #1 and before #2. On the other hand this would be even less consistent with reversing the order of #2 and #3 and could easily be just a question of interpretation.

The interesting thing whatever the order of #2 and #3 is the change of camera position and resulting parallax. The image shifts (I estimate this roughly from halftone images of the prints assuming constant scaling and based on Hartmann's statement of 2.4 degrees subtense for the UFO in #1) about 5.5 - 6.0 degrees left in relation to the landscape background from #2 to #3. This is the same direction in which the mirror shifts, by about 4.0 - 4.5 degrees. A stationary model at any distance

greater than the mirror would shift against the landscape by less than the mirror. So it can't be stationary and at a distance.

The UFO shifts more than the mirror, so what about the possibility of a model closer than the mirror? The image appears about the same distance below the top edge of the window in both photographs, suggesting a model hung from the edge of the cab roof. Because the camera is closer to the window and to the model in #3 the angular distance from a suspended model to the windshield post on the left should increase between #2 and #3, which it does - by about 9%. This probably underestimates the hypothetical change in the distance from lens to model because of the perspective: That is, the vanishing-point angle made by the line of the cab roof and the line of horizon scrub increases between #2 and #3, i.e. the downward slope of the roof line measured from the scrub line is steeper in #3 because of the change in perspective, so the distance from model to window post is foreshortened very slightly in #3, tending to reduce the separation on the photo. So allowing for this we should assume that a model suspended from the top of the window is some 10% nearer to the lens in #3 than in #2 and should subtend an angle some 10% larger. It is far from clear that this is the case. I would estimate rather a possible 4% reduction in angular size between #2 and #3.

Another interesting point that has been raised is a possible anomaly of the apparent cloudy conditions in #4, the smoke ring photo (shades of Trindade?!).

The likely weather conditions at the time seem to have been: Early overcast probably dissipated leaving visibility reduced by "smoke and haze" with "scattered cloud" a few miles to the west. Heflin said there was "haze overhead". On Hartmann's visit he observed that "heavy smog" in the area gave conditions resembling those in the photos. Photo #4 appears to have been taken looking roughly NW at a modest angle of elevation, so scattered cloud nearer the coast could conceivably have provided some sky detail whereas the other photos were taken variously N and SE. But if this is not plausible then there is another factor:

The camera used had a fully automatic exposure meter. Note that the FOV from the truck in #1, #2 and #3 includes areas of shadowed interior and dark scrubland, whereas #4 was taken outside with the camera pointed at the open sky. Without knowing the exact type of meter, I would expect that the cab shots would probably auto expose for the average light value over the whole FOV, a value far below the sky value, thus washing out faint detail in the bright sky areas; whereas #4 would be exposed for the true sky brightness (i.e. stopped down or with a faster shutter speed) possibly preserving subtle sky detail lost on the other photos.

Note that Heflin's supervisor who was mobile a mile or two away testified to hearing the unusual type of radio interruption described by Heflin at the time of the event. There were some inconsistencies and possible embroideries in Heflin's later stories about mystery visitors etc, but I think this case is still an interesting one.

As mentioned these arguments are made based on fairly poor images and need to be checked if possible.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Tim Shell** <tshell.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:53:32 -0500 (CDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 14:59:13 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:10 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Even if you had found a "nice big saucer" many yards
>away it would not be proof because you couldn't prove that he
>had not faked the parallax by moving the object a small distance
>sideways between exposures.

Completely true. But just think of what that would involve.
According to the way Heflin describes the sequence in which he
took the photo, the saucer was first photographed as it hovered
above the left side of the road in front of the truck. It then
moved perpendicular to the road and into the field on the right
side of the truck. The next two photos (the ones I constructed
the stereo image from) were taken out the passenger side window,
with the front of the truck being to the left. You can see the
rest of the truck in the side view mirror.

While the saucer tilted from photo #2 (right eye, top saucer) to
photo #3 (left eye, bottom saucer), the top part of the saucer
didn't change in size as would be expected if it continued its
flight path away from the truck and shrank in perspective. The
top part of the saucer matches between the two photos quite
well, so if it did change its flight path it would have to do so
to run parallel with the horizontal change in the lens positions
of the camera (and the road). Not only would it have to make an
almost 90 degree change from photo #1 to photo #2 (right eye),
it would also have to stay at exactly the same height, also, or
the top half of the saucer images wouldn't align at all.

So it has to change course 90 degrees, and stay at exactly the
same altitude and distance from the truck while Heflin took
photos #2 and #3 for it to appear to be at a different distance
and different size. That would be awfully convenient, don't you
think? That it would line up just perfectly so that when it was
seen in stereo it would appear to be small and up close, rather
than big and distant? Maybe a little too convenient.

Maybe this will help. Here's a link to cross-eye stereo pair
that you can "free view" and see in 3-D without the need for the
red and blue glasses (particularly if you're familiar with
viewing stereo images this way, like I am):

<http://img50.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinstereo5ih.jpg>

If the saucer continued to move on its apparent flight path,
which in these photos would be left to right, then it wouldn't
appear closer, it would actually appear farther away. In the
red-blue image the blue saucer would be separated more from the
red saucer, like the blue clump of trees is separated from the
red clump in the distance. In that case, rather than appearing
smaller and closer, it would appear further away and huge. See
what I mean?

So that means not only would the saucer have to change the angle
of its flight path, it would also have to reverse direction
between photos #2 and #3 for it to appear smaller and closer.

All the while remaining at the same altitude and distance from the truck.

So, yes, movement of the saucer would have an effect on its relative size and distance. If it stopped, changed its direction and flew backwards while flying at the same height and distance from the truck, parallel to the two lens positions. Or it could be just what the stereo pair shows, that it's probably a small thing, dangling several feet away from the top of the truck.

And why is Heflin sitting in the driver's seat while taking photos out the passenger side window, anyway? You'd think he might want to scoot over and poke his head out or something. Maybe get a little better shot. But that might reveal his fishing pole. Just speculation.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: TRUFOS - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:50:01 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:32:09 -0400
Subject: Re: TRUFOS - Frison

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:07 -0400
>Subject: Re: TRUFOS [was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So]

>TRUFO = Truely unexplained or, better yet, truly unexplianable
>UFO.

Yes!

TRUFO = Truely unexplained, or truly unexplainable, UFO. I know exactly what you're getting at! TRUFO = phenomenon/object unexplained after extensive investigation. I fully understand this!

But TRUFO is missing the second 'U' for 'unexplained' or 'unexplainable' so it very strongly comes off as meaning 'true UFO.' And, as we all know, 'UFO' means 'unidentified flying object'. That's 'flying' and that's 'object' and if you're realling looking at the whole picture of the UFO phenomenon then 'flying' and 'object' are far too restrictive.

Without giving a clear meaning of something merely 'clearly unexplainable' it instead refers to a very narrow category of unexplained unidentified flying objects, and, I think, the evidence shows that the UFO phenomenon is far more than that. But if you're stuck in 'flying saucer mode' then it's hard not to accept the 'bigger UFO picture' and thus to see how this term (TRUFO) is simply way, way too small for the job.

I'm not connecting TRUFO with ET. I simply said in my previous post that it's a perfect term for the saucer cultists and that Rick Nielsen was using it to mean alien spaceships (which he was). My problem is with the word itself! It's not a good term! Plain and simple!

Reread my initial post. You'll all see you assumed I connected TRUFO with ET. Not so! I don't like the word for different reasons. Good reasons!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 14:00:35 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:33:14 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 16:32:07 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>Thanks for taking the time to respond Eugene. Please let me know
>what standards you use for making conclusions. I'd then be able
>to respond with more thought to your post.

No insult intended, Rick, but you've made statements like "we
can conclude aliens hate humans and should be seen as enemies."
If you can't see how that is a premature conclusion if there
ever was one then it would take far more time and energy than I
have to debate standards with 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:30:51 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:34:59 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:41:22 -0500
>Subject: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

<snip>

>Thus, I am pleased to draw your attention to an excellent paper
>in the current (119: 184-202, Spring 2006) issue of the
>venerable Journal of American Folklore: William J. Dewan's 'A
>Saucerful of Secrets': An Interdisciplinary Analysis of UFO
>Experiences.

<snip>

>Consequently, Dewan supports the view that "UFO encounters are
>often based on real, sometimes bizarre experiences that both
>inform and are formed by existing cultural traditions and mental
>schemas." Like Hufford, he argues for an "experience-centered
>approach" which listens to and takes witness testimony
>seriously, then tracks its fallout in culture and society as
>well as in personal interpretation as experiencers struggle to
>understand what they have seen or undergone and to put it into a
>framework that makes sense to them.
>

Hi,

The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that does not make what they see or believe is real. So I'm glad Jerry supports this psychosocial approach to ufology, which has been promoted by Magonia for so long.

Nigel Watson

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:57:43 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:37:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kasten

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:56:11 +0000
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>As for the mysterious government insider, "mysterious" no;
>"government insider" yes. We know all about him. He is an aide
>to a senior Member of Congress who happens to believe in UFOs
>(or is a UFO nut as some would categorize him).

>Aides like this guy often pretend to be "in the know" about
>important government matters. Obviously he was fishing for
>information from Marcel and trying to impress him.

>The reverse also holds true. One aide who disbelieves in UFOs
>said that if they existed, he would know about it. Just like
>some ufologists, they tend to have giant egos, and they like to
>play power games.

So, Mr. Hall, what is the name of the "insider" - who isn't
really an insider. Or, do you want to play the same game you
claim you are not playing? You know, the one called "nah, nah, I
know more than you do."

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

From: Tom Horn <tomhorn.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 12:21:36 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:41:07 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:44:45 EDT
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Source: Raiders News Update - Salem, Oregon, USA

>><http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

>>Monday, May 22, 2006

>>RNU Exclusive

>>Col. Jesse Marcel Jr., On & Off The Record
>>By Thomas Horn
>>Senior RNU News Reporter

>>RNU.com -- (Raiders News Update) -- A new book by Col. Jesse
>>Marcel Jr. - Roswell: It Really Happened - claims that the
>>famous Roswell UFO event actually occurred, including the
>>recovery of an extraterrestrial craft. Col. Marcel's famous
>>father, Maj. Jesse Marcel Sr. was the lead military investigator
>>into the crash of 1947 and is finally vindicated according to
>>this book.

>Y'know, Col. Marcel is such an amazing man even without the
>Roswell story attached to him that if he wrote any book just
>about his adventures as a combat flight surgeon and doctor
>serving his community I would buy it.

>Can you imagine spending your life in service of both your
>country and community healing and saving lives?

>Can't get much better than that.

Another thing I was impressed with is what appears to be an
unwillingness on his part to exaggerate the Roswell story.

I watched person after person at the recent McMinnville
festival, during, the Q&A bait him to add something sensational
to the event, but his story remained the same as what he was
saying years ago.

When I asked why he had written this book now, he said,
"Because, Tom, I'm not getting any younger and I want to set the
record straight on my dad while I still can."

The reason his new book was slightly delayed is because, as he
told me, someone helping him with the manuscript had 'enlarged'
on the truth and he wasn't willing to accept it or to allow the
publisher, a personal friend of mine, to print it as is. So he
took the mss back and is carefully going through it to make sure
the depictions are true.

In a world where big egos can get in the way and be loose with
the truth, I found Jesse Marcel refreshing and believable.

Tom Horn

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: UFO Abductions And John Mack - Bueche

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 12:40:18 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:37:48 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Abductions And John Mack - Bueche

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 14:55:39 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFO Abductions And John Mack

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 22:44:46 +0000
>>Subject: UFO Abductions And John Mack

>>I commend to the attention of everyone on this List who has an
>>interest in UFO abduction reports the recent article by Budd
>>Hopkins titled John Mack, UFO Abductions And Transformative
>>Experiences. The article appears in Intruders Foundation Special
>>Report No. 8, February 2006. He has captured my outlook
>>perfectly and expressed it much more eloquently than I have been
>>able to do.

>I fully agree with Dick's comments. Budd's article about John
>was excellent and on target.

>I shared some stages with John and found that he had basically
>started from the assumption that one couldn't get here from
>there so there had to be other explanations.

>Budd has often been more scientific than many so-called
>scientists.

>Stan Friedman

I'd love to see the article too. Without having yet seen it, I
can only express a general sort of agreement that John seemed to
have a reluctance to quantify human experiences.

While John was great at collecting narratives and then
discerning and presenting the common themes, he tended to shy
away from clinical research.

He was a psychiatrist, not a clinical psychologist, but
nonetheless his disinterest in clinical research was odd.

But I continue to be impressed by him for his willingness to
present themes experiencers have reported which other
researchers (including Hopkins) choose to ignore or devalue.

That the two of these gentlemen remained friends despite their
nearly polar opposite biases regarding the aliens (Hopkins'
terror-oriented perspective and Mack's transformation-oriented
perspective) is a credit to the field.

Looking forward to reading the article if it can be made
available. Alternatively, I see IF sells the issues for a couple
bucks plus shipping.

A nice photo of the two of them:

<http://www.johnemackinstitute.org/images/mackandhopkinsaward.jpg>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:01:33 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:40:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Boone

>From: Tom Horn <tomhorn.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 12:21:36 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 09:44:45 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>In a world where big egos can get in the way and be loose with
>the truth, I found Jesse Marcel refreshing and believable.

Amen to that Tom Horn!

It's called integrity. Something that isn't celebrated or
acknowledged enough nowadays.

In today's world of bribes and payoffs it's a settling feeling
that there are still good folk like Dr. Marcel around to set an
example.

That should be a lesson to 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:03:41 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:42:47 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:30:51 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:41:22 -0500
>>Subject: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>Consequently, Dewan supports the view that "UFO encounters are
>>often based on real, sometimes bizarre experiences that both
>>inform and are formed by existing cultural traditions and mental
>>schemas." Like Hufford, he argues for an "experience-centered
>>approach" which listens to and takes witness testimony
>>seriously, then tracks its fallout in culture and society as
>>well as in personal interpretation as experiencers struggle to
>>understand what they have seen or undergone and to put it into a
>>framework that makes sense to them.

>The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that
>does not make what they see or believe is real. So I'm glad
>Jerry supports this psychosocial approach to ufology, which has
>been promoted by Magonia for so long.

This is, of course, precisely the response one would anticipate
from the clueless reductionist, and precisely the approach
Hufford and Dewan reject. Nice try, though.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 24](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:17:16 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:47:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Rudiak

>From: Kathy Kasten <catja90024.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:57:43 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:56:11 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

><snip>

>>As for the mysterious government insider, "mysterious" no;
>>"government insider" yes. We know all about him. He is an aide
>>to a senior Member of Congress who happens to believe in UFOs
>>(or is a UFO nut as some would categorize him).

>>Aides like this guy often pretend to be "in the know" about
>>important government matters. Obviously he was fishing for
>>information from Marcel and trying to impress him.

>>The reverse also holds true. One aide who disbelieves in UFOs
>>said that if they existed, he would know about it. Just like
>>some ufologists, they tend to have giant egos, and they like to
>>play power games.

>So, Mr. Hall, what is the name of the "insider" - who isn't
>really an insider. Or, do you want to play the same game you
>claim you are not playing? You know, the one called "nah, nah, I
>know more than you do."

Actually, the guy's name has been publicly bandied about the Net
for the last decade (so "nah, nah" back at you).

According to my notes, he is Dick D'Amato, who was (is?) an aide
to Sen. Robert Byrd. Dr. Marcel already disclosed his name back
around 1995 in an address at Helena, Montana.

Marcel said he met D'Amato in Washington, D.C. in 1991. D'Amato
claimed to be affiliated with the National Security Council and
a Security Specialist for Sen. Byrd of the Senate Intelligence
Committee.

D'Amato told him there was a saucer crash and aliens were
aboard, that a powerful, unknown "black arm" of the government
was keeping it secret and spending huge sums of money illegally,
and the NSC doesn't know where the wreckage was.

Again, according to my old notes, Stanton Friedman confirmed
also being at this meeting and expressed surprise that Marcel
would publicly reveal this information.

Timothy Good has also acknowledged meeting D'Amato on several
occasions and was likewise surprised at the disclosure. Good
didn't believe D'Amato was with the NSC but may liaise with
them. Good also thought he was a representative for the Senate
International and National Security Policies Committee on
Appropriations. (This info was posted on alt.paranet.ufo,
8/7/95, by, of all people, James "Pelican" Easton, and was a

crosspost from Rich Boylan on the Compuserve "Encounters" forum, so how reliable the information is I don't know, but seems to be consistent with what is being said now.)

In a follow-up post, Gene Huff, Bob Lazar's friend, said D'Amato spoke with him, Lazar, and journalist George Knapp in Las Vegas in 1990. Huff said D'Amato seemed pretty naive about UFOs, and Huff doubted that he had the credentials or inside information ascribed to him. Back then, he was simply one of a number of auditors for the Senate's oversight of black projects, trying to find the money trail for Aurora and the disc program at the Nevada Test Site.

Whitley Strieber also apparently met D'Amato at that time. Strieber (who supposedly introduced D'Amato to Good) also thinks that D'Amato "...is not a major player in the congressional investigation of the UFO cover-up," but is just another government person interested in UFOs. (Letter to Michael Lindemann, "ISCNI Flash," v.13, #1, 9/16/95) An anonymous government official, probably D'Amato, is also described in Strieber's "Breakthrough," but Strieber attaches greater significance to him.

In another follow-up post by Fred Muratori (8/8/95), he noted that the British paper "The Guardian" mentions D'Amato in its 7/25/95 story on the Roswell alien autopsy film, which states that he is a national security aide to Sen. Byrd. He is, so listed in the 1995 "Congressional Staff Directory," assisting Byrd in defense matters related to the Committee on Appropriations, is a retired Navy officer, and has served in the legislative branch since 1975.

David "anti-nah-nah" 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 21:46:46 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:12:39 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02:28 -0300
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 21:30:19 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine.
>>>I recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in
>>>1965 of his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of
>>>them. You can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are
>>>necessary to correctly view the stereo effect):

>>><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

>>>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think.
>>>Give me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we
>>>looking at a small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a
>>>big thing flying over a field?

>>Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing
>>them. This came out during a UK ITV show aired in May 1968.
>>Yet I have never seen any other mention of this, either by
>>believers in the photos or by skeptics. If British TV can
>>discover this titbit of info, why couldn't knowledgeable UFO
>>investigators?

>Chris,

>While you are on the subject of British TV, can you offer any
>knowledge about the producers of this documentary [See URL
>below]. Perhaps Mantour Productions-but I doubt it. The URL was
>posted by Greg Boone. Maybe you have seen this documentary
>yourself? It sounds like Roger Moore's voice doing the voice
>over.

><http://youtube.com/watch?v=Z3CdTdrKfGY&search=flying%20saucer>

Don,

Although your question was addressed to CDA, I assume neither of
you will mind if I provide some information.

The clip at the URL you provided is extracted from a TV
documentary, presented by Roger Moore entitled "The Secret KGB
UFO Files".

The relevant documentary was directed by Dan Goldman, and
written by David Doyle and Gregg Ostrin, for a TNT network
broadcast on 13 September 1998. (The background of the latter

writer is quite amusing...).

The relevant credits are at:

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0224072/>

The documentary is available on Amazon (and the relevant webpage includes various reviews, which are almost universally rather negative) at:

<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/B0000399XH/>

That documentary has been shown in the UK numerous times, including quite a few showings in the last month or two on the Sci-Fi channel.

When I last wrote about this documentary (about two weeks ago), it could be viewed online in its entirety at the link below (although this link does not appear to be working today):

<http://superstar.everythingcyber.com:8080/ramgen/karvanek/KGBUFO.rm>

Most of the discussions of this fairly well-known documentary relate to famous (or possibly that should be "infamous") footage of an alleged UFO crash site and alien autopsy in Russia. The relevant crash/autopsy footage is discussed in some detail on various websites and if you are looking into the documentary you may be interested in some of those discussions (since they may provide some insight into the credibility of the production overall, and also point you in the direction of researchers that have investigated the various bits of material presented in the relevant documentary).

Relatively short and to the point is the discussion at the link below, which gives various reasonably strong reasons for concluding that the crash/autopsy footage is a hoax:

<http://www.parascope.com/nb/articles/kgbUFOhoax.htm>

Rather more difficult to understand, but fairly detailed, is the commentary at:

<http://boris-shurinov.info/uftnt/tnt2.htm>

The latter of the above two links makes various points in relation to the style of documents used that should be easy for any Russian to confirm or deny. For example, it is claimed that the "death certificates" of the 3 doctors that allegedly performed the "alien autopsy" are in the style used in the Russian Federation _after_ 1993, when according to the documentary those death certificates are _supposed_ to date from 1969.

If you are only interested in discussions directly relating to the clip of footage at the URL you provided, you may be interested in the discussion of that extract on the Above Top Secret forum at the link below:

<http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread205987/pg1>

By the way Don, I don't think "British TV" deserves the blame for the relevant documentary...

All the best,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 22:20:47 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:14:59 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:53:32 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:10 -0400
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>While the saucer tilted from photo #2 (right eye, top saucer) to
>photo #3 (left eye, bottom saucer), the top part of the saucer
>didn't change in size as would be expected if it continued its
>flight path away from the truck and shrank in perspective. The
>top part of the saucer matches between the two photos quite
>well, so if it did change its flight path it would have to do so
>to run parallel with the horizontal change in the lens positions
>of the camera (and the road).

Hi Tim

You make an interesting case. I bow to your more accurate measurement of the angular size; on my inferior images #3 appeared slightly (about 4%) smaller than #2. Do you have exact values? But anyway, the flight path as reconstructed by Hartmann on the basis of "detailed questioning" of Heflin shows exactly this - the object crosses the road to a position 90 degs to Heflin's right then, about the time he takes #2, it turns NE and moves parallel to the road to position #3. According to this reconstruction the displacement from #2 to #3 is only about 15 degs and difference in range is about 3%. We need to be able to measure the image width to more than this accuracy to prove the angular size is inconsistent with the testimony. Is this possible?.

>Not only would it have to make an
>almost 90 degree change from photo #1 to photo #2 (right eye),
>it would also have to stay at exactly the same height, also, or
>the top half of the saucer images wouldn't align at all.

In fact Heflin said in Sept 1965: "As the UFO travelled it maintained a relatively level altitude (150 ft) in relation to the flat terrain."

>So it has to change course 90 degrees, and stay at exactly the
>same altitude and distance from the truck while Heflin took
>photos #2 and #3 for it to appear to be at a different distance
>and different size. That would be awfully convenient, don't you
>think? That it would line up just perfectly so that when it was
>seen in stereo it would appear to be small and up close, rather
>than big and distant? Maybe a little too convenient.

Maybe.

>So that means not only would the saucer have to change the angle
>of its flight path, it would also have to reverse direction
>between photos #2 and #3 for it to appear smaller and closer.
>All the while remaining at the same altitude and distance from
>the truck.

It may have done. This is not inconsistent with the scenario reported, certainly since 1967 (I can't at the moment dig out anything prior to that to check).

>So, yes, movement of the saucer would have an effect on its
>relative size and distance. If it stopped, changed its direction
>and flew backwards while flying at the same height and distance
>from the truck, parallel to the two lens positions. Or it could
>be just what the stereo pair shows, that it's probably a small
>thing, dangling several feet away from the top
>of the truck.

I don't think so. Your argument for a hoax is that the stereo coincidence indicates a stationary model. From the measured displacements of the mirror and the UFO against the landscape I believe if it were a stationary model it would have to be a very small model suspended closer than the mirror, such as from the top of the truck window.

This might be consistent with the sharp definition and apparent lack of haze extinction on a hazy day possibly? But only (I think) if UFO#3 can be shown to be about 10% larger than UFO #2 consistent with the fact that the lens must be about 10% closer.

If not we could get around it by saying the model was moved between shots - but then we might blunt the force of your primary stereo argument against a moving object.

>And why is Heflin sitting in the driver's seat while taking
>photos out the passenger side window, anyway? You'd think he
>might want to scoot over and poke his head out or something.
>Maybe get a little better shot. But that might reveal his
>fishing pole. Just speculation.

According to him he isn't sitting in the drivers seat. After #1 he slid two feet t to the right to take #2. Presumably this is a bench seat. I don't know if anyone has ever done the precise photogrammetry with the identical truck to determine camera positions? This should be done if not. If it turns out that he didn't slide all the way up to the passenger window then there's the possibility that he had equipment or junk stowed on the seat as people often 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 21:22:26 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:17:30 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Hall

>From: Kathy Kasten <catja90024.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:57:43 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:56:11 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>As for the mysterious government insider, "mysterious" no;
>>"government insider" yes. We know all about him. He is an aide
>>to a senior Member of Congress who happens to believe in UFOs
>>(or is a UFO nut as some would categorize him).

>>Aides like this guy often pretend to be "in the know" about
>>important government matters. Obviously he was fishing for
>>information from Marcel and trying to impress him.

>>The reverse also holds true. One aide who disbelieves in UFOs
>>said that if they existed, he would know about it. Just like
>>some ufologists, they tend to have giant egos, and they like to
>>play power games.

>So, Mr. Hall, what is the name of the "insider" - who isn't
>really an insider. Or, do you want to play the same game you
>claim you are not playing? You know, the one called "nah, nah, I
>know more than you do."

Kathy,

If that's the way you interpret my message, it simply proves
that you don't know me. In fact, I confirmed that from my
knowledge he is (or was) a government insider. It was just that
there is and was nothing particularly mysterious about him.
people are always wanting to make relatively innocent
occurrences into deep, dark mysteries.

However, it is up to those who directly interacted with him to
blow his cover if they wish to. I never met him; some of my
close friends and colleagues did. Also, I do happen to know
quite a bit about UFOs (about 50 years worth) and the way the
Congress operates (10 years at Congressional Information
Service). I think generally people on this List appreciate
having my comments and insights on various matters; certainly
they don't always agree with me, which is fine.

If you see game playing in it, then I suggest you look again.
Disagree all you like, but please don't derogate my character.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 22:34:12 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:19:08 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Shough

>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:30:51 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:41:22 -0500
>>Subject: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>
><snip>

>>Thus, I am pleased to draw your attention to an excellent paper
>>in the current (119: 184-202, Spring 2006) issue of the
>>venerable Journal of American Folklore: William J. Dewan's 'A
>>Saucerful of Secrets': An Interdisciplinary Analysis of UFO
>>Experiences.

><snip>

>>Consequently, Dewan supports the view that "UFO encounters are
>>often based on real, sometimes bizarre experiences that both
>>inform and are formed by existing cultural traditions and mental
>>schemas." Like Hufford, he argues for an "experience-centered
>>approach" which listens to and takes witness testimony
>>seriously, then tracks its fallout in culture and society as
>>well as in personal interpretation as experiencers struggle to
>>understand what they have seen or undergone and to put it into a
>>framework that makes sense to them.

>The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that does
>not make what they see or believe is real. So I'm glad Jerry
>supports this psychosocial approach to ufology, which has been
>promoted by Magonia for so long.

Nigel

This is a spectacular missing of the point on so many levels
that my mind swims at the prospect of trying to repair the
disconnect between Jerry Clarke's meaning and your burlesque.

Thankfully I'm sure Jerry will do that himself. This is the sort
of shallow literalism that does the "psychosocial approach" no
favours.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:51:55 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:22:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:17:16 -0700
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Kathy Kasten <catja90024.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:57:43 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:56:11 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>><snip>

>>>As for the mysterious government insider, "mysterious" no;
>>>"government insider" yes. We know all about him. He is an aide
>>>to a senior Member of Congress who happens to believe in UFOs
>>>(or is a UFO nut as some would categorize him).

>>>Aides like this guy often pretend to be "in the know" about
>>>important government matters. Obviously he was fishing for
>>>information from Marcel and trying to impress him.

>>>The reverse also holds true. One aide who disbelieves in UFOs
>>>said that if they existed, he would know about it. Just like
>>>some ufologists, they tend to have giant egos, and they like to
>>>play power games.

<snip>

>Actually, the guy's name has been publicly bandied about the Net
>for the last decade (so "nah, nah" back at you).

>According to my notes, he is Dick D'Amato, who was (is?) an aide
>to Sen. Robert Byrd. Dr. Marcel already disclosed his name back
>around 1995 in an address at Helena, Montana.

>Marcel said he met D'Amato in Washington, D.C. in 1991. D'Amato
>claimed to be affiliated with the National Security Council and
>a Security Specialist for Sen. Byrd of the Senate Intelligence
>Committee.

>D'Amato told him there was a saucer crash and aliens were
>aboard, that a powerful, unknown "black arm" of the government
>was keeping it secret and spending huge sums of money illegally,
>and the NSC doesn't know where the wreckage was.

>Again, according to my old notes, Stanton Friedman confirmed
>also being at this meeting and expressed surprise that Marcel
>would publicly reveal this information.

<snip>

I can certainly confirm that it was Dick D'Amato. Senator Byrd
came in to the office while I was there, so there was no reason

to think something untowards was going on.

Thanks to David for bringing up the name which was temporarily lost to my ancient memory.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:54:18 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:31:20 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Boone

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>The Current Situation: If We Can Defend Humanity, Let's Do So

<snip>

>If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and
>exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it.

>What say ye all?

If the situation was one where everyday production of the human environment was arrested by these abductions I would side with ye and with a hoisted mug of ale.

Since we don't see abductions on the nightly news, nor do we see dozens of neighbors a day screaming and running for the hills the alarm is way down on the list of things to save humanity from.

We can't, or won't, save humanity from drunk drivers. Nor do we save humanity from people who don't wash their hands enough which must kill millions each year. I could go on with a list of things to save humanity from first:

- Clumsy people
- Governments
- Mosquitoes
- Spousal Abusers
- Neighbors
- Parents
- Offspring
- Slippery floors
- Bad drivers

That's to name a few. We're far more dangerous to ourselves than our visitors who are so adept at stealth and occlusion that any efforts on our part to curtail them are meager. You won't see any public screaming about the issue until the television broadcasts, supplies of alcohol, dope, and cigarettes are interrupted. Let those creature comforts become compromised and I'll bet you there won't be a star system twixt here and the Horse Head Nebula that'll be safe from the 'Wrath of the Humans'.

So they're interbreeding with us. Like we're doing a better job?

Maybe they're just upgrading the hardware like they've been doing since day one. Maybe it's just the mechanics of things but we're now more aware of the true origin and don't supplant our own mythologies.

Maybe we're just finally confronting the man behind the curtain.

One day maybe a new breed of human will emerge who can drive

with both hands on the wheel, not give in to narcotics, not destroy it's environment, and finally learn how to use the proper etiquette during a formal dinner.

It's a scary proposition that our destinies are in the hands of beings who don't want to speak to us face to face. Maybe they tried but their ideas of aesthetics didn't match our own and their universal translator thingie couldn't decipher 'Aaaaaaa!' that kept erupting from our mouths. That our existence is nothing more than that of prized livestock in some paddock. Maybe we weren't due for a hardware upgrade for another 100,000 years but that nuclear bomb testing thingie caused the manufacturer to speed up production.

No one is going to save humanity because humanity doesn't want to be saved. We're listful creatures that delegate responsibility to intangible delusions and the small percentage of psychotics amongst us who've cornered the market on charisma. We sit back, let the psychotics whip up a problem and then bitch and moan and get violent about it after the fact.

Let's hope that they're just not making a better human, but instead are working on making a better person.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:34:56 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:33:57 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

>From: Carol Buckallew <clbuckallew.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 19:21:48 -0500
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>>Aliens are piloting the TRUFOS and abducting and exploiting
>>>human beings for their own purpose and benefit. We can conclude
>>>that the aliens hate humans and should be seen as enemies.

>>Oh, we can conclude all this, can we? I strongly doubt we can
>>conclude any of it!

>>Bottom line: all of your conclusions (in your entire post)
>>are premature! Some, if not most, of your conclusions are
>>extremely premature and even sound paranoid!

>I strongly doubt you can conclude anything not having
>had any of these things happen to you, setting in your
>arm chair deciding what is or isn't true. What people see
>and experience and who's doing what is what's true, you
>ought to try it sometime then see what you have to say,
>maybe it will be your turn next.

Thanks for your support Carol! But if all that folks like Dr.
Jacobs, and Mr. Hopkins have concluded is true, and I have no
reason yet to doubt it, I wouldn't wish an alien abduction on
any other human being!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:58:04 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:41:15 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02:28 -0300
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 21:30:19 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin >Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing
>>them. This came out during a UK ITV show aired in May 1968.
>>Yet I have never seen any other mention of this, either by
>>believers in the photos or by skeptics. If British TV can
>>discover this titbit of info, why couldn't knowledgeable UFO
>>investigators?

>While you are on the subject of British TV, can you offer any
>knowledge about the producers of this documentary [See URL
>below]. Perhaps Mantour Productions-but I doubt it. The URL was
>posted by Greg Boone. Maybe you have seen this documentary
>yourself? It sounds like Roger Moore's voice doing the voice
>over.

><http://youtube.com/watch?v=Z3CdTdrKfGY&search=flying%20saucer>

Don and List

When Stan Friedman visited the S.F. Bay Area a few years back, Reuben Uriate, Northern California MUFON director, demonstrated for us that many portions of your referenced "documentary" were flagrantly hoaxed.

This program was shown on the TNT network and was supposed to show, among other things, films of Russian jet interceptors encounters with UFOs.

What they really did was take a previous TNT documentary on American fighter planes and then used computer graphics to insert the supposed-UFOs.

He showed the clips from the original documentary followed immediately by the "UFO" clips. No doubt about it. The UFOs were computer generated and they hoped the average viewer wouldn't know a Russian MIG from a U.S. fighter.

The other part of this 'documentary' was supposedly of a Russian UFO crash and alien autopsy. This too turned out to be hoaxed.

As I remember, one proof of this was that the rifles of the military unit guarding the 'saucer' were anachronistic, being of recent vintage instead of dating to the year of the supposed crash.

The whole thing was a sham from start to finish. Yes, it was narrated by Roger Moore. Shame on him and TNT for helping to perpetrate this slimy fraud on the public.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Robert Gates <rgates8254.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 20:23:11 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:43:57 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine.
>I recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in
>1965 of his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of
>them. You can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are
>necessary to correctly view the stereo effect):

><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think.
>Give me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we
>looking at a small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a
>big thing flying over a field?

Hi Tim,

As I recall to shoot true stereo images you have to have two cameras in a fixed location that fire the shutter at the same exact time. Likewise the camera has to be in a fixed location. In the case of Heflin there was gap between photos (I recall he shot them with a Poloroid), plus he moved in the truck, meaning the photos were shot in different positions plus their is a time gap between them. Because of these issues, I suspect any stereo analysis (not the person doing it) would be of questionable results and questionable value.

As I also recall in photo number 1 way in front (say under neath the object) you have an area of stirred up dirt that is approx 1 and 1/2 lanes in width. Stirred up dirt is not apparent elsewhere in the photograph except below the object. While an interesting analysis, the fact remains that we don't have photos fired at the same time from a fixed location, we don't know how much Heflin moved across the seat to shoot the photographs. I suspect he moved almost all the way across. It would also be wrong to second guess why Heflin stayed in the car rather than jumping out onto the road...who knows.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: TRUFOfs - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 20:22:52 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:46:03 -0400
Subject: Re: TRUFOfs - Maccabee

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:50:01 -0300
>Subject: Re: TRUFOfs [was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So]

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:07 -0400
>>Subject: Re: TRUFOfs [was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So]

>>TRUFOf = Truely unexplained or, better yet, truly unexplainable
>>UFO.

>Yes!

>TRUFOf = Truely unexplained, or truly unexplainable, UFO. I know
>exactly what you're getting at! TRUFOf = phenomenon/object
>unexplained after extensive investigation. I fully understand
>this!

>But TRUFOf is missing the second 'U' for 'unexplained' or
>'unexplainable' so it very strongly comes off as meaning 'true
>UFO.' And, as we all know, 'UFO' means 'unidentified flying
>object'. That's 'flying' and that's 'object' and if you're
>realling looking at the whole picture of the UFO phenomenon then
>'flying' and 'object' are far too restrictive.

Change it to TRUUFOf.

Or TRU^2FO.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 23:02:05 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:50:03 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:03:41 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:30:51 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:41:22 -0500
>>>Subject: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>Consequently, Dewan supports the view that "UFO encounters are
>>>often based on real, sometimes bizarre experiences that both
>>>inform and are formed by existing cultural traditions and mental
>>>schemas." Like Hufford, he argues for an "experience-centered
>>>approach" which listens to and takes witness testimony
>>>seriously, then tracks its fallout in culture and society as
>>>well as in personal interpretation as experiencers struggle to
>>>understand what they have seen or undergone and to put it into a
>>>framework that makes sense to them.

>>The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that
>>does not make what they see or believe is real. So I'm glad
>>Jerry supports this psychosocial approach to ufology, which has
>>been promoted by Magonia for so long.

>This is, of course, precisely the response one would anticipate
>from the clueless reductionist, and precisely the approach
>Hufford and Dewan reject. Nice try, though.

Jerry, I'm surprised that you think Hufford and Dewan would
reject the concept that people might agree with them! I don't
see what's cluelessly reductive about that.

Dewan and Hufford argue for an "experience-centred approach." So
does Magonia. There is not a word in the paragraph you quote
which I or any of the Magonia team would argue with.

In my review of Hufford's 'Terror that Comes in the Night' in
MUFOB, about a hundred years ago, I argued that the UFO
experience was just that - an actual experience which happened
to real people, and the experiencers then struggle to
"understand what they have seen or undergone and to put it into
a framework that makes sense to them" and that those experiences
are based on "real, sometimes bizarre experiences that both
inform and are formed by existing cultural traditions and mental
schemas".

I've been sending you MUFOB and Magonia for about twenty-five
years now, I wonder if you ever bother to read it!

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Magonia Supplement No. 61

From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 19:53:28 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:52:05 -0400
Subject: Magonia Supplement No. 61

In the latest issue of Magonia Supplement Martin Kottmeyer investigates the "collective shame" theory of UFO flaps, arguing that there is some evidence that the hurricane Katrina debacle was associated with a significant increase in UFO reports in the USA.

John Harney argues that the fondness of "serious ufologists" for the ETH ensures that the subject will never be taken seriously by mainstream science.

Peter Rogerson reviews Jerome Clark's *The Unidentified* and Loren Coleman's *Creatures Of The Outer Edge*, now republished under one cover, and there are Notes and News from Nigel Watson.

The HTML edition is now available at:

<http://www.users.waitrose.com/~magonia/ms61.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming6.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 22:05:10 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 05:54:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Fleming

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Source: Raiders News Update - Salem, Oregon, USA

>><http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

>>Monday, May 22, 2006

>>RNU Exclusive

>>Col. Jesse Marcel Jr., On & Off The Record
>>By Thomas Horn
>>Senior RNU News Reporter

>>The mysterious government insider continued talking for a while
>>and then asked Marcel if he knew where the material recovered
>>from the Roswell ranch was being kept. Jess found the question
>>curious and said, "No. Don't you?" "X"'s answer was as curious
>>as the question, so Marcel responded with a inquiry of his own:

>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>truth).

I've always been amazed that self-styled "skeptics" can glibly
assert that writing a book decreases the credibility of a
witness' testimony, but I've never once heard any of them say
that not writing a book has ever increased anyone's
credibility. It seems that what they're really trying to say is:
"Heads I win, tails you lose."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:21:53 +0200 (CEST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:00:23 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 00:36:36 EDT
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Also, the relative size of the
>>mirror changes too... which (seemingly?) lends credence to that
>>person's shift in response to the change of the object being
>>photographed. I'm not sure which image is first in the sequence
>>or whether the size of each image has been adjusted somewhat...
>>if so, please let us know before we settle on what is actually
>>taking place and in what order.

>There may be no certain way to know the order of the Heflin
>photos since the original polaroids are lost, but I believe the
>order recalled by the witness was as given in the Condon report
>(plates 42-44 - profile through left part of front windshield in
>shot #1, oblique underside view through right side window in
>shot #2, profile view through right side window in shot #3) and
>as described by Hartmann from interviews with Heflin in 1967, 2
>years after the event.

<snip>

Am I correct in remembering having read that Ann Druffel was
planning to provide digital copies of the originals to
interested investigators?

Is Ms. Druffel the present custodian of the originals?

Best wishes,

Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: TRUFOS - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 02:22:45 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:03:13 -0400
Subject: Re: TRUFOS - Hatch

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:13:05 -0300
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:48:54 -0400
>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

<snip>

>>>TRUFOS? Now here's a messed-up word if there ever was one - one
>>>which I'm sure will catch on and get used rather than getting
>>>lost like it should. A perfect word for the saucer cultists!

<snip>

>Yes, I'm familiar with how the term 'TRUFO' came to be.

>I don't like the word simply because it's inaccurate. And
>unnecessary! A UFO is something which is unidentified. If it's
>explainable then it's an IFO. If it remains unexplainable then
>it's a UFO. You don't need a word like TRUFO. An anomalous
>(behaving in an unexplainable manner) flying object is covered
>by the term UFO. It's either a UFO or it's not. It's either a
>UFO or an IFO. TRUFO is not necessary and represents overkill.
>You don't need to add the 'TR' to 'UFO' to cover the core of
>truly unexplainable and anomalous objects. They're UFOs! You
>don't need multiple terms here to explain a single thing (that
>core of anomalous objects). The term 'UFO' already does the job
>fine!

<snip>

While I seldom use the word TRUFO myself, it may have some utility. In the proper context, it could help separate real head scratchers from the plethora of junk out there.

If we are limited to UFO and IFO, what do we do with Night Light cases and the like? Those are far weaker than TRUFOS, yet not really IFOs. A few of those dreary reports could actually be something truly anomalous, but poorly perceived.

I might call them borderline IFOs or BIFOS, but I don't want to muddy the waters even more. Instead, I just pass over them and index the cases that look like potential TRUFOS to me.

The term TRUFOS doesn't bother. I just use it very sparingly, if at all.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

UFOs Fact Or Fiction?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:09:28 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:09:28 -0400
Subject: UFOs Fact Or Fiction?

Source: iAfrica.Com - Newlands, Western Cape, South Africa

<http://cooltech.iafrica.com/features/421016.htm>

Thu, 25 May 2006

UFOs =97 Fact Or Fiction?
Rebekah Kendal

South Africa is abuzz with speculation about UFO activity following the recent alleged sighting in Port Shepstone.

A number of witnesses testified to seeing an unidentified flying object crash into the sea amid smoke and flames. No aeroplanes have been reported missing and the NSRI have not, as yet, discovered anything in the area.

We spoke to Cristo Louw, founder of South Africa's UFO Resource (SAUFOR) about the sighting in KZN, government conspiracies and SA's UFO hotspots.

iafrica: What do you think of the recent sighting in KZN?

CL: This story has spread like wildfire all around the world due to the power of the internet, and although I do not suspect (at this stage) that there was an actual object seen, this event has shown that most people are actually open to the possibility that UFOs exist and are curious about the phenomenon. My conclusion is based on video-footage which was taken of the event and this shows a tornado-like formation which actually does account for many of the details from the eye-witness descriptions. There are however a few unanswered questions which still leaves the door open for an object to have been seen. The case is still open.

iafrica: Is there any spot in South Africa that is particularly prone to UFO activity?

CL: Yes, there are many. From our database of sightings, it is clear that the Eastern Cape is a hotbed for sightings, but contrary to popular belief, these things can (and are) seen just about anywhere. The research shows that many reports occur near bodies of water, military and nuclear installations, and even in space=85

iafrica: Is there stuff that the public should know, but doesn't? In other words, is information kept hidden from the public?

CL: Without a doubt, yes! And this is a global situation. I'll give the example of the 7 May 1989 incident where our Air Force actually shot down a UFO which crashed in the Kalahari Desert on the Botswana side of the border. We would never have known about this case if an Air Force Intelligence officer hadn't come forward with the story. His credibility has since been found to be very dubious, however through diligent research many aspects of the case were substantiated. The cherry on top here was

(apparently) that South Africa received nuclear weapons in exchange for what was recovered. The level of secrecy around this case is mind-boggling.

To summarise what the public should be aware of compared to what has been force-fed, let me list a few points:

* UFOs exist and many are real physical objects where others are different forms of energy.

* Some of these are extraterrestrial and/or inter-dimensional.

* Certain highly advanced technologies have been recovered from downed craft and/or in exchange programmes with extraterrestrials. Examples of this are believed to be lasers, holograms, night-vision, Velcro, microwave applications, fibre-optics, the computer integrated circuit and probably many more=85

* Proof that UFOs are real exists. There are thousands of cases where physical traces were left such as unexplained geometrical marks on the ground, burnt and/or damaged vegetation, electro-magnetic effects on vehicles, higher levels of radiation in the environment, magnetic field anomalies, and actual pieces of debris.

* Official studies that were previously classified but released under the Freedom of Information Act in America and other similar acts elsewhere, clearly show that the official level of concern is very high and a lot of documents have been found by researchers proving the cover-up.

* Thousands of authenticated photos & video footage exists, a lot of it still in the hands of the military.

* Radar-tracking coupled with visual sightings (especially from civilian and military pilots) exists, but is mostly kept in military files.

* In our history, innumerable myths and legends speak of a time when the 'gods' walked among men and craft were seen flying in the skies.

iafrica: What exactly do you classify as a UFO?

CL: Simply, a UFO is an Unidentified Flying Object. This means that the observer cannot identify what is seen. Upon investigation, most UFOs are identified and are no longer UFOs. It is the =B115% of truly unexplained reports which definitely deserve further study. When confronted with any report, we will firstly rule out all known possibilities, and then after extensive investigation, only then can it be said that something is unexplained. It is extremely irresponsible to jump to conclusions when all the facts have not been verified and all the possible leads checked out.

[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](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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Theories On Recent Cattle Mutilations Sort Of Alien

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:17:50 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:17:50 -0400
Subject: Theories On Recent Cattle Mutilations Sort Of Alien

Source: The Denver Post - Colorado, USA

http://www.denverpost.com/ci_3857439?source=rss

05/24/2006

Theories On Recent Cattle Mutilations Sort Of Alien
By Rich Tosches
Denver Post Staff Writer

Eads

The tales of mysterious livestock mutilations go way back on the Colorado flatlands, back at least to 1967 outside of Alamosa, where Snippy the horse died a strange death.

Snippy had been skinned in a bizarre way. The cuts were sharp and precise. There was no blood at the scene. Snippy's owner said when she touched the horse's flesh, it oozed green fluid that burned her skin.

There were, of course, reports of UFOs in the area that night.

Beam ahead, so to speak, to Monday. To the parched land near this tiny town just 40 miles from the Kansas border. Chuck Bowen, 54, a rancher and a photographer, gazes across the 13,000 acres his family has owned since the 1940s. He takes a step, and the dust around his boots swirls in the relentless wind.

Two of his cows have died freaky deaths. And then he hears the word "alien," and he smiles. It's hard, frankly, for down-to-earth Bowen to imagine why extraterrestrial beings would hover over his remote meadow, carefully snatch away the faces of two cows and then dart back into the twinkling stars.

"You would think," he said, "they'd have something more important to do."

And yet Bowen wonders what on earth could have killed his Angus cows and surgically removed the skin from the same side of both cows' faces, leaving the carcasses otherwise intact in the undisturbed grass of the sprawling ranch.

"The grass around their legs was still upright, still tall," he said. "When an animal dies it usually thrashes around and disturbs the ground. This was like the cows had been gently laid down in the grass. Like they'd been lowered."

Oh, and there's this little tidbit that jacks up the spooky meter another notch in Bowen's head: The ranch, originally owned by his grandfather, sits on the site of the infamous Nov. 29, 1864, Sand Creek Massacre, in which some 200 Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians were killed by U.S. Army soldiers. Bowen and his wife, Sheri, have spent decades sifting through the dirt, uncovering about 3,000 artifacts of that horrible day. Everything from cannonball fragments to metal arrowheads to

soldiers' uniform buttons.

In February and again in April, not far from that main battlefield and down by the towering cottonwood trees that stood even back then, Bowen found the dead cows.

"Both of them had the skin sliced off the left side of their faces in exactly the same pattern," he said.

"The cut was a perfectly straight line," Sheri Bowen said. "You could tell it was done with a knife."

Ahead of a thunderstorm on Monday, the noon sun pushed the thermometer past 85 degrees and the foul odor of a cow carcass danced in the air. Lying on the ground amid a colony of prairie dogs was the body of one of the Bowens' cows. This one went down, as best Chuck can figure, about April 1. Its black hide was weathered, but the precise slicing of the skin around its jaw and snout was plain to see.

Kiowa County Sheriff Forest Frazee and deputies examined both carcasses. Frazee said a veterinarian told him an eagle might have sliced the skin from the cows' faces. And that the brittle winter grass around the bodies had not been stepped on.

"That grass breaks. It's easy to see a footprint. No one came anywhere near those cows," Frazee said. "So I don't really know what happened. I do know that I don't believe in the boogeyman."

The Bowens - seemingly about as regular and ordinary as people can be - live about 30 miles south, in Lamar. They run about 90 cows on the family land, and the two deaths have left them rattled.

"Coyotes wouldn't go anywhere near the carcasses for weeks and weeks," Sheri Bowen said. "They just left them alone. And Chuck's metal detector, the one we use to find artifacts, it gave a reading of foil over the entire body. Aluminum foil.

"I've heard all the stories, but I have a little trouble with the alien thing. Aliens killing our cattle just doesn't make any sense."

Chuck shakes his head.

"Both cows had the exact same patch of skin taken from the same side of their face," he said. "And to be honest, it's a little creepy."

Staff writer Rich Tosches writes each Wednesday and Sunday. He can be reached at rtosches.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 11:16:51 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:36:55 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:21:53 +0200 (CEST)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>There may be no certain way to know the order of the Heflin
>>photos since the original polaroids are lost, but I believe the
>>order recalled by the witness was as given in the Condon report
>>(plates 42-44 - profile through left part of front windshield in
>>shot #1, oblique underside view through right side window in
>>shot #2, profile view through right side window in shot #3) and
>>as described by Hartmann from interviews with Heflin in 1967, 2
>>years after the event.

><snip>

>Am I correct in remembering having read that Ann Druffel was
>planning to provide digital copies of the originals to
>interested investigators?

>Is Ms. Druffel the present custodian of the originals?

Hello VJ

It's my understanding that Heflin said the original Polaroids were taken away by the infamous "NORAD" visitor(s) in Sept 1965. Dick Hall will know more about this, but, I also recall that Heflin said they were returned to him anonymously in odd circumstances some time later and that he then sold them for a few hundred dollars when in need of cash. I wonder who to?

I think a set of negatives were made professionally from what were believed to be the original Polaroids before they disappeared. If these are the "originals" you mention then it would certainly be interesting to see them.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: TRUFOS - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:41:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 07:49:22 -0400
Subject: Re: TRUFOS - Lehmborg

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 20:22:52 -0400
>Subject: Re: TRUFOS

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:50:01 -0300
>>Subject: Re: TRUFOS [was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So]

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:07 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: TRUFOS [was: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So]

>>>TRUFO = Truly unexplained or, better yet, truly unexplainable
>>>UFO.

>>Yes!

>>TRUFO = Truly unexplained, or truly unexplainable, UFO. I know
>>exactly what you're getting at! TRUFO = phenomenon/object
>>unexplained after extensive investigation. I fully understand
>>this!

>>But TRUFO is missing the second 'U' for 'unexplained' or
>>'unexplainable' so it very strongly comes off as meaning 'true
>>UFO.' And, as we all know, 'UFO' means 'unidentified flying
>>object'. That's 'flying' and that's 'object' and if you're
>>realling looking at the whole picture of the UFO phenomenon then
>'>flying' and 'object' are far too restrictive.
>Change it to TRUUFUO.

>Or TRU^2FO.

Truthiness-UFO?

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:19:55 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:28:02 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 21:46:46 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02:28 -0300
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 21:30:19 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>Although your question was addressed to CDA, I assume neither of
>you will mind if I provide some information.

>The clip at the URL you provided is extracted from a TV
>documentary, presented by Roger Moore entitled "The Secret KGB
>UFO Files".

<snip>

Having been interviewed for the above show in Southern
California, I can verify what Isaac wrote. I was very careful in
what I said and, of course, as usual had no idea what anybody
else said. I concur, fraudulent.

Can't blame the Brits for this one though the Discovery Ch.
program about I had sex with an alien was a Mantour UK
monstrosity.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:29:14 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:32:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 21:22:26 +0000
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Kathy Kasten <catja90024.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:57:43 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:56:11 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>As for the mysterious government insider, "mysterious" no;
>>>"government insider" yes. We know all about him. He is an aide
>>>to a senior Member of Congress who happens to believe in UFOs
>>>(or is a UFO nut as some would categorize him).

>>>Aides like this guy often pretend to be "in the know" about
>>>important government matters. Obviously he was fishing for
>>>information from Marcel and trying to impress him.

>>>The reverse also holds true. One aide who disbelieves in UFOs
>>>said that if they existed, he would know about it. Just like
>>>some ufologists, they tend to have giant egos, and they like to
>>>play power games.

>>So, Mr. Hall, what is the name of the "insider" - who isn't
>>really an insider. Or, do you want to play the same game you
>>claim you are not playing? You know, the one called "nah, nah, I
>>know more than you do."

>Kathy,

>If that's the way you interpret my message, it simply proves
>that you don't know me. In fact, I confirmed that from my
>knowledge he is (or was) a government insider. It was just that
>there is and was nothing particularly mysterious about him.
>people are always wanting to make relatively innocent
>occurrences into deep, dark mysteries.

>However, it is up to those who directly interacted with him to
>blow his cover if they wish to. I never met him; some of my
>close friends and colleagues did. Also, I do happen to know
>quite a bit about UFOs (about 50 years worth) and the way the
>Congress operates (10 years at Congressional Information
>Service). I think generally people on this List appreciate
>having my comments and insights on various matters; certainly
>they don't always agree with me, which is fine.

>If you see game playing in it, then I suggest you look again.

>Disagree all you like, but please don't derogate my character.

Please don't derogate the character of Dr. Marcel either.

I know of no finer person in the UFO field or any other. Besides being a medical doctor, flight surgeon and helicopter pilot as a Colonel in Iraq for a year while in his late 60's, he also served in Vietnam and has more than 40 years affiliation with the military... a gentleman and a scholar.

It is really too bad that Peter Jennings didn't mention these facts in his infamous 'documentary'.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: TRUFOS - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:42:27 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:45:27 -0400
Subject: Re: TRUFOS - Friedman

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 02:22:45 -0700
>Subject: Re: TRUFOS

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:13:05 -0300
>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:48:54 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

><snip>

>While I seldom use the word TRUFO myself, it may have some
>utility. In the proper context, it could help separate real head
>scratchers from the plethora of junk out there.

>If we are limited to UFO and IFO, what do we do with Night Light
>cases and the like? Those are far weaker than TRUFOS, yet not
>really IFOs. A few of those dreary reports could actually be
>something truly anomalous, but poorly perceived.

>I might call them borderline IFOs or BIFOS, but I don't want to
>muddy the waters even more. Instead, I just pass over them and
>index the cases that look like potential TRUFOS to me.

>The term TRUFOS doesn't bother. I just use it very sparingly, if
>at all.

At the beginning of my Flying Saucers ARE Real! lectures I point
out that all flying saucers are UFOs, but that only some UFOs are
flying saucers. My interest is in them not the IFOs or "not
enough data" cases.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 08:01:42 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:48:56 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 23:02:05 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 15:03:41 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:30:51 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:41:22 -0500
>>>>Subject: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

John and patient and gentle Listfolk:

>>>The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that
>>>does not make what they see or believe is real. So I'm glad
>>>Jerry supports this psychosocial approach to ufology, which has
>>>been promoted by Magonia for so long.

>>This is, of course, precisely the response one would anticipate
>>from the clueless reductionist, and precisely the approach
>>Hufford and Dewan reject. Nice try, though.

>Jerry, I'm surprised that you think Hufford and Dewan would
>reject the concept that people might agree with them! I don't
>see what's cluelessly reductive about that.

>Dewan and Hufford argue for an "experience-centred approach." So
>does Magonia. There is not a word in the paragraph you quote
>which I or any of the Magonia team would argue with.

This is so silly and disingenuous - and so characteristic of the
way Magonia responds to academics who reject approaches like
theirs (i.e., "We agree with them!", or perhaps more to the
point: "They agree with us!") - that I am tempted to pass it
over in silence:

Nonetheless, sigh....

In the real world, Magonia represents an approach opposite
Hufford's and Dewan's. It was Hufford who coined the witty
phrase "tradition of disbelief" - a play on the somewhat
condescending academic term "tradition of belief" referring to
people's experiences of and convictions about the anomalous,
paranormal, or supernatural - to describe the sort of approach
that debunkers take. Magonia writers, in their magazine and on
this List, have frequently expressed their dismal view of
dissenters from disbelief dicta. Pick your unflattering noun,
adjective, or adverb, and it's been thrown our way, well more
than once. If you don't sign on to the disbelief tradition,

folks, consider yourselves toast. Or at least a major-league fool.

In the tradition of disbelief, experiences of the anomalous are implicitly presumed to be based in error, misperception, or mental state or disorder, explicable (or potentially so) to the wiser eye of the skeptic and posing no consequential threat to conventional existing academic belief. For examples of how this works, see any issue of Magonia or innumerable Updates postings from its minions. For devastating criticism of such, see David J. Hufford's *The Terror That Comes in the Night* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983, still in print) or his paper "Traditions of Disbelief," *New York Folklore Quarterly* 8, 3&4, Winter 1982.

All you and Watson are saying in effect is that most anomalous testimony is not conscious fiction, an easy and cheap concession of no relevance or interest to the current discussion. You have misread Hufford in precisely the way Hufford complains other disbelief traditionalists have misread him: they and you fail to grasp just how radical and subversive an experience-centered approach can be - how it leaves, for example, aspects of the Old Hag experience, Hufford's principal case in point, a profound challenge to current knowledge. Such an approach opens the door to possibilities that - judging from the sheer amount of contrary rhetorical wind expelled from its august quarters - the Sceptics Club at the Pelican Pub very much wants shut.

In the first quoted paragraph above, Nigel Watson - whose view, amusingly, you're endorsing - expresses with admirable brevity the operating principle of the disbelief tradition. The uncharitable would charge that you're trying to have it both ways. Others would complain of a shameless opportunism. Being more kind-hearted, I'll simply chalk it down to incoherence.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 14:33:06 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:51:00 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:58:04 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02:28 -0300
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Don and List

>When Stan Friedman visited the S.F. Bay Area a few years back,
>Reuben Uriate, Northern California MUFON director, demonstrated
>for us that many portions of your referenced "documentary" were
>flagrantly hoaxed.

>This program was shown on the TNT network and was supposed to
>show, among other things, films of Russian jet interceptors
>encounters with UFOs.

>What they really did was take a previous TNT documentary on
>American fighter planes and then used computer graphics to
>insert the supposed-UFOs.

>He showed the clips from the original documentary followed
>immediately by the "UFO" clips. No doubt about it. The UFOs were
>computer generated and they hoped the average viewer wouldn't
>know a Russian MIG from a U.S. fighter.

>The other part of this 'documentary' was supposedly of a Russian
>UFO crash and alien autopsy. This too turned out to be hoaxed.

>As I remember, one proof of this was that the rifles of the
>military unit guarding the 'saucer' were anachronistic, being of
>recent vintage instead of dating to the year of the supposed
>crash.

>The whole thing was a sham from start to finish. Yes, it was
>narrated by Roger Moore. Shame on him and TNT for helping to
>perpetrate this slimy fraud on the public.

Great news. Roger Moore once did a hard-hitting TV series in the
UK called The Saint. The closing scenes always showed a halo
over his head. Now we know he was the exact opposite. Perhaps he
ought to be divested of his knighthood for perpetrating this
phony UFO documentary. Ha!

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:35:24 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:52:50 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:54:18 EDT
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>The Current Situation: If We Can Defend Humanity, Let's Do So

<snip>

>>If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and
>>exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it.
>>What say ye all?

<snip>

>We can't, or won't, save humanity from drunk drivers. Nor do we
>save humanity from people who don't wash their hands enough
>which must kill millions each year. I could go on with a list of
>things to save humanity from first:

- >Clumsy people
- >Governments
- >Mosquitoes
- >Spousal Abusers
- >Neighbors
- >Parents
- >Offspring
- >Slippery floors
- >Bad drivers

<snip>

>So they're interbreeding with us. Like we're doing a better job?

<snip>

>Let's hope that they're just not making a better human, but
>instead are working on making a better person.

Thanks for your reply Greg!

I admit that for the most part humanity lumbers along, unaware of their knuckles dragging in the dust. But sooner or later, even high crimes are made public, at least, and dealt with. I know that frustration can sometimes lead to fatalism. But that defeatism may only be a result of not knowing what else to do.

This platform for peer review can change that, if only by pointing out ideas untried yet personally. With all our faults, I still choose humanity, as it is. So I'm still asking for ways to defend humanity.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:31:01 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 11:04:01 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:10 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine. I
>>recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in 1965 of
>>his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of them. You
>>can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are necessary to
>>correctly view the stereo effect):

>><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

>><snip>

>>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think. Give
>>me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we looking at a
>>small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a big thing flying
>>over a field?

>The problem with stereo photography is that pictures from the
>"left and right cameras" have to be taken simultaneously unless
>one can be positive that the object of interest is stationary.
>If it is known to be stationary then one can use a single camera
>at two locations separated by several inches or more and get
>stereo. Even if you had found a "nice big saucer" many yards
>away it would not be proof because you couldn't prove that he
>had not faked the parallax by moving the object a small distance
>sideways between exposures.

One of the advantages in this particular case is that the
movement pattern (vector) of photographer can be determined
relative to the car (assuming the car hasn't been moved). We can
also determine the movement of the object relative to the
surrounding scenery (free float the stereoimages, ignore the car
position, align only to the scenery and see which way the object
went). Given that there was a time lapse in this case, if the
the movement direction of the object (as reported) conflicts
with the that determined by using the stereoimages, it could
provide evidence (for or against) the manner in which these
photographs were taken. Thus take the disadvantages and turn
them into advantages using all the facts that might be available
in this particular case.

Viktor Golubik

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:07:46 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 11:06:52 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 22:34:12 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:30:51 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:41:22 -0500
>>>Subject: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>><snip>

>>>Thus, I am pleased to draw your attention to an excellent paper
>>>in the current (119: 184-202, Spring 2006) issue of the
>>>venerable Journal of American Folklore: William J. Dewan's 'A
>>>Saucerful of Secrets': An Interdisciplinary Analysis of UFO
>>>Experiences.

>><snip>

>>>Consequently, Dewan supports the view that "UFO encounters are
>>>often based on real, sometimes bizarre experiences that both
>>>inform and are formed by existing cultural traditions and mental
>>>schemas." Like Hufford, he argues for an "experience-centered
>>>approach" which listens to and takes witness testimony
>>>seriously, then tracks its fallout in culture and society as
>>>well as in personal interpretation as experiencers struggle to
>>>understand what they have seen or undergone and to put it into a
>>>framework that makes sense to them.

>>The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that does
>>not make what they see or believe is real. So I'm glad Jerry
>>supports this psychosocial approach to ufology, which has been
>>promoted by Magonia for so long.

>This is a spectacular missing of the point on so many levels
>that my mind swims at the prospect of trying to repair the
>disconnect between Jerry Clarke's meaning and your burlesque.

>Thankfully I'm sure Jerry will do that himself. This is the sort
>of shallow literalism that does the "psychosocial approach" no
>favours.

Hi,

I've obviously hit a nerve considering the insults directed
towards my good self.

What is wrong with using psychology and sociology for the study
of UFO 'experiencers'?

I will actually read the report and see if my tiny pelican brain
can become coherent and on-message.

Oh, and note I have not insulted anyone here.

Nigel

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Smith

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:40:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 11:09:37 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Smith

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:35:24 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:54:18 EDT
>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>>If there is a way to defend against the systematic invasion and
>>>exploitation of human beings by aliens, let's find it and use it.
>>>What say ye all?

>>We can't, or won't, save humanity from drunk drivers. Nor do we
>>save humanity from people who don't wash their hands enough
>>which must kill millions each year. I could go on with a list of
>>things to save humanity from first.....

>This platform for peer review can change that, if only by
>pointing out ideas untried yet personally. With all our faults,
>I still choose humanity, as it is. So I'm still asking for ways
>to defend humanity.

I agree with Greg that there are many other things to worry
about fixing before alien invasions.

There are two levels of "defense" you are talking about. One,
defense against alien spacecraft (assuming they exist). Two,
defense against alien abduction (assuming it exists).

The first one is really the job of the government since they
have the level of resources adequate to even hope to stop such
objects. Building Star Wars-like weapons systems typical for
missile defense is not a home brew sort of thing. If they can't
figure out a way to stop them, then average folk surely have no
hope.

If they do have methods to stop such objects, they clearly have
not used them adequately to stop UFO sightings since these are
still going on. This implies that either they accept UFO
intrusions or are saving the methods for some future time (not
giving time to adapt to defenses).

Really, there seems little hope of defense against such advanced
objects (if they exist) from our puny technology.

Even if some whiz-kid type folk felt they could build a home
brew CO2 laser or electropulse weapon against UFOs, they still
run a terrible risk that they would be attacking some object
that is "one of ours". Unless they are able to uniquely identify
the target at an enemy intruder, they might as well not shoot.
This requires adequate instrumented data to determine the alien
spacecraft signature (as opposed to prosaic signatures of

natural or terrestrial vehicles).

For the second class of defense (against abductions), it seems highly justified that individuals do something for themselves about this. Just as one may shoot a human intruder breaking and entering one's home (at least in most states) in self defense, one may do the same for "alien" intrusion. Based on many remarks by abductees, it does not seem easy to either detect or stop such intrusions. It would seem that with enough sensors (motion, IR, sound, EMF) and video cameras, then the abductee should be able to detect the event and take action. Since this has not been the case, we must assume that some advanced method (mind reading, time manipulation, etc) is being used which cannot be defended against by humans. The first step needs to be some sort of detection device (EMF?) to determine if the event is likely to happen. After this, then perhaps defensive countermeasures could be created.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 11:07:53 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:29:22 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:53:32 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 15:08:10 -0400
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Even if you had found a "nice big saucer" many yards
>>away it would not be proof because you couldn't prove that he
>>had not faked the parallax by moving the object a small distance
>>sideways between exposures.

>Completely true. But just think of what that would involve.
>According to the way Heflin describes the sequence in which he
>took the photo, the saucer was first photographed as it hovered
>above the left side of the road in front of the truck. It then
>moved perpendicular to the road and into the field on the right
>side of the truck. The next two photos (the ones I constructed
>the stereo image from) were taken out the passenger side window,
>with the front of the truck being to the left. You can see the
>rest of the truck in the side view mirror.

>While the saucer tilted from photo #2 (right eye, top saucer) to
>photo #3 (left eye, bottom saucer), the top part of the saucer
>didn't change in size as would be expected if it continued its
>flight path away from the truck and shrank in perspective. The
>top part of the saucer matches between the two photos quite
>well, so if it did change its flight path it would have to do so
>to run parallel with the horizontal change in the lens positions
>of the camera (and the road). Not only would it have to make an
>almost 90 degree change from photo #1 to photo #2 (right eye),
>it would also have to stay at exactly the same height, also, or
>the top half of the saucer images wouldn't align at all.

>So it has to change course 90 degrees, and stay at exactly the
>same altitude and distance from the truck while Heflin took
>photos #2 and #3 for it to appear to be at a different distance
>and different size. That would be awfully convenient, don't you
>think? That it would line up just perfectly so that when it was
>seen in stereo it would appear to be small and up close, rather
>than big and distant? Maybe a little too convenient.

>Maybe this will help. Here's a link to cross-eye stereo pair
>that you can "free view" and see in 3-D without the need for the
>red and blue glasses (particularly if you're familiar with
>viewing stereo images this way, like I am):

><http://img50.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinstereo5ih.jpg>

>If the saucer continued to move on its apparent flight path,
>which in these photos would be left to right, then it wouldn't
>appear closer, it would actually appear farther away. In the
>red-blue image the blue saucer would be separated more from the
>red saucer, like the blue clump of trees is separated from the
>red clump in the distance. In that case, rather than appearing
>smaller and closer, it would appear further away and huge. See

>what I mean?

>So that means not only would the saucer have to change the angle
>of its flight path, it would also have to reverse direction
>between photos #2 and #3 for it to appear smaller and closer.
>All the while remaining at the same altitude and distance from
>the truck.

>So, yes, movement of the saucer would have an effect on its
>relative size and distance. If it stopped, changed its direction
>and flew backwards while flying at the same height and distance
>from the truck, parallel to the two lens positions. Or it could
>be just what the stereo pair shows, that it's probably a small
>thing, dangling several feet away from the top
>of the truck.

>And why is Heflin sitting in the driver's seat while taking
>photos out the passenger side window, anyway? You'd think he
>might want to scoot over and poke his head out or something.
>Maybe get a little better shot. But that might reveal his
>fishing pole. Just speculation.

The first key to demonstrating and understanding the 3D
proposition raised, is to make two alignments which I've
specified in my post and e-mails yet to be placed _or, have
already been placed?

Hopefully, this will make it clearer to understand for everyone.

We first want to know how the photographer inside the car has
moved inside the car_right? Lets' say we might want to
compensate for his movement in some more complex calculation _so
it's something you want to discover and know about.

To do this, you have to visually overlap the window frame in the
two images. And, when you do this, to our surprise, the objects
in the two frames coincide perfectly overlapping. Its as though
the photographer has rotated around a stationary object close
by. Just imagine a dot painted on a rolled up window _ no mater
where you move inside the car, the dot on the window will still
maintain the same spacing around it relative to the sides of the
window frame. Imagine doing that with a moving object instead_
very difficult trying to make sure the object stays, let's say
for simplicity sakes, in the center of the window frame_but
that's exactly what happens here_amazing dexterity to say the
least! So, in other words, he would have had to compensate
perfectly for the movement of the object by pure luck! Not
Impossible but still quite possibly a very interesting
revelation.

Next we want to know how the object has moved relative to the
ground_ a far away fixed point at the horizon.

So, the second key to this is to align the two photographs to
the far away scenery and forget about the framing of the window.
In that case we want to see how the UFO has moved relative to a
fixed point real far away. When you align the two images with
the far away background, a displacement is observed in the
object not observed in the original alignment we had done
previously. Well, that's exactly what would happen if he moved
around in the car with a dot painted on the window _right? The
dot would have move relative to the background! So this is still
consistent with the first alignment proposition above.

However, this may also just prove the object has in fact really
moved and is consistent with the witness testimony. If, however,
the object was shown to move backward as compared to his
accounting it would be further proof of a fraud. In that case,
we need to know which photograph was taken first and which was
second.

In conclusion, if the exact distance the photographer has moved
in the car can be calculated, it might be exactly that which is
observed with the dot (object) moving relative to the background
using the window plane as your point of rotation which may be
consistent with the proposition proposed and a second way to
lend credibility to the proposal of a fake.

And, yes, it's still quite possible he photographed a real or
large fake UFO that is just thrown up there for fun:) Or, is it
a just a tiny UFO near the window's plane with little

tiny aliens inside?

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 12:39:04 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:42:56 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 21:46:46 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02:28 -0300
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>>While you are on the subject of British TV, can you offer any
>>knowledge about the producers of this documentary [See URL
>>below]. Perhaps Mantour Productions-but I doubt it. The URL was
>>posted by Greg Boone. Maybe you have seen this documentary
>>yourself? It sounds like Roger Moore's voice doing the voice
>>over.

>><http://youtube.com/watch?v=Z3CdTdrKfGY&search=flying%20saucer>

>Don,

>Although your question was addressed to CDA, I assume neither of
>you will mind if I provide some information.

>The clip at the URL you provided is extracted from a TV
>documentary, presented by Roger Moore entitled "The Secret KGB
>UFO Files".

<snip>

Hi Issac,

Thanks for the detailed information re production, the URLs and
clips etc.

There is some small possibility that I have seen the documentary
in question, but if so I must have missed that clip. The clip in
question seems to start a bit too far into the "action" to my
liking but that might have to do with the limited frames
copyright non-infringement law You Tube [Broadcast Yourself] was
adhering to.

I don't know much about the rest of the documentary but the clip
itself was interesting. That's where my focus lies. Not having
seen or remembered the documentary I can't assign "blame" but
there's bad stuff produced on both sides of the Atlantic.

Working back from some of the contact information you've
provided, I'll see if I can find out more about the clip.
getting producers/directors to respond once they've finished
with you is difficult enough but if they've never worked with
you it's even tougher.

Thanks again for the information.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 12:59:58 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:57:12 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 16:58:04 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02:28 -0300
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 21:30:19 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin >Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing
>>>>them. This came out during a UK ITV show aired in May 1968.
>>>>Yet I have never seen any other mention of this, either by
>>>>believers in the photos or by skeptics. If British TV can
>>>>discover this titbit of info, why couldn't knowledgeable UFO
>>>>investigators?

>>While you are on the subject of British TV, can you offer any
>>knowledge about the producers of this documentary [See URL
>>below]. Perhaps Mantour Productions-but I doubt it. The URL was
>>posted by Greg Boone. Maybe you have seen this documentary
>>yourself? It sounds like Roger Moore's voice doing the voice
>>over.

>><http://youtube.com/watch?v=Z3CdTdrKfGY&search=flying%20saucer>

>When Stan Friedman visited the S.F. Bay Area a few years back,
>Reuben Uriate, Northern California MUFON director, demonstrated
>for us that many portions of your referenced "documentary" were
>flagrantly hoaxed.

>This program was shown on the TNT network and was supposed to
>show, among other things, films of Russian jet interceptors
>encounters with UFOs.

>What they really did was take a previous TNT documentary on
>American fighter planes and then used computer graphics to
>insert the supposed-UFOs.

>He showed the clips from the original documentary followed
>immediately by the "UFO" clips. No doubt about it. The UFOs were
>computer generated and they hoped the average viewer wouldn't
>know a Russian MIG from a U.S. fighter.

>The other part of this 'documentary' was supposedly of a Russian
>UFO crash and alien autopsy. This too turned out to be hoaxed.

>As I remember, one proof of this was that the rifles of the
>military unit guarding the 'saucer' were anachronistic, being of

>recent vintage instead of dating to the year of the supposed
>crash.

>The whole thing was a sham from start to finish. Yes, it was
>narrated by Roger Moore. Shame on him and TNT for helping to
>perpetrate this slimy fraud on the public.

Hi Dave,

Thanks. It looks like you will be saving me some time.

I know nothing about the documentary. All I had was the little
clip from "You Tube" provided by Greg Boone.

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=Z3CdTdrKfGY&search=flying%20saucer>

The plane in question from that clip is an F-16, supposedly
photographed from some Russian aircraft. But it could be a clip
from anywhere with the UFO generated.

As for the documentary itself, there seem to be more than a few
of these shames produced of late.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

From: Tom Horn <tomhorn.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:13:18 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:02:22 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 18:51:55 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 13:17:16 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>>Actually, the guy's name has been publicly bandied about the Net
>>for the last decade (so "nah, nah" back at you).

>>According to my notes, he is Dick D'Amato, who was (is?) an aide
>>to Sen. Robert Byrd. Dr. Marcel already disclosed his name back
>>around 1995 in an address at Helena, Montana.

>>Marcel said he met D'Amato in Washington, D.C. in 1991. D'Amato
>>claimed to be affiliated with the National Security Council and
>>a Security Specialist for Sen. Byrd of the Senate Intelligence
>>Committee.

>>D'Amato told him there was a saucer crash and aliens were
>>aboard, that a powerful, unknown "black arm" of the government
>>was keeping it secret and spending huge sums of money illegally,
>>and the NSC doesn't know where the wreckage was.

>>Again, according to my old notes, Stanton Friedman confirmed
>>also being at this meeting and expressed surprise that Marcel
>>would publicly reveal this information.

><snip>

>I can certainly confirm that it was Dick D'Amato. Senator Byrd
>came in to the office while I was there, so there was no reason
>to think something untowards was going on.

>Thanks to David for bringing up the name which was temporarily
>lost to my ancient memory.

Because the "mysterious" figure, as I phrased it, was later
identified, I added Dick D'Amato, an aide to Sen. Robert Byrd
to the editorial.

Tom

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:09:35 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:03:53 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 11:53:32 -0500 (CDT)
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

Tim

I said that a small model at the distance of the window would need to appear some 10% larger between #2 and #3 and that

>You make an interesting case. I bow to your more accurate measurement of the angular size; on my inferior images #3 appeared slightly (about 4%) smaller than #2.

I have now re-measured from enlarged images, using the ratio of "rim" diameter to "crown" diameter shown relatively clearly in #1 to calculate the appropriate values for #2 and #3, which only clearly show the crown and the rim respectively. This result shows I was wrong.

As near as I can judge the diameter of image #3 is about 7% larger than #2, which is quite close to what would be expected for the reduced distance between the lens and a small stationary model suspended from the top of the window. So this does after all tend to support your stereo argument for a hoax.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:06:26 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 00:36:36 EDT
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Also, the relative size of the
>>mirror changes too... which (seemingly?) lends credence to that
>>person's shift in response to the change of the object being
>>photographed. I'm not sure which image is first in the sequence
>>or whether the size of each image has been adjusted somewhat...
>>if so, please let us know before we settle on what is actually
>>taking place and in what order.

>There may be no certain way to know the order of the Heflin
>photos since the original polaroids are lost, but I believe the

In one of the little twists in the Heflin case, the three photos
Heflin said were taken by "NORAD" representatives showed up in
his mailbox in 1993 immediately after he received a phone call
telling him to check his mail. Thus the originals are all back
and have been reanalyzed. For a very complete writeup of the
Heflin case with all four photos, see:

<http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

>order recalled by the witness was as given in the Condon report
>(plates 42-44 - profile through left part of front windshield in
>shot #1, oblique underside view through right side window in
>shot #2, profile view through right side window in shot #3) and
>as described by Hartmann from interviews with Heflin in 1967, 2
>years after the event.

According to the article, Heflin numbered the Polaroid prints by
hand afterwards based on his memory of the sequence in which he
took the shots.

>I have a few observations to make, based on the copies I have.
>These need to be checked on a good set of complete full-frame
>images with known consistent scaling. If possible.

>The above picture order suggests the camera shifting back or to
>the right as the witness leans closer to the side window between
>#2 and #3. The camera has clearly moved slightly towards the
>mirror. The angular size of the mirror increases, the parallax
>of the mirror and its mounting changes, more of the bush and
>horizon is revealed behind the mirror and the reflection shifts
>to show an area of the truck side closer to the cab. This is
>consistent with the UFO ("UAP"!?) having turned back on itself,
>changing heading from about SE (between #1 and #2) to NE between

>#2 and #3, and Heflin leaning to his right to keep the object in
>view as it drifted to his left towards the post of the
>windshield.

That would be consistent with the photo details for the
distant object hypothesis.

>This is the course indicated in Hartmann's Fig.9. But it is
>arguably not quite as suggested in Heflin's Sept 1965 written
>NICAP statement, where he said that the object began to move off
>NE after #1 and before #2. On the other hand this would be even
>less consistent with reversing the order of #2 and #3 and could
>easily be just a question of interpretation.

I think a lot of the so-called inconsistencies used to try to
discredit Heflin (and many other witnesses) represent the usual
difficulties of trying to accurately recall exactly what
happened. Nobody tells a thoroughly repeatedly and consistent
story time after time (unless they've memorized it). Often times
a sincere witness tells it one way, then another. They may
simply have second thoughts or later remember a detail or two
that they failed to mention initially, so they bring it up
later, then get accused of inconsistency and embellishing, when
the intention was to be helpful and more thorough. In this
field, no good deed goes unpunished.

>The interesting thing whatever the order of #2 and #3 is the
>change of camera position and resulting parallax. The image
>shifts (I estimate this roughly from halftone images of the
>prints assuming constant scaling and based on Hartmann's
>statement of 2.4 degrees subtense for the UFO in #1) about 5.5 -
>6.0 degrees left in relation to the landscape background from #2
>to #3. This is the same direction in which the mirror shifts, by
>about 4.0 - 4.5 degrees. A stationary model at any distance
>greater than the mirror would shift against the landscape by
>_less_ than the mirror. So it can't be stationary and at a
>distance.

That's not correct. If it were a stationary model beyond the
mirror, it will still shift rightward relative to the mirror
in the rightmost view (photo #3). To see this, close your right
eye, and line up a finger from each hand with your left eye.
Have one finger behind the other by at least several inches and
have something in the more distant background also clearly
visible. The closer finger now represents the "mirror" and the
more distant finger the "model". Now close your left eye and
view the scene with your right eye. The more distant finger (the
"model") will shift right of the closer finger (the "mirror"). A
much larger shift to the right will be seen in the distant
background.

That's also what we see in the Heflin #2 (left) and #3 (right)
photos. A convenient reference point is the upper left corner of
the window. The "saucer" shifts right more than the mirror, so
if a stationary object, it definitely is further away than the
mirror.

If the "saucer" were stationary and closer than the mirror, then
the opposite would happen. It would shift leftward in switching
from left to right views. (In this case, the more distant finger
would be the "mirror" while the closer finger the "model.")

>The UFO shifts more than the mirror, so what about the
>possibility of a model closer than the mirror? The image appears
>about the same distance below the top edge of the window in both
>photographs, suggesting a model hung from the edge of the cab
>roof.

If it were a model and stationary, it would have to be suspended
beyond the mirror, not closer, for the reasons given above.

>Because the camera is closer to the window and to the
>model in #3 the angular distance from a suspended model to the
>windshield post on the left should increase between #2 and #3,
>which it does - by about 9%.

Although the Heflin right view is a little closer to the mirror,
this doesn't change the situation. To simulate with the eye
blink test, move the lined up fingers (lined up with the open
left eye) directly in front of the right eye. This will make the
fingers closer to the right eye. Shift viewing eyes and the more

distant finger (model) still jumps right of the closer finger (mirror).

>This probably underestimates the
>hypothetical change in the distance from lens to model because
>of the perspective: That is, the vanishing-point angle made by
>the line of the cab roof and the line of horizon scrub increases
>between #2 and #3, i.e. the downward slope of the roof line
>measured from the scrub line is steeper in #3 because of the
>change in perspective, so the distance from model to window post
>is foreshortened very slightly in #3, tending to reduce the
>separation on the photo. So allowing for this we should assume
>that a model suspended from the top of the window is some 10%
>nearer to the lens in #3 than in #2 and should subtend an angle
>some 10% larger. It is far from clear that this is the case. I
>would estimate rather a possible 4% reduction in angular size
>between #2 and #3.

I agree with this estimate. I place size difference (judging by the length of the bottom "saucer" rim at 3-5% (scaling the distant background features to equal size). Although you have the direction of your assumed model wrong, placing it beyond the mirror doesn't change the situation any. The model if stationary would still be closer to the right view (just as when the two fingers are moved directly in front of the right eye). Therefore, the model should be larger in the righthand view, whereas it is actually a little smaller. Of course, this still proves nothing. The model could have swung outward in #3 so that we see it nearly edge on instead of from underneath as in #2. Possibly this would account for all or part of the size difference (Interestingly, the same sort of situation presents itself in the Trent/McMinnville photos, in one photo seeing the bottom side and in the other it is a little smaller and seen nearly edge-on.).

Or Heflin could have moved his "fishing pole" suspending the model out a little bit (plus have a little swing to the model) to agree with his story of the object beginning to move away from him into the distance. It would take much more complete 3D modeling to see if this is viable. E.g., if the hypothetical model is simply swung away from the camera in #3, we'd check to see if the elevation angles and size differences are compatible with a swung model. This would require figuring out exactly where the camera is in both photos relative to the window, mirror, etc., and also making some assumptions about the suspension line. (Which, BTW, nobody has ever been able to find.)

>Another interesting point that has been raised is a possible
>anomaly of the apparent cloudy conditions in #4, the smoke ring
>photo(shades of Trindade?!).

Yes, and in some ways I think that is the most interesting of the four photos because it would have been almost impossible to fake. It is also thought by some, such as Robert Nathan of JPL who analyzed the photos back in the '60s, that the smoke ring may also be seen around, and partly obscuring, the upper part of the object in photos #1 & #2, visible as a dark band. I think this argues very powerfully against Heflin hoaxing the photos.

Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence of thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe 5 feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin thread indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye, e.g., would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

<snip>

>Note that Heflin's supervisor who was mobile a mile or two away
>testified to hearing the unusual type of radio interruption
>described by Heflin at the time of the event.

If I understand the article correctly, there were other highway department people in the area with radios and they also noticed radio disruption. This is also mentioned by Hartmann in the Condon Report. This again would have been impossible for Heflin to fake, but would be a classic case of UFO EM interference.

>There were some

>inconsistencies and possible embroideries in Heflin's later
>stories about mystery visitors etc, but i think this case is
>still an interesting one.

The article explains that Heflin had previously lent the photos to both the Air Force and Marines when they came to his door, and both returned the photos. But the mysterious "NORAD" people did not. The point is, Heflin apparently thought nothing of loaning out the photos again to military representatives fully expecting them to be promptly returned based on his previous experiences.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

'Alien Message' Sparks Tsunami Panic

From: **Mike Jamieson** <mike.jamieson.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 11:23:43 -0700
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:12:38 -0400
Subject: 'Alien Message' Sparks Tsunami Panic

Source: Aljazeera

<http://english.aljazeera.net>

Thursday 25 May 2006

'Alien message' Sparks Tsunami Panic
By Ahmed El Amraoui

A website warning of a tsunami has spread panic in Morocco, despite the government's assertion that the alert was merely rumour - and the dubious nature of its source.

The Ufological Research Centre said on its website last week that a tsunami could hit the Atlantic after a comet passes close to earth on Thursday, May 25.

Eric Julien, author of *La Science Des Extraterrestres* (Science of Aliens), claimed that the impact of a comet fragment would trigger powerful volcanoes in the Atlantic and generate a giant tsunami that would be destructive across the coasts of several countries, including Morocco.

Julien, who claimed to have received the information psychically, said that waves up to 200 metres high will reach coastlines of countries bordering the Atlantic.

The alert caused fear and panic among Moroccan citizens, though the Moroccan meteorological office dismissed it on Monday as insignificant.

The Moroccan news agency MAP quoted Mustafa Janah, the head of the Meteorological Office, as saying the comet would pass earth at a distance of about 10 million kilometres.

Citing the US space agency, Nasa, he ruled out any risk of a tsunami in the Atlantic Ocean.

Janah also said that "the Ufological Research Centre does not have technical means" to observe this kind of phenomenon.

But despite all the assurances, many Moroccan coastal residents have abandoned their homes and moved to higher ground, anxiously awaiting May 25.

Memories remain of the tsunami that hit Asia in 2004 and left up to 232,000 people dead or missing across large parts of the continent.

Less well known, however, is the track record of Eric Julien who, according to the Morocco Times, claimed in May 2004 to have been abducted by aliens who wanted to teach him to drive UFOs.

Aljazeera

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 14:34:44 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:14:59 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Robert Gates <rgates8254.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 20:23:11 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Stereo photography has always been kind of a hobby of mine.
>>I recently took 2 of the 4 photos taken by Rex Heflin in
>>1965 of his UFO encounter and constructed a 3-D photo out of
>>them. You can see the results here (red-blue 3-D glasses are
>>necessary to correctly view the stereo effect):

>><http://img90.imageshack.us/my.php?image=heflinrb3ew.jpg>

>>Please take a look at the image and tell me what you think.
>>Give me your expert opinions. Did I get it wrong? Are we
>>looking at a small thing hanging from a fishing pole, or a
>>big thing flying over a field?

>As I recall to shoot true stereo images you have to have two
>cameras in a fixed location that fire the shutter at the same
>exact time. Likewise the camera has to be in a fixed location.
>In the case of Heflin there was gap between photos (I recall he
>shot them with a Poloroid), plus he moved in the truck, meaning
>the photos were shot in different positions plus their is a time
>gap between them. Because of these issues, I suspect any stereo
>analysis (not the person doing it) would be of questionable
>results and questionable value.

<snip>

Hi Robert/Tim

No this isn't true at all. You can construct stereo images of the car's frame of reference with respect to the changed position of the driver and learn about his shift. And, if there is a time gap between the photos then directional information about the object can also be ascertained with respect to the ground_ which is actually very relevant to this case, especially if it contradicts the direction as reported by the observer. Because you can calculate and compensate for the drivers shift with this method you can also compensate for it mathematically.

As with this case, it turns out that the photographer may have exactly compensated for the speed and direction of the object such that the object maintains it's exact spot within the 'centerized' position of the window frame_this is either highly coincidental_ and the object is, therefore, more likely to be genuine_or evidence now points to a possible fraud. I hope this makes sense.

My only purpose here is to try to make it as clear as possible to all readers and not just talk over everyone's head which is boring and rhetorically misplaced.

One of the problems in communicating about this case is that not everyone can freely see the 3D effects without the aid of stereo glasses. If you want, I can explain how to do that without having to use stereo glasses and it is all really _very cool stuff!

Regards,

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Stephen Lovekin Is Not Brigadier General

From: Michael Gates <MichaelGates.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:41:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:30:33 -0400
Subject: Stephen Lovekin Is Not Brigadier General

[Non-Subscriber Post]

Hello,

I saw on your website information about someone named Lovekin who is in the North Carolina State Guard Association.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/feb/m26-003.shtml>

The North Carolina State Guard Association is not a military organization. It is a private group that wears military uniform in violation of United States Code Title 10, Section 771. The group has no connection with the North Carolina state government and has is not a State Defense Force and is not in line to become one. State Defense Forces are created by state governments and not chosen from private groups.

Stephen Lovekin is not Brigadier General. You have to be in the military to be a General. The North Carolina State Guard Association is not a military organization. So in other words, Lovekin is breaking the law when he wears the uniform of a general.

Lovekin is not recognized by the Governor of North Carolina and is not part of the North Carolina Military Department. He is a private citizen pretending to be a military officer.

The North Carolina State Guard Association (NCSGA) claims that the State Guard Association (SGAUS) gives it some kind of standing because it is a member. The SGAUS is a private organization and has no authority over any State Defense Force. The SGAUS cannot give any official standing to the NCSGA, as both are private groups and neither is military.

The statement "The SGAUS does not support private groups who may call themselves 'militia', but who are not officially recognized, unless the group is bona fide and seeking such official state recognition", is a joke.

SGAUS is a private business that has upset many members of legal State Defense Forces by supporting groups like the NCSGA. The statement about being "bona fide" is so ridiculous since no group can be "bona fide" and seeking official state recognition. State's do not give recognition to private groups, they must create military organizations from within the state's military department.

I have been a State Defense Force member for many years and know that anyone associated with groups like the North Carolina State Guard Association is a person not to be trusted, as they disrespect the military by wearing our uniforms and pretending to be one of us.

Thanks,

Michael Gates

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 20:47:10 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:33:51 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:07:46 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>I've obviously hit a nerve considering the insults directed
>towards my good self.

This sort of victim stancing might make you feel good, Nigel,
but to me all it illustrates is how bad you are at dealing with
criticism.

To wit:

>>The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that does
>>not make what they see or believe is real.

No competent folklorist would be expected to come up with this
howler. It's a basic empiricist tenet that the experience is
always real - it's the interpretation which is at issue.

>What is wrong with using psychology and sociology for the study
>of UFO 'experiencers'?

There's nothing wrong with using psychology and sociology.
What's wrong is abusing psychology and sociology.

>Oh, and note I have not insulted anyone here.

I think you've insulted quite a few people, Nigel, it's just
that you're quite unaware of doing it.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 16:53:32 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:31:53 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 11:16:51 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:21:53 +0200 (CEST)
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>There may be no certain way to know the order of the Heflin
>>>photos since the original polaroids are lost, but I believe the
>>>order recalled by the witness was as given in the Condon report
>>>(plates 42-44 - profile through left part of front windshield in
>>>shot #1, oblique underside view through right side window in
>>>shot #2, profile view through right side window in shot #3) and
>>>as described by Hartmann from interviews with Heflin in 1967, 2
>>>years after the event.

>><snip>

>>Am I correct in remembering having read that Ann Druffel was
>>planning to provide digital copies of the originals to
>>interested investigators?

>>Is Ms. Druffel the present custodian of the originals?

>It's my understanding that Heflin said the original Polaroids
>were taken away by the infamous "NORAD" visitor(s) in Sept 1965.
>Dick Hall will know more about this, but, I also recall that
>Heflin said they were returned to him anonymously in odd
>circumstances some time later and that he then sold them for a
>few hundred dollars when in need of cash. I wonder who to?

>I think a set of negatives were made professionally from what
>were believed to be the original Polaroids before they
>disappeared. If these are the "originals" you mention then it
>would certainly be interesting to see them.

Hi all,

Since I raised the relevance/importance of the order of the
sequence, I would also like to throw my request into the
ring.

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:26:47 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence of
>thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe 5
>feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin thread
>indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye, e.g.,
>would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

Most of you know that I am a professional photographer and technical expert on photography. Because I have had a commercial photography studio for many years, I have learned many of the tricks of the trade, and have written about many of them.

The trick to suspending a model so that the suspension "thread" doesn't show up in photos is to use very fine, nonreflective tungsten wire. I keep a couple of spools of it in two thicknesses on hand in my studio for just this purpose. When someone wants a photo of a product suspended in mid air, this is what I use. It is actually an old trick from the movie industry in Hollywood. A very light object such as a balsa wood model can be suspended from the thinnest of these wires and there will be no sign of the support wires in the photograph.

Now I am not arguing for or against these photos, I'm just saying that the absence of a visible support thread means nothing, particularly in Polaroid photos which do not have very high resolving power.

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:20:31 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:30:02 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Frison

>From: Carol Buckallew <clbuckallew.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 19:21:48 -0500
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 13:33:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>Bottom line: all of your conclusions (in your entire post)
>>are premature! Some, if not most, of your conclusions are
>>extremely premature and even sound paranoid!

>I strongly doubt you can conclude anything not having
>had any of these things happen to you,

First, it has happened to me. I've had three very unusual encounters with UFOs - one so close up, it's as close as you ever want to get to one. I've had several personal experiences with what is often called the 'abduction experience' and other paranormal-type events - some that scared the living breath out of me and left me shaking for quite some time.

So have very many members of my family

But, despite my numerous experiences and sightings, I don't - and haven't - concluded anything about them yet.

So please recognize this as your first assumption.

>setting in your arm chair deciding what is or isn't true.

Second, I don't sit in my armchair - I'm actively out investigating cases and have several on the go right now - including abduction cases - and have done so for a good number of years.

Third, I haven't made up my mind in any way, shape, or form as to what is or isn't going on with the UFO phenomenon - anyone who knows me knows I'm constantly saying the truth isn't determined yet. I say nobody knows the truth right now, so it's way off base for you to say I'm "deciding what is and isn't true."

So please recognize these as your second and third assumptions.

>What people see and experience and who's doing what is what's true,

Here is where you've made your fourth and biggest, most dangerous assumption - that things are as they appear or are as they've been interpreted.

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: [fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash? -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:45:30 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:36:21 -0400
Subject: Re: [fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash? -

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:32:49 -0700
>Subject: [fantasticreality] Re: Flight 77's Crash?

>I believe Kelly speaks for me in my attitude towards
>UFO seekers and conspiracy theorists. These are
>oxymorons. Those who report UFOs are more worthy
>of study and conspiracists are not theorists.

<snip>

Terry and Kelly, your points are valid. All the more reason to just take in facts and report them as is (good and bad)... study them from a skeptical vantage point, but don't throw out the baby with the bath water. Otherwise, you may never get a Nobel Prize with that attitude... realistic attitudes with a creative curiosity are the backbones of science.

Always stay on center ground and admit to your mistakes... but be mature and proactive if you venture beyond some of the acceptable variables. But, get past it, otherwise it's all retroactive and essentially worthless.

Also, we must all keep in mind that conspiracies are often confused for cover-ups. Which is worse? Cover-ups cover blunders, cover-ups hide facts, and cover-ups may hide the truth regardless of whether there was anything relavently truthful in the first place.

And, once a cover-up ensues, conspiracy-like behavior can easily be mistaken for the desperate acts of men organized to the drums of similar purpose.

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

P-47: UFOPOP Opens New Gallery

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:46:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:46:18 -0400
Subject: P-47: UFOPOP Opens New Gallery

From: Jim Klotz <fadedgiant.nul>
To: PROJECT-1947.nul
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 14:20:39 -0700
Subject: UFOPOP Opens New Gallery

UFOPOP Opens New Gallery

We are pleased to announce the opening of the Merchandising Gallery at UFOPOP.org

Whether or not flying saucers and extraterrestrial aliens are real, their images sell and have been in common use in the market place for many years.

Such images have been widely used to promote the sales of all manner of items saucer and alien related items and not. The Merchandising Gallery presents hundreds of examples of advertisements, promotional items, events, businesses and products that use flying saucer and alien imagery.

In UFOPOP's three other Galleries are over 3600 comics, books, and magazines with covers that include flying saucers and extraterrestrial aliens.

UFOPOP.org will appeal to your interest in UFOs or popular culture. We encourage you to visit often as new items are constantly being added.

<http://www.ufopop.org>

We hope you enjoy your visit.

Jim Klotz Les Treece-Sinclair
UFOPOP Co-Creators

Please forward to other E-Mail Lists and interested parties

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore -

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 22:45:49 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:49:09 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore -

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 20:47:10 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:07:46 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>I've obviously hit a nerve considering the insults directed
>>towards my good self.

<snip>

>>What is wrong with using psychology and sociology for the study
>>of UFO 'experiencers'?

<snip>

>I think you've insulted quite a few people, Nigel, it's just
>that you're quite unaware of doing it.

Hi Cathy,

Hope this doesn't offend anybody: "psychology and sociology" are
not sciences, just bunches of opinions collected (and
discarded) more or less at the whim of fashion.

One could "use" them to prove - & disprove - anything, and at the
same time.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 25](#)

Analysis Of Ellen Crystal's UFO Photos?

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:36:49 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:52:25 -0400
Subject: Analysis Of Ellen Crystal's UFO Photos?

I remember reading the late Dr. Ellen Crystal's book
Silent Invasion.

In it she had some remarkable photos in black and white
and in an issue of one of the UFO magazines there were
color versions.

Those photos weren't as sharply reproduced as can be
done now digitally so I was wondering if anyone had ever
gone and analyzed her photos, or if they've been reproduced
on a website or publication somewhere?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:24:53 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:24:53 -0400
Subject: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled

Source: BBC News - London, UK

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/5016068.stm>

Thursday, 25 May 2006

Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled

Researchers in the US and Britain have unveiled their blueprints for building a cloaking device.

So far, cloaking has been confined to science fiction; in Star Trek it is used to render spacecraft invisible.

Professor Sir John Pendry says a simple demonstration model that could work for radar might be possible within 18 months' time.

Two separate teams, including Professor Pendry's, have outlined ways to cloak objects in the journal Science.

These research papers present the maths required to verify that the concept could work. But developing an invisibility cloak is likely to pose significant challenges.

Both groups propose methods using the unusual properties of so-called "metamaterials" to build a cloak.

These metamaterials can be designed to induce a desired change in the direction of electromagnetic waves, such as light. This is done by tinkering with the nano-scale structure of the metamaterial, not by altering its chemistry.

Light flow

John Pendry's team suggest that by enveloping an object in a metamaterial cloak, light waves can be made to flow around the object in the same way that water would do so.

"Water behaves a little differently to light. If you put a pencil in water that's moving, the water naturally flows around the pencil. When it gets to the other side, the water closes up," Professor Pendry told the BBC.

"A little way downstream, you'd never know that you'd put a pencil in the water - it's flowing smoothly again.

"Light doesn't do that of course, it hits the pencil and scatters. So you want to put a coating around the pencil that allows light to flow around it like water, in a nice, curved way."

The work provides a mathematical "recipe" for bending light waves in such a way as to achieve a desired cloaking effect.

John Pendry, along with colleagues David Smith and David Schurig at Duke University in North Carolina, US, have been testing

suitable metamaterials for the device they plan to build.

This, Sir John explained, would consist of a sphere or cylinder wrapped in a sheath of metamaterial which could cloak it from radio waves.

"It's not tremendously fancy, but that for us would be quite an achievement," he told the BBC News website.

Professor Ulf Leonhardt, author of another cloaking paper in Science, described the effect for light as a "mirage".

"What you're trying to do is guide light around an object, but the art is to bend it such that it leaves the object in precisely the same way that it initially hits it. You have the illusion that there is nothing there," he told the BBC's Science in Action programme.

The work could have uses in military stealth technology - but engineers have not yet created the materials that could be used to cloak an aircraft or a tank, John Pendry explains. Professor Pendry's research has been supported by the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (Darpa).

Several other scientific teams have proposed ideas for cloaking devices. One theoretical paper proposed using a material known as a superlens to cancel out light being scattered from an object.

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

If It Quacks Like An Alien...

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:31:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:31:15 -0400
Subject: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

Source: The San Francisco Chronicle - California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/no25x>

Thursday, May 25, 2006

[Many images at site]

If It Quacks Like An Alien...

Unidentified facelike object peeks out from duck X-ray at wild bird rescue center

Peter Fimrite
Chronicle Staff Writer

As if crop circles weren't proof enough that extraterrestrials are among us, an alien has now been found in the stomach of a duck.

That, at least, is the conclusion reached by workers at the International Bird Rescue Research Center in Cordelia (Solano County) when they viewed an X-ray image they took of a sick mallard.

Right there, in the duck's ventriculus, or gizzard, is the shocking image of a grimacing, bald-headed being. How it got there, nobody knows, but when an autopsy was performed after the bird died of unrelated causes, the alien had mysteriously disappeared.

"We're a 35-year-old organization, and we've seen a lot of things - bullets, fish hooks - but this is the first time anything like this has shown up," said Jay Holcomb, executive director of the bird rescue center, which was founded in 1971 after an oil spill beneath the Golden Gate Bridge. "I don't know my aliens well, but it looks like one of those with the big eyes and the long fingers."

The drake in question arrived at the center Sunday with a broken wing. Workers do not know how the mallard was injured, but it was clearly weak and emaciated. In an effort to pinpoint the trouble, Maria Travers, the assistant rehabilitation manager, took a radiograph image of the bird. She was stunned by what she saw.

"Look at this," she shouted. "It's an alien head!"

Holcomb admitted the strange image could have been an odd arrangement of grain in the stomach, similar to the anomalous "Face on Mars" photographed by the Viking Lander when it orbited the Red Planet in 1976.

Ducks sometimes eat grain or even gravel and use it as a kind of internal grinding mechanism when they are digesting food, Holcomb explained. An autopsy Thursday revealed some grain in

the bird's stomach, but nothing else out of the ordinary.

Still, it is hard to deny the clarity of the alien image. No long fingers can be seen, but the face certainly has prominent brows, a small button nose that is slightly askew and a scary grimace.

Unusual characteristics are commonly on display among male mallards during the spring mating season, according to Travers. Their testicles, for instance, grow to three times the size of their brains, but they have never been known to sprout an alien head, she said.

"The bird rescue center is the national leader in oiled-wildlife response management. Wildlife experts and center volunteers have traveled the world helping more than 150 species of wild birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians, including many rare and endangered species, not just in oil spills, but after accidents, mass strandings and other life-threatening situations.

The nonprofit, which relies mostly on volunteers, struggles every year for the publicity and funding it needs to pay for its programs.

All of which may explain why the X-ray has caused such a stir at the center. One could not help but notice, given the apparent shock of the discovery, how quickly Holcomb and the center volunteers gathered themselves and put the image up for sale on eBay.

The one-of-a-kind X-ray, which measures 17 inches by 14 inches will be auctioned, along with a certificate of authenticity, starting Sunday, Holcomb said, with all the proceeds going to the rehabilitation center.

A T-shirt will also be put up for sale on CafePress.com, he admitted, embossed with the message, "In Space, No One Can Hear You Quack."

"The poor duck died, but maybe this will help other animals," Holcomb said.

It will not be the first time the center has used its unique work to make money. A pelican-adoption program was recently started in which volunteers get a certificate and are allowed to release a rehabilitated pelican for a \$500 fee. An adopt-a-duckling program has also been instituted, charging \$25 a bird.

The intelligent-being question has come up before in the Cordelia area, most notably when crop circles were discovered twice in the past three years on wheat fields near the rescue center.

"I don't think they found the aliens then," Holcomb said, "or else we would have seen it in the local paper."

Holcomb said it is important for workers at the center to maintain a sense of humor because the work can often be depressing. Besides the death of the alienated duck, he said, everybody was devastated recently when a great blue heron had to be euthanized after it was found suffering from a bullet wound.

Since the birds can't talk, he said, maybe an X-ray image, an alien and a bit of imagination can talk for them.

"People might think we're quacks," Holcomb admitted, pun apparently intended, "but maybe this is a message to the world that's coming through the duck, and we're just sharing it."

E-mail Peter Fimrite at pfimrite.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

SA UFO 'Probably A Small Meteorite Or Something'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:37:42 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:37:42 -0400
Subject: SA UFO 'Probably A Small Meteorite Or Something'

Source: Electronic Mail & Guardian - Johannesburg, South Africa

<http://tinyurl.com/n36nv>

23 May 2006

UFO 'Probably A Small Meteorite Or Something'

The search for an unidentified object that apparently crashed into the sea at Port Shepstone on Saturday will resume at the weekend as there were no bodies to search for, the National Sea Rescue Institute said on Tuesday.

"It is unlikely that we will go out to search before the weekend. The NSRI's core business is rescuing people and here there is no loss of life involved," said NSRI Shelley Beach Station Commander Eddie Noyons.

The search for the unidentified object began on Saturday after witnesses reported that an object, possibly an aircraft, had crashed into the sea behind the breaker line off-shore of the Port Shepstone High School.

Police, rescue craft and a fixed wing aircraft were alerted to the scene to investigate.

"Following a full-scale search of the area covering 12 square nautical miles nothing had been found.

"There are no reports of activity in the area that may be related to this incident and there are no aircraft reported to be overdue or missing," said Noyons.

He said numerous witnesses -- including teachers and pupils attending a sports event at the high school, and other bystanders including local fishermen -- were convinced they had seen an aircraft go into the water, including seeing smoke and a water plume.

Interviews with the witnesses revealed that some also reported seeing flames.

"Some reported seeing something, an unidentified object, splash into the sea causing a ripple effect of waves," Noyons said.

Due to the number of witnesses with similar reports, it was presumed that weather activity might have given the impression of something falling into the sea.

Noyons said rescue workers were unable to find oil slicks, petrol spillage or any signs or wreckage during the search on Saturday.

"We are not sure what it was as we are still unaware of any missing aircraft, but will continue the search at the weekend. It's probably a small meteorite or something. The weekend will

be a nice time for diving," said Noyons. - Sapa

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:11:18 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:43:04 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:38:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>>truth).

>Eugene the book isn't finished yet. The story is not a new one.
>I was also interviewed at the Capitol Location as was Walter
>Haut. Let's not jump to conclusions. There was a conference of
>Roswell-related people across from DC sponsored by the Fund.

Stan:

I know of the conference. I also heard through the grapevine
that you were interviewed too.

I just don't see how putting this (Mr. X) in a book about
Roswell contributes to making things any clearer, considering
the circus Roswell has become. That's if that's what Jesse is
doing. To me, Mr. X is of no value in determining the truth
about Roswell.

Rarely can what these type of guys say ever be tracked down or
verified, provided, of course, they say anything interesting at
all.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:12:02 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:45:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 18:56:11 +0000
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>>truth).

>He is an aide
>to a senior Member of Congress who happens to believe in UFOs
>(or is a UFO nut as some would categorize him).

>Aides like this guy often pretend to be "in the know" about
>important government matters. Obviously he was fishing for
>information from Marcel and trying to impress him.

Dick:

If it was not apparent, my criticism and skepticism was directed
more towards the so-called 'Mr. X' and not Jesse Marcel.

However, that does not mean that I don't consider Jesse to be
above wanting his book to sell and adding things for that
effect. Or above wanting to vindicate his father. Or just wrong
about what he believes.

I'm sure Jesse is one of the straightest people around from all
I've heard of him. But I still consider the possible motives of
even really nice people when I'm in doubt about the truth of
anything. And I question even more - a lot more - when someone
has a book to promote around what they're saying. I don't mean
to be unfair to him. Just very cautious.

And, to be sure, I've even known some very straight people (or
at least gave the impression for two forevers) that they were
straight up, and they weren't above telling 'little white lies.'

As to Mr. X, from where I stand, he is a dubious element. I
can't see him being of any benefit to the case and wish Jesse
hadn't given him the significance he did in the interview
posted.

To me, it doesn't bode well for the book and I'm very skeptical
regarding Mr. X. - although I didn't intend to imply I doubt his
existence. I was referring generally to these mysterious
government insiders, or any insiders, in that they often can't
be tracked down (such as when someone says he heard it from an
'unnamed general) or (when their identities are known) what they
say is usually impossible to verify.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:12:22 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:47:21 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Tom Horn <tomhorn.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 09:23:42 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>>truth).

>Just for the record, Jesse did not give the person he met at the
>Capital building the name Mr. "X", I did, because I needed
>something to refer to besides redundantly saying "the source".

>Secondly, Stanton Friedman verified to me that not only did this
>meeting happen but that Stanton met similarly.

Tom:

Yes, I know where the name Mr. X came from - read my previous
post again and you'll see I wrote "given the name" instead of
"using the name." I also think "the source" is just as bad. Why
not use his actual name?

These types of scenarios are not proper.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:14:06 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:50:30 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:40:40 -0400
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>>truth).

>The trip to Washington that Jesse took was fairly well known at
>the time and I'm surprised you don't remember it. If memory
>serves, this was part of Kent Jeffries' effort to dig into the
>Roswell event. Unfortunately, I don't believe the hypnotic
>regression provided any new details.

>Does Mr. X exist? I can say that people are fairly strange at
>times in DC and if I see Jesse at an event I'll probably ask for
>a description of the event.

Steve:

I do remember it! And I'm not surprised the hypnotic
regression panned out the way it did - it's not a good tool in
this type of case.

I wasn't alluding to whether he exists or not - I was always
fairly sure he did - just voicing my skepticism over the methods
used and the implications made - and the fact that Jesse or
anyone else would make a big deal out of Mr. X. I did not
include much of the interview in my reply (post) and I'm even
skeptical we should make a big deal out of Jesse's opinions
regarding the materials he saw - in other words, take his good
word on it.

I make no blinds over the fact that I don't believe in the MJ-12
documents, cosmic watergates, or that I don't believe in the
majority of so-called UFO crashes. I also don't hide that I
doubt Roswell. I concede there might be something to Roswell.
But even if a crash occurred and non-human bodies recovered then
nothing yet proves them ET.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Tim Shell** <tshell.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:25:59 -0500 (CDT)
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:52:13 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>The model could have swung outward in #3 so that
>we see it nearly edge on instead of from underneath as in #2.
>Possibly this would account for all or part of the size
>difference (Interestingly, the same sort of situation presents
>itself in the Trent/McMinnville photos, in one photo seeing the
>bottom side and in the other it is a little smaller and seen
>nearly edge-on.).

So far, my 3-D construction of the McMinnville photos has been somewhat fruitful, although the lens separation is so wide it's like looking at the scene as if you were the size of King Kong. Also, the object in those photos wasn't being nearly as cooperative as in the Heflin photos, and appears to have moved quite a bit between photos.

I'll post my results on my fiddling with these when I think I have something viewable. If nothing else, it will allow an interesting (to me, anyway) comparison/constrast with the Heflin photos.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:20:13 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:53:59 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:40:14 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 06:35:24 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

<snip>

>>This platform for peer review can change that, if only by
>>pointing out ideas untried yet personally. With all our faults,
>>I still choose humanity, as it is. So I'm still asking for ways
>>to defend humanity.

<snip>

>There are two levels of "defense" you are talking about. One,
>defense against alien spacecraft (assuming they exist). Two,
>defense against alien abduction (assuming it exists).
>The first one is really the job of the government since they
>have the level of resources adequate to even hope to stop such
>objects. Building Star Wars-like weapons systems typical for
>missile defense is not a home brew sort of thing. If they can't
>figure out a way to stop them, then average folk surely have no
>hope.

<snip>

>For the second class of defense (against abductions), it seems
>highly justified that individuals do something for themselves
>about this. Just as one may shoot a human intruder breaking and
>entering one's home (at least in most states) in self defense,
>one may do the same for "alien" intrusion. Based on many remarks
>by abductees, it does not seem easy to either detect or stop
>such intrusions. It would seem that with enough sensors (motion,
>IR, sound, EMF) and video cameras, then the abductee should be
>able to detect the event and take action. Since this has not
>been the case, we must assume that some advanced method (mind
>reading, time manipulation, etc) is being used which cannot be
>defended against by humans. The first step needs to be some sort
>of detection device (EMF?) to determine if the event is likely
>to happen. After this, then perhaps defensive
>countermeasures could be created.

Thanks James! I'm actually looking for something else to defend
against attacks on individuals. Dr. Jacobs suggests looking into
exposure of the abduction phenomenon, mostly by getting the word
out. I think that would be a good start. But I'm hoping for
something we humans may have, some innate human quality or
skill, which could be used to defend against the individual
attacks. Let's start with the goal of stopping the abductions,
if we can.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Boone

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 21:47:13 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:56:13 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Boone

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>The Current Situation: If We Can Defend Humanity, Let's Do So

>There is much credible scientific research published with
>accurately deduced conclusions. I list the following, not
>because they are the only ones worth considering, but because
>they are reliable, concisely expressed, and made freely
>available for public review. These also make it easy for someone
>like me to consolidate into a consistent whole.

Well I feel a lot better!

This thread just rekindled so much frustration that I had a
cognition as to why it's so difficult to get people to listen to
the fantastic, to heed warning without proof.

As usual when one has tossed one's hands up in the air one can
turn to the old tomes and find a story that illustrates any
problem. For me that story was in the scriptures. The story
contained a character named:

Noah.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 00:12:40 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:58:19 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence of
>>thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe 5
>>feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin thread
>>indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye, e.g.,
>>would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

>Most of you know that I am a professional photographer and
>technical expert on photography. Because I have had a commercial
>photography studio for many years, I have learned many of the
>tricks of the trade, and have written about many of them.

>The trick to suspending a model so that the suspension "thread"
>doesn't show up in photos is to use very fine, nonreflective
>tungsten wire. I keep a couple of spools of it in two
>thicknesses on hand in my studio for just this purpose. When
>someone wants a photo of a product suspended in mid air, this is
>what I use. It is actually an old trick from the movie industry
>in Hollywood. A very light object such as a balsa wood model can
>be suspended from the thinnest of these wires and there will be
>no sign of the support wires in the photograph.

>Now I am not arguing for or against these photos, I'm just
>saying that the absence of a visible support thread means
>nothing, particularly in Polaroid photos which do not have very
>high resolving power.

>Bob Shell

Hi Bob,

I was going to go to some site and find a copy of one of these
Heflin photos and do a blow-op, etc. to look for just that
support cable. You've saved me the time. I wondered about
Polaroid res as well.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 00:55:36 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 07:00:15 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 22:45:49 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>Hope this doesn't offend anybody: "psychology and sociology"
>are not sciences, just bunches of opinions collected (and
>discarded) more or less at the whim of fashion.

>One could "use" them to prove - & disprove - anything, and at
>the same time.

This isn't offensive. But it's more than a little silly. I'd love to see Ray give five or six examples of serious sociological work that fits his description.

In my own day job, I write a lot about the future of classical music, and also serve as a consultant to some large classical music organizations. (Major orchestras, and the like.) In order to do this work, I need very solid sociological data. For instance, is the classical music audience shrinking, as many people worry that it might be? Is it growing older? Will the present younger generation take an interest in classical music when they grow older, as their parents' generation did?

In trying to figure these things out, I've shared data with a sociologist at Princeton University, and exchanged ideas with him a lot. His approach is exactly the opposite of what Ray imagines sociology is like. He's about the last person I know who'd venture a wild opinion about anything in his field. He won't accept anything that's not supported by solid data, and he also spends a lot of time making sure that data really is solid.

Here's one quick example of what he does. He and I have both spent a lot of time with data collected by the National Endowment for the Arts. (That's a federal government agency in the US, for those who aren't familiar with the arts in America. It gives money to arts organizations, and also does studies of important issues facing the arts.) This data pretty clearly shows that the classical music audience grew notably older between 1982 and 2002.

But that alone doesn't answer any questions. The population as a whole is getting older. So the first thing any sociologist has to do is compare the aging of the classical music audience with the aging of the general population. As it happens, the NEA (National Endowment) has done this work for us, and states that the classical music audience is aging faster than the population as a whole. My sociologist friend, though, would want to check that for himself. He wouldn't necessarily take the NEA's word for it. We haven't even gotten to what his own opinion might be. He has to verify the data that's available to support any opinion he might come to.

There are more wrinkles in this, but here's the real kicker. This data verification gets pretty complicated. It turns out that the NEA data is supplied by the official US census, which is conducted every 10 years. A certain percentage of the population, in the course of the census, is asked to answer very

detailed questions. Among these questions are some about participation in the arts. That's how the NEA claims to know how many people go to classical concerts, and how old these people are.

But how, exactly, are these questions answered? The census forms aren't distributed to individuals. They're distributed to households. So when the forms are returned, with answers to the questions about arts participation (and everything else), who exactly has supplied the answers? Has each person in each household answered individually? Or did one person (typically the head of the household) supplied answers for everybody?

This is an important question. If you want to know, for instance, if younger people are going to classical concerts, the best way to get that data is to ask younger people what concerts they go to. Thus, the census data will be more valuable if the younger people themselves are supplying the information about them on their family's census forms. But suppose the form has actually been filled out by the head of the household, without consulting the younger members of the family? Suppose the father of the family fills out the form. Does he know what concerts his kids have gone to? Maybe he does, and maybe he doesn't. But if you want to make sure the NEA's data on arts participation is accurate, you have to know who actually filled out those census forms.

Enough. I'm not going to bore anyone with further tiny details of what my sociologist friend has to do before he can begin to form an opinion on the aging of the classical music audience. I just hope everyone understands what I'm saying here. While Ray sits in his armchair and complacently tells us that sociologists form any damn opinion they want to, my poor friend Paul is interviewing census officials and poring over page after page of fine print, very likely at great cost to his eyesight, simply to determine whether he can trust the data he wants to use.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Ann Druffel <Anndruffel.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 02:48:14 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 07:55:37 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

[Non-Subscriber Post]

>From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:21:53 +0200 (CEST)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 00:36:36 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>Also, the relative size of the
>>>>mirror changes too... which (seemingly?) lends credence to that
>>>>person's shift in response to the change of the object being
>>>>photographed. I'm not sure which image is first in the sequence
>>>>or whether the size of each image has been adjusted somewhat...
>>>>if so, please let us know before we settle on what is actually
>>>>taking place and in what order.

>>There may be no certain way to know the order of the Heflin
>>photos since the original polaroids are lost, but I believe the
>>order recalled by the witness was as given in the Condon report
>>(plates 42-44 - profile through left part of front windshield in
>>shot #1, oblique underside view through right side window in
>>shot #2, profile view through right side window in shot #3) and
>>as described by Hartmann from interviews with Heflin in 1967, 2
>>years after the event.

><snip>

>Am I correct in remembering having read that Ann Druffel was
>planning to provide digital copies of the originals to
>interested investigators?

>Is Ms. Druffel the present custodian of the originals?

Dear Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos:

Regarding your questions about the Heflin 1965 photos, I am the present custodian of the originals. Rex Heflin entrusted them to me shortly after he received them under unexplained circumstances in the 1990s, as detailed in the paper written by myself, Dr. Robert M. Wood and Dr. Eric Kelson, appearing in the Journal Of Scientific Exploration (JSE), Vol. 4, No. 14, 2000. They are archived in my own UFO files.

In our 2000 paper, Drs. Wood, Kelson and myself wrote that when

Dr. Kelson completes his own study of the photos we would then be willing to provide digital copies of the originals to interested investigators and researchers. We have had several requests for such since 2000, but Dr. Kelson has not yet completed all the studies he plans. His final analysis will appear as "Article II" in the Journal, but because of his extremely busy schedule in his university professor position he cannot make any determination at this time when his studies will be complete.

I thank you, Martin Shough, Viktor Golubik, Errol Bruce-Knapp and Tim Shell for your interest in the photos, which well deserve all the interest of the UFO field. Dr. Kelson and I will discuss the questions which have arisen regarding the photos recently on the 'net and will make proper response to the questions which have been brought up.

Please let me say now, however, that you have the order of the photos (#1, #2 and #3) correct in your e-mail which was blind-copied to me today. In the e-mails from various persons interested in this situation I have noticed two mistakes, but do not know which person made these mistakes.

The first mistake is the report that "the originals were still lost" and they were returned to Heflin under mysterious circumstances, detailed not only in the JSE 2000 paper but also in much more detail in Chapter 13 of my 2003 book Firestorm! Dr. James E. McDonald's Fight For UFO Science. FIRESTORM! is widely available on the 'net, including on amazon.com and even on my own website, www.anndruffel.com.

Dr. Kelson and I will address the additional mistakes in our answer, which will be forthcoming when our schedules permit.

All best wishes,

Ann Druffel
anndruffel.nul
www.anndruffel.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 03:05:22 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 08:00:00 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Kaeser

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 22:45:49 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

<snip>

>Hi Cathy,

>Hope this doesn't offend anybody: "psychology and sociology" are
>_not_ sciences, just bunches of opinions collected (and
>discarded) more or less at the whim of fashion.

>One could "use" them to prove - & disprove - anything, and at
>the same time.

Ray,

I'm sure that comment will offend someone. But science is a process and not a "thing" to define, so how do these areas of study fail the "science" test? I understand what you're saying, and probably have the same reservations, but they have more structure than your brief description would seem to indicate.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:03:40 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 08:03:13 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 22:45:49 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 20:47:10 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 15:07:46 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>I've obviously hit a nerve considering the insults directed
>>>towards my good self.

><snip>

>>>What is wrong with using psychology and sociology for the study
>>>of UFO 'experiencers'?

><snip>

>>I think you've insulted quite a few people, Nigel, it's just
>>that you're quite unaware of doing it.

>Hi Cathy,

>Hope this doesn't offend anybody: "psychology and sociology" are
>_not_ sciences, just bunches of opinions collected (and
>discarded) more or less at the whim of fashion.

>One could "use" them to prove - & disprove - anything, and at the
>same time.

Hi Everybody,

Answering Cathy's post, I'm sorry I've insulted people for
suggesting that psychology and sociology should be applied in
the study of UFO experiences. Although this is what is suggested
in the Folklore Journal essay.

As for these subjects being bunches of opinion - that doesn't
say much for ufology. Lets all go native like Mack did and
discard Western science altogether.

To get to my original point - experiences are real to the
experiencer but that does not mean that what they experience
exists beyond their own perceptions. Have you never heard of
hallucinations for example?

Finally, if that essay had been published in Magonia where it
would easily fit alongside anything written by Peter Rogerson,
Rimmer et al I doubt that Jerry would have looked at it twice,
let alone condone it.

Nigel

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 26](#)

Re: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 03:44:50 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 08:05:07 -0400
Subject: Re: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled - Hatch

>Source: BBC News - London, UK

><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/5016068.stm>

>Thursday, 25 May 2006

>Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled

>Researchers in the US and Britain have unveiled their
>blueprints for building a cloaking device.

A very interesting article and concept.

Now imagine aircraft that can "turn on" such technology and seemingly vanish in place. We would wonder if it was swallowed up in some kind of dimensional 'space warp' when the answer lies somewhere between materials science and applied physics.

I might have guessed this lay further in the future, but it looks like its on the planning stages now.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 08:27:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:28:24 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:14:06 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 11:40:40 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>>>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>>>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>>>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>>>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>>>truth).

>>The trip to Washington that Jesse took was fairly well known at
>>the time and I'm surprised you don't remember it. If mememory
>>serves, this was part of Kent Jeffries' effort to dig into the
>>Roswell event. Unfortunately, I don't believe the hypnotic
>>regression provided any new details.

>>Does Mr. X exist? I can say that people are fairly strange at
>>times in DC and If I see Jesse at an event I'll probably ask for
>>a description of the event.

>Steve:

>I do remember it! And I'm not surprised the hypnotic
>regression panned out the way it did - it's not a good tool in
>this type of case.

>I wasn't alluding to whether he exists or not - I was always
>fairly sure he did - just voicing my skepticism over the methods
>used and the implications made - and the fact that Jesse or
>anyone else would make a big deal out of Mr. X. I did not
>include much of the interview in my reply (post) and I'm even
>skeptical we should make a big deal out of Jesse's opinions
>regarding the materials he saw - in other words, take his good
>word on it.

>I make no blinds over the fact that I don't believe in the MJ-
>12 documents, cosmic watergates, or that I don't believe in the
>majority of so-called UFO crashes. I also don't hide that I
>doubt Roswell. I concede there might be something to Roswell.
>But even if a crash occurred and non-human bodies recovered then
>nothing yet proves them ET.

I would tend to agree with most of your views, but require the
same proof for those who provide mundane explanations and prefer
not to assume that one is more likely than the other.

Roswell may have been a tremendous mis-understanding that has evolved and grown over time as an urban legend, but the fact that something happened is without doubt and all of the explanations have been stretched to fit the documented scenario.

I think we need to see what Jesse Marcel actually includes in his book, rather than rely on a publicity piece to judge it. One post indicated that it's still being edited by Jesse for accuracy, and I think we should give him a chance to tell his story.

Steve

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Vicktor Golubik** <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 09:26:22 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:31:08 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence of
>>thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe 5
>>feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin thread
>>indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye, e.g.,
>>would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

>Most of you know that I am a professional photographer and
>technical expert on photography. Because I have had a commercial
>photography studio for many years, I have learned many of the
>tricks of the trade, and have written about many of them.

>The trick to suspending a model so that the suspension "thread"
>doesn't show up in photos is to use very fine, nonreflective
>tungsten wire. I keep a couple of spools of it in two
>thicknesses on hand in my studio for just this purpose. When
>someone wants a photo of a product suspended in mid air, this is
>what I use. It is actually an old trick from the movie industry
>in Hollywood. A very light object such as a balsa wood model can
>be suspended from the thinnest of these wires and there will be
>no sign of the support wires in the photograph.

>Now I am not arguing for or against these photos, I'm just
>saying that the absence of a visible support thread means
>nothing, particularly in Polaroid photos which do not have very
>high resolving power.

Thanks Bob,

It is still worth doing the analysis anyway with the originals.

Since the eye can only perceive about 200 shades of gray,
it is imperative to scan the originals with as much bit depth
as possible to confirm whether something linear-like could
emerge from scaling such higher bit depth scans.

It is also imperative to replicate the shots using similar film
and thread to reveal if the same techniques can reveal such
details and thereby provide more comprehensive and believable
comparison.

One other possible reason for taking a close-up shot of such a
small object, is to encourage an out of focus condition depending
on which aperture was used. This can as be revealed in a
similar experiment.

In other words, as you know, the lens/aperture/light conditions

will set the infinity focus.

If this object is short of that umbrella setting, any object close to the lens in that zone will become blurred and thereby reveal possible intention to fraud.

Just pointing these things out to everyone on the List.

Again, only experiment can sort these things out conclusively.

The lighting also appears diffuse and dull which would force a wider aperture setting in the directions I've indicated.

Vicktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled - Golubik

From: **Vicktor Golubik** <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 09:46:32 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:33:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled - Golubik

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 03:44:50 -0700
>Subject: Re: Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled

>>Source: BBC News - London, UK

>><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/5016068.stm>

>>Thursday, 25 May 2006

>>Plan For Cloaking Device Unveiled

>>Researchers in the US and Britain have unveiled their
>>blueprints for building a cloaking device.

>A very interesting article and concept.

>Now imagine aircraft that can "turn on" such technology and
>seemingly vanish in place. We would wonder if it was swallowed
>up in some kind of dimensional 'space warp' when the answer lies
>somewhere between materials science and applied physics.

>I might have guessed this lay further in the future, but it
>looks like its on the planning stages now.

Thanks Larry,

Since I am a materials scientist, I just wanted to point out
that such concepts were first reported on national broadcasts
about seven years ago.

The stimulus for the endeavor was brought about as a result of
the movie, Predator. The scientist interviewed said so.
Though, I've liked the UFO parallel much better!

It would also be interesting to do a Patent search, available to
everyone here for free, and actually read them and find out the
actual first date of conception. If anyone does do a patent
search, pay attention to the other patents that are referenced
which will provide earlier and earlier dates for the prior art.

Viktor Golubic

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 06:54:16 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:37:14 -0400
Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So - Nielsen

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 21:47:13 EDT
>Subject: Re: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 May 2006 15:49:52 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: If We Can Defend Humanity Let's Do So

>>The Current Situation: If We Can Defend Humanity, Let's Do So

>>There is much credible scientific research published with
>>accurately deduced conclusions. I list the following, not
>>because they are the only ones worth considering, but because
>>they are reliable, concisely expressed, and made freely
>>available for public review. These also make it easy for someone
>>like me to consolidate into a consistent whole.

>Well I feel a lot better!

>This thread just rekindled so much frustration that I had a
>cognition as to why it's so difficult to get people to listen to
>the fantastic, to heed warning without proof.

>As usual when one has tossed one's hands up in the air one can
>turn to the old tomes and find a story that illustrates any
>problem. For me that story was in the scriptures. The story
>contained a character named:

>Noah.

>Best,

>Greg

Thanks for another response Greg! I'd like to laugh, but can't.
You do have me wondering where some of those old visions came
from. They say the proof of the prophet is the coming to pass of
his or her prophecies. But who gave the vision, and who
facilitated the event foretold? We'd better leave that to the
theologists.

I'm still taking the conclusions of folks like Dr. Jacobs and Mr.
Hopkins seriously. I mean those conclusions with only anecdotal
"proof", and scoop marks and scars of unknown origin, and
"aborted" pregnancies, and foreign substance implants, and missing
people whose dessicated bodies show up later, dumped where they
were taken.

I'm still looking for something that can be done by each human
being, as well as by humanity, to stop this exploitation. And I'm
probably wrong, but I don't think we'll find it in any quick,
"new age" type answers.

What do you think?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Isaac Koi <isaackoi2.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:10:44 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:39:53 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>In one of the little twists in the Heflin case, the three photos
>Heflin said were taken by "NORAD" representatives showed up in
>his mailbox in 1993 immediately after he received a phone call
>telling him to check his mail. Thus the originals are all back
>and have been reanalyzed. For a very complete writeup of the
>Heflin case with all four photos, see:

><http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

<snip>

Hi David, List,

The Heflin case is full of little twists, as are a surprising number of other UFO cases when they are examined in detail...

Given the current interest in the Heflin case, for the ease of reference of anyone wishing to brush up on this case I might as well contribute a list of the top few references from my UFO Chronology when the relevant references are sorted by length. I've cut and pasted below the references for the longest 7 discussions I've noted in various UFO books. (Some of these discussions give references to further discussions for anyone interested)

(I'll avoid boring everyone by cutting and pasting the other 40 or so references to shorter discussions in other UFO books. They can be seen in Koi Chrono Core at 1965.0803 - and sorted by length, by author or by date).

(a) 27 pages - Druffel, Ann in her "Firestorm : Dr James E McDonald's Fight for UFO Science" (2003) at page 271 (in Chapter 11), 287-309, 322-324 (in Chapter 12) of the Wild Flower Press softcover edition.

(b) 22 pages - Young, Mort in his "UFO Top Secret" (1967) at pages 30-40 (in Chapter 3), 107 (in Chapter 7), 130 (in Chapter 9), 138-146 (in Appendix 2) of the Essandess softcover edition.

(c) 14 pages Randle, Kevin D in his "Scientific Ufology" (1999) at pages 114-125, 126-127 (in Chapter 4) of the Avon softcover edition.

(d) 12 pages - Randle, Kevin and Estes, Russ in their "Spaceships of the Visitors" (1997) at pages 149-160 (in Part 3) of the Fireside softcover edition.

(e) 10 pages - Condon Report ("Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects", Edward U Condon (Director) and Daniel S Gillmor (Editor) (1969) as Condon Case 52 at pages 112, 115, 123 (in Section 3, Chapter 2 "Analysis of UFO Photographic Evidence", by William K Hartmann), 671-697 and plates 42-46 (in Section 4,

"Case Studies", Chapter 3, "Photographic Case Studies") of the uncorrected version submitted to the Air Force (with the same page numbering in the 3 volume paperbound edition distributed by the National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce) at pages 78, 80, 84-85, 437-455 of the Vision hardback edition (with the same page numbering in the Bantam paperback edition). The first of these editions has the same page numbering as the edition available free online at the following links:

<http://ncas.sawco.com/condon/text/contents.htm>

<http://www.project1947.com/shg/condon/contents.html>

(f) 7 pages - Hobana, Ion and Weverbergh, Julien in their "UFO's from behind the iron curtain" (1974) at pages 93-98, 107 (in Chapter 6) of the Corgi paperback edition.

(g) 6 pages - Randles, Jenny in her "Investigating the Truth Behind MIB" (1997) at pages 89-94 (in Chapter 8) of the Piatkus softcover edition.

I might as well also mention that this case is listed as Project Blue Book Case Number 9654 on the redacted US National Archives and Records Administration ("NARA") microfilm records of Project Blue Book, released to the National Archives in 1975 - see National Archives Microfilm Publication T1206 roll number 1. An image of the relevant index page has been given the unique Page ID ("PID") of NARA-PBB1-342 (page 342 of 1014) at the link below. It is also listed (without a Project Blue Book Case Number) on the unredacted Maxwell Air Force Base ("Maxwell") microfilm records of Project Blue Book - see Maxwell microfilm roll number 30,363. An image of the relevant index page has been given the unique Page ID ("PID") of MAXW-PBB2-556 (page 556 of 1352) at the link below. <http://www.bluebookarchive.org>

All the best,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:33:20 -0300
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:44:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:11:18 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:38:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>>>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>>>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>>>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>>>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>>>truth).

>>Eugene the book isn't finished yet. The story is not a new one.
>>I was also interviewed at the Capitol Location as was Walter
>>Haut. Let's not jump to conclusions. There was a conference of
>>Roswell-related people across from DC sponsored by the Fund.

>Stan:

>I know of the conference. I also heard through the grapevine
>that you were interviewed too.

>I just don't see how putting this (Mr. X) in a book about
>Roswell contributes to making things any clearer, considering
>the circus Roswell has become. That's if that's what Jesse is
>doing. To me, Mr. X is of no value in determining the truth
>about Roswell.

>Rarely can what these type of guys say ever be tracked down or
>verified, provided, of course, they say anything interesting at
>all.

Eugene:

I see nothing in Horn's article that says the story noted is in
the book. Why are you jumping to conclusions? Have you read the
book?

You have commented about MJ-12. Have you rebutted the new
chapter in TOP SECRET/MAJIC 2nd Edition that deals with a host
of objections? Or are yours, which you haven't spelled out,
different from those expressed in the new chapter or in, Update
On Majestic 12, on my website at www.stantonfriedman.com ?

Nothing wrong with having opinions, but on what are they based?
Readers would like to know.

You seem to have an anti-alien phobia.. What is the big deal?

What are your specific objections to Roswell and on what are they based?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik Diverge247.nul
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:32:23 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:48:45 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Golubik

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:11:18 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 12:38:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

Eugene/Stan,

In the event (Mr X's) sources become questionable, is just another reason to structure some kind of distance from such roundabout avenues in such a way that you yourself do not become discredited in the process. I believe that Jesse Marcel Jr. will hopefully do just that and is a very capable person. In the final analysis, sometimes their sources will also loop back to your sources and in the process nothing new is reveal except a circular witness train.

I think this book will be very interesting and I hope he puts in many of his frustrations.

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:38:57 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:50:46 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 00:55:36 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 22:45:49 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>Hope this doesn't offend anybody: "psychology and sociology"
>>are not sciences, just bunches of opinions collected (and
>>discarded) more or less at the whim of fashion.

<snip>

>This isn't offensive. But it's more than a little silly. I'd
>love to see Ray give five or six examples of serious
>sociological work that fits his description.

>In trying to figure these things out, I've shared data with a
>sociologist at Princeton University, and exchanged ideas with
>him a lot. His approach is exactly the opposite of what Ray
>imagines sociology is like. He's about the last person I know
>who'd venture a wild opinion about anything in his field. He
>won't accept anything that's not supported by solid data, and he
>also spends a lot of time making sure that data really is solid.

What Greg Sandow describes here looks like an example of what is
sometimes called "applied social science" - which is actually a
somewhat misleading term, because what is being applied is a
research methodology, not a corpus of knowledge.

But in a way, that illustrates the problem, because in the
social sciences there is no corpus of knowledge to apply. It's
when claims are made for such a corpus of knowledge, or for
theories supposedly based on such a corpus of knowledge, that
the claims made by social scientists begin to look more than a
little dodgy.

Applied social science works precisely because it is both
rigorously empirical and completely atheoretical, and I
certainly agree that there are people who operate like this.
Unfortunately they are the exception, not the rule. If you don't
believe me, just take a look through the latest edition of just
about any social science journal - and check out just how much
of what is published depends on assumption, unsupported
generalization, and cultural consensus.

As for examples of social sciences work which matches Ray
Dickenson's description, I should say pretty much anything
published within the paradigms of Freudian Psychoanalysis,
Behaviorism and Cognitive Psychology, and about ninety percent
of what is published under the rubric of Evolutionary
Psychology.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <CathyM.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:40:22 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:57:23 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:03:40 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>Answering Cathy's post, I'm sorry I've insulted people for
>suggesting that psychology and sociology should be applied in
>the study of UFO experiences.

And where exactly did I say this is what had insulted people?
You had better be able to say where, Nigel, because otherwise
not only are you being offensive, you're being intellectually
dishonest.

>Although this is what is suggested in the Folklore Journal
>essay.

>As for these subjects being bunches of opinion - that doesn't
>say much for ufology. Lets all go native like Mack did and
>discard Western science altogether.

Just how do you get from cynicism about psychology and
sociology, to a conclusion that Western science should be
disregarded altogether? Come to that, where does Mack say that
Western science ought to be discarded?

>To get to my original point - experiences are real to the
>experiencer but that does not mean that what they experience
>exists beyond their own perceptions. Have you never heard of
>hallucinations for example?

Actually, what you said was this:

"The experiences might be real to the experiencers but that does
not make what they see or believe is real."

If you'd said "What experiencers see may not be physically real"
you'd have been on firm ground. Likewise if you'd said "What
experiencers see may be entirely subjective." But when you
suggest that what experiencers see is not real, you are making a
value judgement. And that breaks rule #1 of folklore studies.

In the same way, what experiencers believe may or may not be
true. But you have no right whatever to say that their beliefs
are not real.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 12:34:33 -0300
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:59:53 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 19:25:59 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>The model could have swung outward in #3 so that
>>we see it nearly edge on instead of from underneath as in #2.
>>Possibly this would account for all or part of the size
>>difference (Interestingly, the same sort of situation presents
>>itself in the Trent/McMinnville photos, in one photo seeing the
>>bottom side and in the other it is a little smaller and seen
>>nearly edge-on.).

>So far, my 3-D construction of the McMinnville photos has been
>somewhat fruitful, although the lens separation is so wide it's
>like looking at the scene as if you were the size of King Kong.
>Also, the object in those photos wasn't being nearly as
>cooperative as in the Heflin photos, and appears to have moved
>quite a bit between photos.

>I'll post my results on my fiddling with these when I think I
>have something viewable. If nothing else, it will allow an
>interesting (to me, anyway) comparison/constrast with the Heflin
>photos.

You are also going to have to post your thoughts on where Trent suddenly acquired the photographic experience and skills needed to carry out this deception.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 16:45:57 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:03:45 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 00:36:36 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: Tim Shell <tshell.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 00:59:50 -0700
>>>>Subject: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>There may be no certain way to know the order of the Heflin
>>photos since the original polaroids are lost, but I believe the

>In one of the little twists in the Heflin case, the three photos
>Heflin said were taken by "NORAD" representatives showed up in
>his mailbox in 1993 immediately after he received a phone call
>telling him to check his mail. Thus the originals are all back
>and have been reanalyzed. For a very complete writeup of the
>Heflin case with all four photos, see:

><http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

Thanks David

I've also been referred to this same paper off-List by Robert Wood. Lots of interesting stuff there, including the explanation of why I thought I'd read that Heflin sold the recovered Polaroids. He did in a sense, but only in a sense, transferring them into the keeping of Ann Druffel who helped him out with medical bills to the tune of \$850. The rest of this post is as written before I looked at the paper. I see that a number of the issues I've raised have been discussed there. I'll come back after I've read it fully. Meantime some of the specific answers below to your points may still be valid.

>>The above picture order suggests the camera shifting back or to
>>the right as the witness leans closer to the side window between
>>#2 and #3. The camera has clearly moved slightly towards the
>>mirror. The angular size of the mirror increases, the parallax
>>of the mirror and its mounting changes, more of the bush and
>>horizon is revealed behind the mirror and the reflection shifts
>>to show an area of the truck side closer to the cab. This is
>>consistent with the UFO ("UAP"!) having turned back on itself,
>>changing heading from about SE (between #1 and #2) to NE between
>>#2 and #3, and Heflin leaning to his right to keep the object in
>>view as it drifted to his left towards the post of the
>>windshield.

>That would be consistent with the photo details for the

>_distant_ object hypothesis.

Yes, of course, that's what I mean by it "changing heading SE to NE and drifting to the left"

>>This is the course indicated in Hartmann's Fig.9. But it is >>arguably not quite as suggested in Heflin's Sept 1965 written >>NICAP statement, where he said that the object began to move off >>NE after #1 and before #2. On the other hand this would be even >>less consistent with reversing the order of #2 and #3 and could >>easily be just a question of interpretation.

>I think a lot of the so-called inconsistencies used to try to >discredit Heflin (and many other witnesses) represent the usual >difficulties of trying to accurately recall exactly what >happened. Nobody tells a thoroughly repeatedly and consistent >story time after time (unless they've memorized it). Often times >a sincere witness tells it one way, then another. They may >simply have second thoughts or later remember a detail or two >that they failed to mention initially, so they bring it up >later, then get accused of inconsistency and embellishing, when >the intention was to be helpful and more thorough. In this >field, no good deed goes unpunished.

Agreed.

>>The interesting thing whatever the order of #2 and #3 is the >>change of camera position and resulting parallax. The image >>shifts (I estimate this roughly from halftone images of the >>prints assuming constant scaling and based on Hartmann's >>statement of 2.4 degrees subtense for the UFO in #1) about 5.5 - >>6.0 degrees left in relation to the landscape background from #2 >>to #3. This is the same direction in which the mirror shifts, by >>about 4.0 - 4.5 degrees. A stationary model at any distance >>greater than the mirror would shift against the landscape by >>_less_ than the mirror. So it can't be stationary and at a >>distance.

>That's not correct. If it were a stationary model _beyond_ the >mirror, it will still shift _rightward_ relative to the mirror >in the rightmost view (photo #3).

I think it is correct, David. Use your "two finger" test. The more distant finger will shift against the landscape by a smaller angle than the nearer finger. Displacement relative to the mirror is a separate issue and not what I'm talking about here. See later.

>To see this, close your right >eye, and line up a finger from each hand with your left eye. >Have one finger behind the other by at least several inches and >have something in the more distant background also clearly >visible. The closer finger now represents the "mirror" and the >more distant finger the "model". Now close your left eye and >view the scene with your right eye. The more distant finger (the >"model") will shift right of the closer finger (the "mirror"). A >much larger shift to the right will be seen in the distant >background.

>That's also what we see in the Heflin #2 (left) and #3 (right) >photos. A convenient reference point is the upper left corner of >the window. The "saucer" shifts right more than the mirror, so >if a stationary object, it definitely is further away than the >mirror.

We have to take account of the fact that the lens is closer to the window in #3. The distance from the UFO to the corner of the window post (call it distance A) is indeed larger on #3 (as I already pointed out - below), by about 7 - 8%. But to get the parallax contribution to the enlarged subtended angle you have to subtract the quantity due to the reduced lens distance, which I estimated at about 10%. Measuring distance A as a proportion of the total window width taken on a line through the UFO you find (or at least I find) that in both cases the proportion is identical at 50% to within about +/- 1% (49% and 50.9% for #2 and #3 respectively) and I wouldn't be confident that the error bars on the measurements are smaller than this. Maybe precise measurements on very high resolution copies would confirm a 1% or 2% difference, but this could be accommodated by a small swing in a suspended model, say. So this could be consistent with a model at about the distance of the window glass.

>If the "saucer" were stationary and closer than the mirror, then
>the opposite would happen. It would shift leftward in switching
>from left to right views. (In this case, the more distant finger
>would be the "mirror" while the closer finger the "model.")

Yes, if it were a little closer than the mirror then A would
reduce a little due to rightward camera motion normal to the
line of sight. But if the motion is not normal to the line of
sight, and the range reduces, then the subtended angle increases
to compensate the reduction. It isn't clear to me that the
measured change could not result from these two effects
operating on a small model about 2 - 3% closer than the mirror.

>>The UFO shifts more than the mirror, so what about the
>>possibility of a model closer than the mirror? The image appears
>>about the same distance below the top edge of the window in both
>>photographs, suggesting a model hung from the edge of the cab
>>roof.

>If it were a model and stationary, it would have to be suspended
>_beyond_ the mirror, not closer, for the reasons given above.

I disagree. I think a model an inch or two closer than the
mirror is possible, for the reasons given above..

>>Because the camera is closer to the window and to the
>>model in #3 the angular distance from a suspended model to the
>>windshield post on the left should increase between #2 and #3,
>>which it does - by about 9%.

>Although the Heflin right view is a little closer to the mirror,
>this doesn't change the situation.

I think it changes the angular relationships as I suggested.

>To simulate with the eye
>blink test, move the lined up fingers (lined up with the open
>left eye) directly in front of the right eye. This will make the
>fingers closer to the right eye. Shift viewing eyes and the more
>distant finger (model) still jumps right of the closer finger
>(mirror).

>>This probably underestimates the
>>hypothetical change in the distance from lens to model because
>>of the perspective: That is, the vanishing-point angle made by
>>the line of the cab roof and the line of horizon scrub increases
>>between #2 and #3, i.e. the downward slope of the roof line
>>measured from the scrub line is steeper in #3 because of the
>>change in perspective, so the distance from model to window post
>>is foreshortened very slightly in #3, tending to reduce the
>>separation on the photo. So allowing for this we should assume
>>that a model suspended from the top of the window is some 10%
>>nearer to the lens in #3 than in #2 and should subtend an angle
>>some 10% larger. It is far from clear that this is the case. I
>>would estimate rather a possible 4% _reduction_ in angular size
>>between #2 and #3.

>I agree with this estimate. I place size difference (judging by
>the length of the bottom "saucer" rim at 3-5% (scaling the
>distant background features to equal size). Although you have the
>direction of your assumed model wrong, placing it beyond the
>mirror doesn't change the situation any. The model if stationary
>would still be closer to the right view (just as when the two
>fingers are moved directly in front of the right eye).
>Therefore, the model should be _larger_ in the righthand view,
>whereas it is actually a little smaller.

I'm now not convinced that it is smaller having redone
measurements more carefully, as I said in another post. It's
deceptive, but now I make it ~ 7% larger in #3. Will you check
this? And whether a model is on front of or beyond the mirror
does make a difference. What differs is the percentage change in
the lens-object distance. This is important. If the object is
large and distant then moving the lens a few inches closer to
the window reduces the object range negligibly and makes
negligible difference to the angular size. If the object is
small and relatively close to the lens - say just beyond the
window - this becomes significant. I don't think this is cut and
dried and I'd like to see this checked on the original set of
prints with guaranteed constant scaling.

You see what worries me is that the percentage enlargement in the UFO from #2 to #3 looks to be of the same order (10%) as the enlargement of the foreground from #2 to #3 due to the camera repositioning. The report has the UFO track running parallel to the road, almost but not quite normal to the line of sight. There need be no measurable angular size change at all, but if there is any due to the motion of a large object on this track then it should be in the opposite direction.

There's definitely room for argument I admit. Angular enlargement due to camera motion could be over-compensating for a slightly smaller "real" angular diminution caused by slight recession of the UFO. E.g., the width of the side window from the rear edge to the post is about 12% larger on #3, so the apparent 7% enlargement of the UFO due to camera motion could be hiding a real ~5% diminution in UFO angular size due to recession. This is not inconsistent with what would be a ~ 3% increase in reported range according to the reported flight track.

But there must be some doubt that the error bars on these measurements are small enough to make the distinction between 12% and 7% significant. We can't be sure what these error bars are. For example do we know that the Polaroid print is a flat field or does the scaling vary across the FOV? Is the scaling really consistent? Absent the original prints, all we can say is there there is an order-of-magnitude coincidence and one is entitled to be a bit suspicious.

>Of course, this still
>proves nothing. The model could have swung outward in #3 so that
>we see it nearly edge on instead of from underneath as in #2.
>Possibly this would account for all or part of the size
>difference (Interestingly, the same sort of situation presents
>itself in the Trent/McMinnville photos, in one photo seeing the
>bottom side and in the other it is a little smaller and seen
>nearly edge-on.).

Yes this is true.

>Or Heflin could have moved his "fishing pole" suspending the
>model out a little bit (plus have a little swing to the model)
>to agree with his story of the object beginning to move away
>from him into the distance. It would take much more complete 3D
>modeling to see if this is viable. E.g., if the hypothetical
>model is simply swung away from the camera in #3, we'd check to
>see if the elevation angles and size differences are compatible
>with a swung model. This would require figuring out exactly
>where the camera is in both photos relative to the window,
>mirror, etc., and also making some assumptions about the
>suspension line. (Which, BTW, nobody has ever been able to
>find.)

>>Another interesting point that has been raised is a possible
>>anomaly of the apparent cloudy conditions in #4, the smoke ring
>>photo(shades of Trindade?!).

>Yes, and in some ways I think that is the most interesting of
>the four photos because it would have been almost impossible to
>fake. It is also thought by some, such as Robert Nathan of JPL
>who analyzed the photos back in the '60s, that the smoke ring
>may also be seen around, and partly obscuring, the upper part of
>the object in photos #1 & #2, visible as a dark band. I think
>this argues very powerfully against Heflin hoaxing the photos.

Difficult maybe. But impossible? Remember Ft. Belvoir. True, Hartmann admitted that if the match with the tree and wire on Myford Rd was definite "twig by twig" (impossible to prove because the trees had been cut back) then it would argue strongly in favour of the case. I agree, with the proviso that even then you couldn't positively rule out a hoax staged around a prior photo of an unusual smoke ring in that area, because weren't the original Polaroids unnumbered?

>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence of
>thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe 5
>feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin thread
>indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye, e.g.,

>would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

This would be an even stronger argument if a model were required to be a little closer than the mirror. On the other hand, could we be certain that the Polaroids were not made by rephotographing retouched prints?

><snip>

>>Note that Heflin's supervisor who was mobile a mile or two away >>testified to hearing the unusual type of radio interruption >>described by Heflin at the time of the event.

>If I understand the article correctly, there were other highway >department people in the area with radios and they also noticed >radio disruption. This is also mentioned by Hartmann in the >Condon Report. This again would have been impossible for Heflin >to fake, but would be a classic case of UFO EM interference.

Oh, I thought it was only his Superintendent or whatever. Anyway, someone did, and said that Heflin was cut off in mid-sentence but not in the way that you would hear if the radio had just been switched off. I don't know if anyone ever found out exactly what that means? It's evidence in Heflin's favour certainly.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/26/06

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:46:46 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:07:21 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/26/06

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 62
May 26, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** VICE PRESIDENT REFUSES TO REPORT ON CLASSIFICATION ACTIVITY
** ISOO REPORTS NINE PERCENT DROP IN CLASSIFICATION

VICE PRESIDENT REFUSES TO REPORT CLASSIFICATION ACTIVITY

For the third year in a row the Office of Vice President Dick Cheney has refused to disclose data on its classification and declassification activity, in an apparent violation of an executive order issued by President Bush.

"The Office of the Vice President (OVP), the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), and the Homeland Security Council (HSC) failed to report their data to ISOO this year," the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) noted in its new 2005 Annual Report to the President (at page 9, footnote 1).

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/isoo/2005rpt.pdf>

The Office of the Vice President has declined to report such data since 2002. Yet it is clear that disclosure is not optional.

"Each agency that creates or handles classified information shall report annually to the Director of ISOO statistics related to its security classification program," according to ISOO Directive 1 (at section 2001.80):

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/isoo/directive1.html>

This and other ISOO directives "shall be binding upon the agencies," President Bush wrote in Executive Order 13292 (section 5.1). And an "agency" is not only a statutorily defined executive branch agency, but also includes "any other entity within the executive branch that comes into the possession of classified information."

Despite this straightforward language, a spokeswoman for Vice President Cheney told the Chicago Tribune in April that his Office is "not under any duty" to provide the required information.

On prior refusals by the Vice President to disclose classification and declassification data, see "Cheney exempts his own office from reporting on classified material" by Mark Silva, Chicago Tribune, April 29, 2006:

<http://tinyurl.com/zwfmr>

Historically, the OVP has "not reported quantitatively significant data," according to ISOO. So the Vice President's current defiance of the executive order does not greatly distort the overall presentation of classification activity.

But it signals an unhealthy contempt for presidential authority and undermines the integrity of classification oversight.

ISOO REPORTS NINE PERCENT DROP IN CLASSIFICATION

The Information Security Oversight Office reported a nine percent drop in overall classification activity in its new annual report for FY 2005.

Total classification activity (including "original" and "derivative" classification) dropped from the record high 2004 level of 15.6 million classification actions to 14.2 million, almost identical to the 2003 level.

"ISOO views the decrease reported in classification, particularly after three years of rising numbers, as a positive step," ISOO Director William Leonard reported to the President.

Declassification increased during FY 2005 by 4 percent to 29.5 million pages.

While the data reported by ISOO each year serve as a useful benchmark, the ISOO methodology for collecting and reporting data is rudimentary and not very illuminating. For example, the annual report provides no way to assess overclassification.

During the period covered by the latest annual report, the 9/11 Commission determined that the amount of the annual intelligence budget was improperly classified and should be disclosed. But House Republicans and the White House blocked declassification (the Senate favored it) and the budget figure remained classified despite an expert bipartisan consensus in favor of disclosure.

But the reality of overclassification is not reflected in the ISOO data. There is no mechanism for determining just what fraction of classification actions are, like intelligence budget secrecy, illegitimate.

Still, the ISOO annual report provides an occasion to reflect on larger trends in classification and declassification.

"A responsible security classification system and a committed declassification program are the cornerstones of an open and efficient government that serves to protect and inform its citizens," Mr. Leonard wrote.

The 2005 ISOO annual report also presents useful information on individual agency performance and related topics such as the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel, the Public Interest Declassification Board, industrial security, and more. See:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/isoo/2005rpt.pdf>

In an extraordinary act of public outreach, the Information Security Oversight Office will hold a free public workshop on June 30 on the use of mandatory declassification review as a tool for researchers. See:

<http://www.archives.gov/press/press-releases/2006/nr06-104.html>

ISOO is also offering interested members of the public a DVD recording of an October 2005 Symposium on classification policy that was held to mark the 10th anniversary of executive order 12958. See:

<http://www.archives.gov/isoo/symposium/dvd.html>

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 is available in blog format at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

From: Tom Horn <tomhorn.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 09:10:17 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:10:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Horn

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:12:22 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Tom Horn <tomhorn.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 May 2006 09:23:42 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 22 May 2006 18:00:40 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>Ah, another 'mysterious government insider' given a name like
>>>'Mr. X' that can't be tracked down or checked into.

>>>Just something we have to believe on faith and the good word of
>>>Marcel (but that's okay because the fact he has a book he wants
>>>to sell wouldn't have anything to do with what he states is the
>>>truth).

>>Just for the record, Jesse did not give the person he met at the
>>Capital building the name Mr. "X", I did, because I needed
>>something to refer to besides redundantly saying "the source".

>>Secondly, Stanton Friedman verified to me that not only did this
>>meeting happen but that Stanton met similarly.

>Tom:

>Yes, I know where the name Mr. X came from - read my previous
>post again and you'll see I wrote "given the name" instead of
>"using the name." I also think "the source" is just as bad. Why
>not use his actual name?

>These types of scenarios are not proper.

Hi Eugene

I didn't use the name in the beginning for one reason, because
Jesse didn't use it, and I always try to be very cautious with
information from somebody willing to be interviewed. I only
added it to the article after the fact, because it was okay with
the publisher, plus it clarified things.

Jesse also told me some things 'off-the-record' and they will
remain off-the-record.

Personally, I don't know if Jesse is correct in his
interpretation of what happened at Rosewell, but I left that
meeting with an upgrade in my opinion of a man whose integrity
is more solid to me now, based on what I know.

Tom

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 12:31:25 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:14:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Golubik

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:23:58 +0100
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 08:45:37 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 18 May 2006 17:44:15 +0100
>>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

><snip>

>>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>>However, some like to get caught up in the insanity of something
>>and we call them comedie - though they're just as brilliant. :)

>>The filter in which they couch their arguments is too narrow,
>>but the degree to which they overanalyze their narrow mindedness
>>is an impressive display but yet it does not justify their
>>limited input.

>>Yes Dick, I agree so far. But will wait final judgment until I
>>get through the entire report. But, I can't tell you how many
>>times I've laughed!

>>Since you agree that any detailed comment is only a waste of
>>time on the part of narrow-minded comedians I won't expect to
>>hear anything more from you on this subject.

Hey Martin,

I think you left what follows out from my earlier comments? I'm
not trying to dredge this up again, just want it included for
the sake of completeness. I had already sent this to you
privately...

"I'm not attacking anyone here and value all opinions greatly and
we all fully realize our dilemmas. It's unfortunate that once
again we have to expend a lot of resources to countermand the
appearance of good science from the vantage point of (Media
defined) repressed ufological dreamers. More power to you guys."

Regards,

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 09:42:50 -0700
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:17:08 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Ann Druffel <Anndruffel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 02:48:14 EDT
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:21:53 +0200 (CEST)
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>Regarding your questions about the Heflin 1965 photos, I am the
>present custodian of the originals. Rex Heflin entrusted them to
>me shortly after he received them under unexplained
>circumstances in the 1990s, as detailed in the paper written by
>myself, Dr. Robert M. Wood and Dr. Eric Kelson, appearing in the
>Journal Of Scientific Exploration (JSE), Vol. 4, No. 14, 2000.
>They are archived in my own UFO files.

My thanks to Ann Druffel for her dogged persistence over the
many years, including the Heflin case. Incidentally, the JSE
paper can be found at the following URL:

<http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

For those people who think Heflin was a hoaxer, I suggest they
read it through from beginning to end (40 pages). But for those
in a hurry, just check out Figure 17, which is an enhancement of
photo 3. This shows the object trailing a ring of black smoke,
exactly as Heflin claimed happened, and a perfect tie-in to
photo 4 of the large black smoke ring Heflin said he
photographed a mile down the road 2 or 3 minutes later. How did
Heflin hoax that?

Also enhancement shows a wedge of light on the bottom of the
object in photo 2 (Figure 18), again agreeing with Heflin's
story of seeing a beam of light coming out the bottom and
sweeping around. Heflin was one clever hoaxer!

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:19:14 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 00:12:40 -0300
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence
>>>of thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>>>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>>>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe
>>>5 feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin
>>>thread indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye,
>>>e.g., would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

>>Most of you know that I am a professional photographer and
>>technical expert on photography. Because I have had a
>>commercial photography studio for many years, I have learned
>>many of the tricks of the trade, and have written about many
>>of them.

>>The trick to suspending a model so that the suspension thread"
>>doesn't show up in photos is to use very fine, nonreflective
>>tungsten wire. I keep a couple of spools of it in two
>>thicknesses on hand in my studio for just this purpose. When
>>someone wants a photo of a product suspended in mid air, this
>>is what I use. It is actually an old trick from the movie
>>industry in Hollywood. A very light object such as a balsa
>>wood model can be suspended from the thinnest of these wires
>>and there will be no sign of the support wires in the photograph.

>>Now I am not arguing for or against these photos, I'm just
>>saying that the absence of a visible support thread means
>>nothing, particularly in Polaroid photos which do not have
>>very high resolving power.

>I was going to go to some site and find a copy of one of these
>Heflin photos and do a blow-up, etc. to look for just that
>support cable. You've saved me the time. I wondered about
>Polaroid res as well.

Don and Bob,

According to the 2000 J. Scientific Exploration paper by
Druffel, Wood, and Kelson - see:

<http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

- the film is ASA 3000, 3-1/4 x 4-1/4 inch print size, which
they blew up to 8 x 10 inch and scanned. The paper said they
were into the grain when scanning at 300 dpi. According to my

calculations, this means the grain size was on the order of 25 to 30 grains per millimeter on the original film, which is pretty grainy.

If a model was outside the window and about 10 times further away then the size of the film (or about 3.5 feet away), this means every millimeter at the plane of the model corresponds to 2.7 grains on the film (call it 3) or one-third millimeter per grain (or 330 microns). This is a little wider than a typical sewing thread (about 0.2 mm or 200 microns).

Does this mean that any support wire or thread thinner than the film grain cannot be seen? No, because the thread still blocks light, so the grains where the thread is still receive less light than those not so-blocked. As a result there will still be a faint line of darkening corresponding to where the thread is in the picture. The film grain can't resolve the thread itself, but it can still detect the presence of its "shadow."

The same is true for the human eye. We can still detect a dark line on a light background much thinner than our retinal grain, by a factor of about 10 times thinner. If the thread gets too thin, then the darkening becomes too slight for the human visual system to detect the contrast difference.

Let's apply the same factor of 10 argument to film grain. This means there still might be detectable darkening representing the threads presence at 1/10th the film grain size, or in this case, $1/10 \times 330 = 33$ microns. A typical human hair is about 50 or 60 microns thick, so in principle, using computer enhancement, one might still be able to detect the presence of a suspension thread a little thinner than a human hair in this instance.

However, in the Heflin case, I consider the question of a suspension thread almost moot. Not only can no such thread (i.e., line of film darkening) be detected in the photos even after enhancement, but other details pretty clearly rule out hoax in my mind. The most important of these is the smoke ring Heflin said the object left behind and which he photographed (his photo 4), but which now also turns out to also be evident in his photo 3. See Figure 17 in the JSE paper, which is an enhancement of photo 3, and in which it can be clearly seen that the object is leaving behind a dark smoke ring, also in line with Heflin's testimony of what he saw (the object seemed to separate from the ring of smoke as it began to depart).

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/26/06 (Extra!)

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 20:59:14 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:22:56 -0400
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/26/06 (Extra!)

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
Volume 2006, Issue No. 63
May 26, 2006 -- EXTRA!

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

** SENATE BILL WOULD REQUIRE INTELLIGENCE BUDGET DISCLOSURE

SENATE BILL WOULD REQUIRE INTELLIGENCE BUDGET DISCLOSURE

Public disclosure of intelligence budget data would be required under a provision of the 2007 Intelligence Authorization Act that was reported by the Senate Intelligence Committee yesterday and disclosed today.

The total amounts authorized and appropriated for the National Intelligence Program would be publicly disclosed each year starting in 2007, the Senate bill states.

After 2007, the bill would also require the President to disclose the aggregate amount requested each year for national intelligence.

The budget disclosure provision was proposed by Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR) and approved yesterday by the Senate Intelligence Committee on a 9-6 vote. All Democrats on the Committee supported the move, as did Republican Senators Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) and Chuck Hagel (R-Nebraska). Other Republicans, including Chairman Pat Roberts (R-KS), opposed it.

Beyond aggregate budget disclosure, the bill would also require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on the advisability of disclosing the budget of each individual element of the intelligence community.

The disclosure requirement (Section 107 of S. 3237) generally corresponds to a bipartisan recommendation of the 9/11 Commission. A similar measure was approved by the Senate in October 2004, but opposed by the White House and blocked in the House.

"The public ought to know how much money the government is spending on intelligence activities and the Senate has long sought this sensible reform," Senator Jay Rockefeller and other Democratic Senators wrote in a Statement appended to the Report.

"We believe declassifying the aggregate amount of money the nation spends on intelligence would not harm the nation's security."

The new Senate Intelligence Committee report on the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2007 includes numerous other significant and interesting provisions including: a requirement

for a DNI report on treatment of detainees (section 313); a requirement for a report on alleged clandestine detention facilities (section 314); establishment of a National Space Intelligence Center (section 410); and quite a bit more.

See the Senate Intelligence Committee Report on the FY 2007 Intelligence Authorization Act, Senate Report 109-259, May 25, here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_rpt/srpt109-259.pdf

The underlying bill, S. 3237, is here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_cr/s3237.pdf

The intelligence bill has been referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee for a ten day period.

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

The Secrecy News Blog is at:
<http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

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

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:
http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
web: www.fas.org/sgp/index.html
email: saftergood@fas.org
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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 21:24:33 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:24:34 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Ann Druffel <Anndruffel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 02:48:14 EDT
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>>From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:21:53 +0200 (CEST)
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>>Am I correct in remembering having read that Ann Druffel was
>>planning to provide digital copies of the originals to
>>interested investigators?

>>Is Ms. Druffel the present custodian of the originals?

>Dear Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos:

>Regarding your questions about the Heflin 1965 photos, I am the
>present custodian of the originals. Rex Heflin entrusted them to
>me shortly after he received them under unexplained
>circumstances in the 1990s, as detailed in the paper written by
>myself, Dr. Robert M. Wood and Dr. Eric Kelson, appearing in the
>Journal Of Scientific Exploration (JSE), Vol. 4, No. 14, 2000.
>They are archived in my own UFO files.

<snip>

Hello Everyone!

As a subscriber to JSE for several years, I am pleased that the Society for Scientific Exploration has decided to make all the articles from their older journals available on-line to all.

Important scientific papers on UFOs and related subjects can now be found at the JSE web site. The complete paper 'Reanalysis of the 1965 Heflin UFO Photos' by Ann Druffel, Robert M. Wood and Eric Kelson along with high quality prints of the Heflin UFO photos can be found at

<http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

If, as others have noted, the dust/soil on the ground directly below the UFO was being disturbed in one of the polaroid photos is correct, then we can estimate the true size of this UFO by comparing it to height of the nearest of the telephone poles visible in the photo - the one with the shadow pointing in the general direction of the UFO on the opposite side of the road.

If the typical height of telephone poles is about 22 feet (from telephone lineman manual) and measures about 55mm in length on my computer screen and the width of the UFO in the sky is indeed in the opposite side of the road and measures about 15mm, then the diameter of this UFO would about 6 feet. The raised central

dome would be about 4 feet across. Such a tiny crew compartment would be too cramped for even a single 3 foot tall ET occupant laying on its side!

Since there is no obvious large shadow of this UFO on the ground immediately to the left of the apparent ground disturbance, then we can reasonably conclude that the UFO was much closer to the truck window and thus much smaller (the size of a hub cap?). If the UFO was much closer or much further than the disturbance on the ground (a dust devil?), then this disturbance had no direct association with the UFO.

The fourth picture that Rex Heflin took which depicts a smoke ring must have been taken at another place or time, possibly at an airshow after an explosion on the ground from the simulated bombing by a passing aircraft. I have an identical photo of a smoke ring "UFO" that I took at an airshow under the conditions described above!

If this UFO Heflin photographed three (or four) times in period of a few minutes from the time he first noticed it to the time it departed was indeed a distant massive object with an apparent angular size much bigger than the full Moon (the Moon would appear much smaller and show less detail than the UFO in Heflin's photos), it should have been seen and reported by others.

Although it is one of my favourite UFO photographic cases, since this UFO sighting was a single witness case and there's doubts raised by the dubious and very different fourth photo of this series, I would follow the generally accepted guidelines by Dr. J. Allen Hynek and other ufologists and reject it as an example of a "real" UFO or TRUFO.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 23:18:36 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:26:07 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence of
>>thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe 5
>>feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin thread
>>indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye, e.g.,
>>would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

<snip>

>The trick to suspending a model so that the suspension "thread"
>doesn't show up in photos is to use very fine, nonreflective
>tungsten wire. I keep a couple of spools of it in two
>thicknesses on hand in my studio for just this purpose. When
>someone wants a photo of a product suspended in mid air, this is
>what I use. It is actually an old trick from the movie industry
>in Hollywood. A very light object such as a balsa wood model can
>be suspended from the thinnest of these wires and there will be
>no sign of the support wires in the photograph.

Another possibility is to use a suspending thread that matches
the background in color. If there is no contrast in either
brightness or color between a thread and the background it
becomes "invisible"

>Now I am not arguing for or against these photos, I'm just
>saying that the absence of a visible support thread means
>nothing, particularly in Polaroid photos which do not have very
>high resolving power.

I agree.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: **Franck Boitte** <Franckboitte.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 04:17:50 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 07:38:05 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:46:55 +0000
>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>I suspect that people who were spiritually inclined in the first
>place would be more likely to find something positive in an
>abduction experience, and people who were inclined to buy into
>the scientific, secular worldview (like me) would be more likely
>to be scared by it.

Hello all,

As an european searcher, I agree with this for it precisely matches my own conclusions after in-depth-studying of a few abduction cases - included the one of my own spouse who believes and tells she was abducted in Angers (France) in 1972.

The Adamski file which I also studied in depth after having met him, as another, early example.

The RR4 phenomenon is more strange and convoluted, more 'extraterrestrial' or 'alien' if you prefer, than most of us think it is. It seems that the 'people' who are behind it, whoever they are, cleverly use parts of our cerebral circuits to mislead us.

The question we should ask ourselves is: Why do they act like this?

My Mother told me she was "paralyzed with fear", at first, and unable to move. She said that a beam of light came from the sphere and struck her on her chest.

Same with my wife: she also was paralyzed (by 'fear' or somewhat else) and saw a big rectangular object in the sky hovering above her, from which came a slowly extending thin beam of light developing in the direction of her head.

When it reached her, she heard a "telepathic voice" saying: "Have no fear. We won't hurt you". Then she began ascending as sucked by this beam towards the ship where she was met by two "angelic" looking little creatures in a white thight fitting garment.

There were lots of other humans inside the ship where she was subjected to a physical examination.

For more details, see the last J. Sider: "OVNIS: Createurs de l'humanite", ed. JMG, 2005, pp. 153 and seq. ISBN 2-915164-44-4, in French.

Yours truly,

F. Boitte

pageperso.aol.fr/franckboitte/perso.html

<http://www.lejdu.com/archives/2005/mai/franck-boitte/index.htm>

<http://www.rr0.org/BoitteFranck.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Welsh UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:18:58 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:18:58 -0400
Subject: Welsh UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained

Source: The Western Mail - Cardiff, Wales, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/f779g>

May 27 2006

UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained

Sam Burson
Western Mail

A spate of mysterious UFO and alien sightings which gripped a Welsh community 30 years ago may have finally been explained.

A former US Navy sailor claims the furore gripping the Broad Haven area of Pembrokeshire in the late 1970s was caused by an officer in a special fireproof uniform, and new RAF jets.

The sailor, who served in the area shortly after most of the sightings, says a fellow officer admitted he had been responsible.

The clamour around the possibility of little green men visiting Pembrokeshire in the late 1970s led to numerous tabloid reports, including one of an entire class of schoolchildren claiming to have seen a UFO landing.

Many others reported being petrified by a strange silver alien.

It all happened in what became known as the Broad Haven Triangle, and canny tourist operators even started running UFO sighting weekends.

However behind the hype, Government officials took some of the tales seriously, and it was revealed last year by UFO expert Dr David Clarke that a secret MoD investigation had been carried out.

Now, following publicity about the investigation, James Carlson from Albuquerque, New Mexico, has written to the Fortean Times - a magazine about the supernatural - with what he believes are answers to West Wales' paranormal riddle.

He was stationed at the US Naval Facility in Brawdy in the 1980s.

In his letter Carlson tells how one of his supervisors, who is identified only by the name Steve, saw him reading a book about paranormal incidents around Brawdy, which was also an RAF base.

The book quotes an RAF officer, who states the descriptions of "alien" suits were in no way similar to military uniforms at the time.

However Carlson was told by Steve that the description was identical to firefighting gear used by American personnel.

He said, "Steve told me that while serving on the fire team of his division, he would often don the asbestos suit and oxygen breathing apparatus provided.

"Fire preparation drills, even those conducted at night, would require members of the fire team to search the areas around the base, and Steve claimed that during these drills he became responsible for two of the alien sightings."

He added that a contemporary report of a UFO sighting in Pembrokeshire, which suggested the craft could not be man-made because of its gentle swaying and hovering motion, exactly fitted a description of the Harrier Vertical Take-off and Landing jet, which had been used in the UK since 1969.

Dr David Clarke, who teaches folklore at Sheffield Hallam University, is the man who last year uncovered the MoD's secret 1970s investigation into Welsh UFOs, and this year discovered a more recent Government investigation, which concluded UFOs are probably caused by atmospheric phenomenon.

He said of the letter in this month's edition, "It adds to certain testimonies and makes sense.

"A few people have already admitted a hoax, and one has even said he had to jump into a hedge when a lady aimed a gun at him in his suit."

Dr Clarke, who is a correspondent for Fortean Times, added, "There will never be absolute proof either way, but Wales has always had a history of these sorts of sightings - it's a real hotspot for them, whether they're just atmospheric phenomenon or not.

"It used to be perceived as fairies and little folk, but now we're in the space age and everybody's seen Battlestar Galactica and Star Wars, everything is aliens and space ships."

UFO mania began in Pembrokeshire after reports of 14 pupils from Broad Haven primary school seeing a UFO landing. The headteacher at the time backed up their claims, saying they had all drawn similar pictures of the craft.

Numerous sightings took place afterwards, although many are now believed to have been the work of pranksters dressed in industrial or military suits.

MoD Minister Dr John Gilbert MP ordered an investigation in 1977 after being inundated with inquiries. Findings were dull, but another was later done in Pembrokeshire without his knowledge, and has still not been published.

Pembrokeshire flying saucer stories reached their height in 1979, when a full-scale model of the Star Wars Millennium Falcon ship was being secretly built in a warehouse in Pembroke Dock. Workers were ordered by Star Wars series producer George Lucas to refer to the ship, which could hover on compressed air, as The Magic Roundabout project.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

'Little Green Men Syndrome'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>

Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:31:55 -0400

Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:31:55 -0400

Subject: 'Little Green Men Syndrome'

Source: Peter Farley's Site

<http://www.4truthseekers.net/art2.htm>

01 January 2006

Little Green Men: The Cover-up Continues

by Peter R. Farley

As any UFO researcher will tell you, the roadblocks set up in his or her way in seeking to understand the subject are numerous. The roadblocks set up to confuse and delude the interested public on the other hand, are often even more insidious and certainly equally as effective.

The most obvious of these roadblocks for the researcher are the denials, disinformation, and deflections provided by the various government and military agencies seemingly since time immemorial. These often include agencies such as the CIA, FBI, and other covert agencies, the various judicial departments, NASA, as well as various elements of the scientific community heavily reliant on the government for their monetary grants and subsequently their livelihood.

Next come the often blatantly hostile attacks put forth by various moral and religious groups, that act as a roadblock to those intimidated by this kind of pressure. One of these was recently launched on myself after my talk in Roswell by a church group acting under the guise of an organization known as Alien Resistance Headquarters. These kind of groups have as their purpose the blockage of any kind of free flow of information and ideas to the public that disagree with their own limited visions. Insecure in their own beliefs, they feel their limited visions of the world will be threatened by the possible existence of extraterrestrial intelligences who may not agree with their often dogmatic ideals.

Last but not least comes the most deceptive, least noticeable, and certainly least publicized type of roadblock set up to hinder the inquiring mind from ultimately finding its own truth. This is the roadblock set up by the local businessmen and women of a community under the guise of making an honest dollar. Herein lies the realm of those most nefarious little roadblocks known in UFO circles as "the little green men."

Standing all of 5 to 6 inches tall, weighing no more than a few ounces at best, made of malleable green plastic and cast in the image of that most ubiquitous of all aliens - the Grays from Zeta Reticuli-this little alien intruder represents possibly the greatest danger of all to the free and unrestricted discussion of issues surrounding UFOs and extraterrestrial visitation. Representative of a whole broad range of tourist treasures ranging from T-shirts and key chains to refrigerator magnets and false alien IDs, these little green men represent to many investigators, authors, and other persons interested in this field of study, the complete trivialization of the whole alien

question.

Complicit in this cover-up of serious questions concerning alien visitation such as abduction, animal mutilation, and possible government interaction with alien forces, are the public-at-large themselves. Ever eager to be led astray from honest solutions to honest problems, steeped in a T-shirt-and-trivia television mentality, the public bares the ultimate responsibility for its own lack of knowledge on many of these issues. It also has to bare some of the responsibility for the ability of certain groups from the government and the corporate-owned media to cover them up, seemingly at will.

One might expect that this would certainly not be the case in Roswell, New Mexico, the world's most recognizable name in terms of its association with the UFO phenomena that has swept the world, particularly over the past five years. To put this kind of assumption on Roswell may be a little unfair, however, since no one in Roswell ever necessarily chose to be the center of this, in certain segments of the population, often unwanted world attention. This small southeastern New Mexico city of around 50,000 people has inherited the role as much as by default as anything else after the alleged crash of a flying saucer north of the city on or around July 4th, 1947.

It was not the crash itself that brought on so much of the attention, however. Rather it was the article that appeared the following day in the local newspaper, the Roswell Daily Record, after a receiving a press release from the local army air base saying in fact that they had recovered the wreckage of a flying saucer from the crash site. This admission was almost immediately retracted on orders from higher echelons of command. It remains, however, the one slip in an otherwise consistent wall of denial by the government of the existence of UFOs. It, therefore, remains to this day the one chink in the armor to which the whole world clings in hope of finding out the truth about the whole enigmatic phenomenon of UFOs, and ultimately whether or not we are alone in the Universe.

Whether or not this incident really occurred or not is of little or no consequence in the grander scheme of things. Almost any day of the year these days there seem to be credible eyewitness accounts of UFOs and cases of cattle mutilations and abductions that would lead any reasonable human being to believe that we are being visited by extraterrestrial lifeforms. Crop circles appear overnight in various parts of the world and in shapes and sizes that could not be duplicated with anywhere near the complexity using any of the known terrestrial technology.

So, as the Mecca for experiencers and those who want to believe alike from all over the world, Roswell is also perhaps the first city in the world to witness and have to deal with the trivialization of the issues surrounding UFOs to a greater extent and on a larger scale than has ever been dealt with before - even among those who purport to know better.

First opened in 1992 against initial resistance from a staunchly conservative and deeply religious farming community, the International UFO Museum and Research Center in Roswell now attracts as many as 200,000 people a year, and is one of New Mexico's newest major attractions.

While it houses an interesting and creative display of artifacts from the 1947 incident, the museum devotes almost equally as much space to displays of flying saucer-like hubcaps, newspaper cartoons, Hollywood memorabilia, and even fake pieces of UFO wreckage once pawned off on an eager public as being genuine. Admission is free to the public, and the museum is described as an educational, non-profit institution. It is supported entirely by donations and the income garnered from a small but incredibly well-stocked gift store where both educational materials and the requisite "little green men" type souvenirs are sold. The gift store's manager is reluctant to say exactly how much is brought in by the store, but rumors have it that it is considerable. Obviously the fun souvenirs of the "little green men" type outsell the educational materials - though the ratio is not readily known.

It is not uncommon for one to see a tourist bus unloading passengers at the museum and hordes of anxious sightseers lining up to sign in and then heading straight for the gift shop,

bypassing the museum displays altogether. All this for the sake of getting little Johnny or the folks back home a mandatory souvenir of the museum. In Tom Robbin's cult-classic 1971 novel *Another Roadside Attraction*, every little town in America was almost required to have some kind of tourist attraction with which to make people stop, at least just long enough to spend some much-needed money in their community. Along these lines, Roswell has found itself a goldmine.

In Roswell's case, however, the town has managed to tap into something much deeper in the human consciousness than just a desire to relieve some overworked kidneys and gaze at a two-headed boa-constrictor. They instead have tapped into the whole thirst for knowledge by almost every individual on the planet to know why they exist, and whether or not we are alone in the Universe. The question is, does Roswell help to answer these questions for the people attracted to the town's hype, or does it indeed set up another roadblock along the way to the disclosure of this very vital information?

The much-publicized 1997 50th anniversary celebration of the Roswell Incident drew an impressive list of speakers on various aspects of the subject. Subsequent festivals have drawn, at best, small crowds to what were little more than city-wide fairs centered more around kitsch than serious speakers and honest discussion of the issues. Guided as they have been by local businessmen, and focusing on "scientific" researchers such as the notorious Dr. Stanton Friedman, these events and the museum itself have now placed their focus heavily on "scientific" fact rather than on what seems to be of most interest to the public in general—personal experiences and broad-ranging answers to honest questions about life and existence in the Universe.

It is this scientific method that, though having an obvious validity in uncovering some of the clues to help in solving the larger issues, has itself few if any of the answers to explain any of the phenomena it purports to study. It is a limited view in which everything is still an apparent mystery, but by calling it so, the scientists are then able to perpetuate their own superior roles as controllers of the information.

Meanwhile, potential speakers such as Gregg Braden, author of *Awakening to Zero Point*, and renowned for the depth and integrity of his research on the areas of pole shifts and planetary movements, have been dismissed as being "too far out" to be recruited among possible speakers for the museum events. Well-documented abductees such as those written about in by psychotherapist, author, and well-known convention speaker Constance Clear in her book, *Reaching for Reality*, have also been casually dismissed, along with the remark that they "only say they have been abducted."

One case of this bias that involved the author of this article brought home the depths to which this roadblock mentality can sink. After a recent standing-room only talk at the museum for the Roswell UFO Festival during which I did my best to cover the immense field of alien involvement in human origins in the short time available, my talk was attacked by Dr. Friedman as being "unscientific," and by a fringe-element religious group in the city as being alien-cult related. Covering the ideas of much-vaunted researchers such as Zecharia Sitchin and Laurence Gardner, the material succeeded in putting together the pieces of what obviously is a very complex puzzle. These comments came among almost universally positive feedback from everyone else who attended, though as usual it is the negative complaints that get passed along and not the positive ones. A subsequent request by me to do a book signing at the museum one weekend was denied on the basis, and I quote, that the museum "didn't want anything to do with the paranormal" in its facility. How ironic coming from supposedly the world's foremost UFO museum.

It seems as though if something is not immediately reproducible in the laboratory or does not agree with the accepted scientific community's view, then it is not fit to be heard by the public, those who can always vote with their feet should they not like what is being presented. This is the same public who have made shows about the paranormal a staple part of our entertainment diets on both television and in movies, as well as in the books that it reads and that it buys. Subjective experiences such as the more than 17,000 UFO sightings on the museum's database and more than 2,000 personally reported to museum personnel should

then, by these definitions, also be dismissed because these people only say they have witnessed a UFO.

Arthur Miller's famous play *The Crucible*, a standard in most high schools or universities, is based exactly on this kind of witch-hunting suppression of freedom of speech and free discussion of ideas.

Attached to the museum is also a research library with more than 3,000 books, videos, and sundry files and reports, many of them donated by noted UFO researcher of almost 50 years, George Fawcett. Fawcett's contributions came from his own personal library and included many books of a philosophical or metaphysical bent, covering the whole field of paranormal phenomena. Librarians at the research center, all with little or no experience in the subject field, freely admit that they think much of the donated material and books such as those dealing with planetary sacred sites, extradimensional phenomena, and metaphysical studies, shouldn't be in the library because "it has nothing to do with UFOs."

Again, this kind of limited view of the whole enormous field of which UFOs are only one small part, is perhaps the greatest roadblock put in the way of all our hopes to one day find our true place in the Universe. The limiting of what kind of material and information people have access to or can listen to is the most insidious form of control over men's minds ever devised.

Much of the field of UFOlogy has itself been usurped as personal territory by the religion of science, as evidenced by the number of PhD's and doctorates listed behind the names of many of the most prominent speakers and researchers in the field. This is not to say that rational judgment isn't helpful at certain times, but not to the exclusion of all other kinds of creative thought and analysis. When people seek to understand themselves and their place in the Universe through an understanding of extraterrestrial lifeforms and UFOs, the often grandiose and pompous attitudes exhibited by so many in the field who want to decide what is fit and proper information for them to use, serves only to hinder rather than to help.

A good example of this limited scientific thinking occurred recently on an edition of Whitley Streiber's very popular nationally syndicated radio show, *Dreamland*. During the whole time the subject of the new harvest of crop circles in England was discussed by a prominent doctor and scientific journalist, every scientific aspect of the crop circles was discussed. What, however, was never mentioned nor even intimated at was the question of what the heck are these crop circles trying to tell us. Electro-magnetic fields, physical effects on people entering the crop circles, military surveillance of the phenomena-all were covered in depth, everything that is but the possible messages these crop circles and their creators were trying to convey.

It is very much like the case of the professor I once had for an honors course in the works of Plato. This scholarly gentleman spent all of his time lecturing on the various intricacies of Socratic argument while admitting he knew none of what it was that either Plato or Socrates were trying to say in these arguments. In these times where the medium has become the message (or the message as Marshall McLuhan would say), the true messages concerning alien involvement with the planet have fallen by the wayside, hidden by the smoke and mirrors of people's attitude of self-importance and their desire for power over others. This has become the most effective cover-up of all.

As a journalist and former instructor of journalism, I have watched with heartfelt sadness at the almost complete destruction of our First Amendment Rights in this country. It is, however, the public's right to know that is at the heart of this current battle in UFO-dom, a right that as we have seen from recent releases under the Freedom of Information Act, has never been very well respected by any of the powers that be.

Where commercialism is concerned, we find the trivialization of the subject matter at hand-"the little green men" syndrome. Where either religion or science are allowed to control the areas or topics for debate, the honest search for truth is also trivialized or made impotent by the narrowness of focus.

As Dr. Friedman was so vocal in making known at his recent Roswell appearance, he did not care for the inclusion of so-called "New Age" speakers among serious speakers at the recent UFO symposium held in Istanbul, Turkey. In almost the same breath he publicly stated, with no apologies to former President Bush or other government and military figures who have used the term, that he believed there was no such thing as the New World Order or its conspiracy.

The real truth of the matter will only be found with the input of all those concerned, and with no information being dismissed as irrelevant. The public should be informed that not only are they the victims of so many of these roadblocks and cover-ups meant to keep them blind to the knowledge around them, but they are also the cause of roadblocks such as those created by the "little green men" syndrome. They need to be reminded that the lines in the old song are true, "There are none so blind as those who will not see."

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

SA UFO A 'Waterspout'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:45:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:45:18 -0400
Subject: SA UFO A 'Waterspout'

Source: The Mercury - KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

<http://tinyurl.com/l8b68>

May 23, 2006

UFO A 'Waterspout'
By Carvin Goldstone

The unidentified object which South Coast residents reported had fallen into the sea near Port Shepstone on Saturday was probably a large volume of water, which had been picked up by a waterspout, falling back into the sea, the National Sea Rescue Institute said.

NSRI Shelly Beach Station Commander Eddie Noyons said people had reported seeing an unidentified object, possibly an aircraft, crashing into the sea behind the breaker line, off-shore of Port Shepstone High School.

"The SA Police Services, our NSRI Shelly Beach seven-metre rigid inflatable Caltex Endeavor and NSRI Port Edward's seven-metre rigid inflatable Rescue 32 Alpha responded to the scene to investigate. Margate Air Traffic Control were alerted and a fixed-wing aircraft was diverted to the scene to provide a fly-by visual of the area. But nothing was recovered after a full-scale search of the area.

"The number of eyewitness reports leads us to presume that weather activity in the area at the time may have given the impression of something falling into the sea," he said.

NSRI spokesman Paul Bevis said the loud crash could have been caused by waterspouts which had been caused by a tornado out at sea.

"This is a very natural weather phenomenon," he said, adding that the diameter of the tornado was usually 20m-30m, but could expand to as much as 200m. He said the whirlwind looked like water in a bath going down the drain.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 12:38:43 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:48:12 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Vicktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 09:26:22 EDT
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence of
>>>thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>>>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>>>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe 5
>>>feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin thread
>>>indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye, e.g.,
>>>would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

>>Most of you know that I am a professional photographer and
>>technical expert on photography. Because I have had a commercial
>>photography studio for many years, I have learned many of the
>>tricks of the trade, and have written about many of them.

>>The trick to suspending a model so that the suspension "thread"
>>doesn't show up in photos is to use very fine, nonreflective
>>tungsten wire. I keep a couple of spools of it in two
>>thicknesses on hand in my studio for just this purpose. When
>>someone wants a photo of a product suspended in mid air, this is
>>what I use. It is actually an old trick from the movie industry
>>in Hollywood. A very light object such as a balsa wood model can
>>be suspended from the thinnest of these wires and there will be
>>no sign of the support wires in the photograph.

>>Now I am not arguing for or against these photos, I'm just
>>saying that the absence of a visible support thread means
>>nothing, particularly in Polaroid photos which do not have very
>>high resolving power.

>>Since the eye can only perceive about 200 shades of gray,
>>it is imperative to scan he originals with as much bit depth
>>as possible to confirm whether something linear-like could
>>emerge from scaling such higher bit depth scans.

Look in the Druffel, Wood, Kelson JSE paper where the object is
shown enlarged to the point of evident grain with contrast
enhancement in the mid range that brings out density variations
in the sky. There are no obvious "strings" above the object in
any of the photos. But there are some interesting features.

In #2 there is a sort of curvilinear "quiff" rising obliquely
from the top left of the object. If you look very closely at #3
(fig 16) there is what looks like a very faint scratch rising
at an angle from a similar point. I think it likely that this is
just a scratch but the quiff in #2 is very odd. Some sort of

bent support wire? It doesn't really look that way. Also if you look again very carefully along the top of this image you can make out a complex of smaller but similar curvilinear features.

This fluffy detail reminds me of the apparent "smoke trail" behind the object in #3, brought out in the same enhancement process. It's as though what is visible in #3 as a trail (or even a broken "ring" if you use a little imagination) is caught in #2 in the process of detaching or being emitted.

I mentioned that the dispute over the cloud background in Heflin #4 was an echo of the similar dispute about the cloud background in Trindade #4. There's another similarity too. If you look carefully at similarly enhanced enlargements of the Trindade object

(<http://trindade-island.mysite.wanadoo-members.co.uk/inversio.htm>)

you can see a similar thing - linear striations with a fluffy quality, these detectable extending beyond the edges of the object. This has been independently noted by myself and Martin Powell and we have discussed it previously. Powell suspects some symptom of hoax. I disagree with his reasons. This frothy or smoky quality was reported visually in that case too.

To my eye, the Heflin #1 enhanced enlargement also shows an odd oblique linear structure inside the black band (which I would dearly like to investigate when high-res scans become available), which Nathan's early JPL analysis identified as appearing to be made up of dark atmospheric "particulates" rather than an optical shadow, conceivably the "smoke" that appears detaching in #2 and #3 and as a fully-formed ring in #4. There is a similar issue with dark regions on the upper surface of the Trindade object which resemble anomalous "shadow" and so have led to suggestions that it is a hoax image introduced "upside down" (this is not a strong argument).

In both cases there is also arguably a gross geometrical skewing of the object outline in the direction of motion (see Trindade site, and Druffel, Wood & Kelson Fig.8). In Heflin #1 the edges of the "dome" appear slanted from the vertical towards the direction of flight, roughly matching the slant angle of the striations in the dark band. In Trindade the parallelogram shaped dark patch on the object's upper surface slants at an angle matching that of the smoke-like striations. In both cases it is evident to the eye (and has been shown by careful measurement in the Trindade case) that the apparent overall skewing of the image is not itself sufficient to account for the obliquity of the striated detail.

Also as I mention on the Trindade site, "there is at least one other photographic case with a similar feature - the unexplained photograph taken by a government aerial survey camera over Costa Rica on 04 September 1971. In this case the investigators report:

"There appears to be a very interesting obliquely oriented micro- and macro-structural detail on the image of the object itself. [T]he left-hand edge consists of dozens of thin, parallel fingers of light that originate in the "body" of the object and fade out into the background luminance. . . . The right-hand edge possesses a much more regular (smooth) contour than the left but also possesses many very short jagged lines of light, each of which is oriented in the same direction . . . [O]ther details having this same orientation . . . are: (a) the upper and lower edges of the disk . . . (b) a relatively long, thin dark line that originates in the central region . . . and (c) the alignment of the two dark regions near the middle of the disk. We have no clear understanding of the origin or meaning of this oblique orientation effect seen in so many of its surface details." (Haines and Vall=E9e, 1999)

Food for thought.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:43:21 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:50:40 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 00:12:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>However, in the Heflin case, I consider the question of a
>suspension thread almost moot. Not only can no such thread
>(i.e., line of film darkening) be detected in the photos even
>after enhancement, but other details pretty clearly rule out
>hoax in my mind. The most important of these is the smoke ring
>Heflin said the object left behind and which he photographed
>(his photo 4), but which now also turns out to also be evident
>in his photo 3. See Figure 17 in the JSE paper, which is an
>enhancement of photo 3, and in which it can be clearly seen that
>the object is leaving behind a dark smoke ring, also in line
>with Heflin's testimony of what he saw (the object seemed
>to separate from the ring of smoke as it began to depart).

>David Rudiak

Gee Doc... you go a long way to throw a bucket of winter slurry
on the irrational hope against hope of some that the Heflin Top
Hat is only that: a top hat. It seems to me your contribution
here would put out a magnesium flare of same. No endorsement, I
know, but still...

Tssss-ssss["s'es" of reducing point size]...

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 27](#)

Spherical UFO Follows Pennsylvania Driver

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:58:17 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:58:17 -0400
Subject: Spherical UFO Follows Pennsylvania Driver

Source: Stan Gordon's Site

<http://tinyurl.com/m2mtb>

19 April 2006

Small Spherical UFO Follows Pennsylvania Driver

Today I interviewed a witness who reported having an unusual encounter with a small luminous object on April 7, 2006. This woman was driving on Route 271, and heading west between Johnstown and Ligonier. The vehicle was moving at about 40 mph and all was normal when suddenly the driver noticed a bright source of light towards the passenger side window. At first the driver thought it was the headlight of an approaching car reflecting on her side mirror. The operator soon realized that there was no car following her. The witness slowed down to about 15 mph so that she could take a better look at this unusual light.

About 3 feet away from the window, was a bright spherical object, about the size and shape of a standard car headlight. The solid round object was glowing a bright white light. On the outside leading edge of the sphere, was a crescent shaped attachment that glowed of a very bright yellow color. The light from the object while very bright, was not blinding.

The object continued to follow along with the vehicle for about 1/2 mile. The object while maintaining it's position in front of the window, would move at times about an inch or two, up and down. The driver watched as the sphere backed away from the window, then arched upwards, and moved out of sight. The witness heard no sound, and all operations of her vehicle operated normally during this experience.

For information on Pennsylvania UFO sightings, the Kecksburg UFO incident, and other anomalies, see my web site at:

www.stangordon.com.

PA UFO Hotline: 724-838-7768

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Strange Object Over Dutch Village

From: Rick Speelman <webmaster.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 14:27:41 +0200
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 07:46:25 -0400
Subject: Strange Object Over Dutch Village

Hi All,

Last week I spoke in person to someone who saw a strange object some 19 years ago, above a village in Holland.

He tried to tell his wife, who didn't believe him, and thought it was a prank.

He made an sketch, and was looking all those years for someone who saw the same thing. As mentioned before, we spoke to him in person, and are convinced he is telling the truth. He wishes to stay anonymous, but asked us if we can find information about this object he saw.

An impression of this object can be found here:

<http://tinyurl.com/jwrgo>

The article is in Dutch, but eventually can be translated into English and posted here.

Does anyone know more about this object, or where it might be cited?

Thanks.

Greetz,

Rick Speelman
Webmaster @ UfoPlaza.nl

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:22:51 -0700
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:07:31 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hatch

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:40:22 +0100
>Subj: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:03:40 +0100
>>Subj: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

<burp!>

I have a simple question, one which will hopefully not hi-jack this thread.

Without searching the Internet for the 'Journal of American Folklore', I would like to know if the JAF covers topics outside of Ufology, Mothman, Bigfoot and the like.

Does the JAF extend their purview to matters like meteors and meteorites, long considered old-wives tales? How about Kugelblitzen or ball lightning? Never properly defined.

(I had one German granny BTW, a teetotaler believe it or not! It took some English chromosomes to counterbalance that unfortunate genetic trait)

Back on topic; does the JAF deal with matters once considered occult but now commonly accepted as factual?

What I'm driving at is this:

Does the JAF place UFO studies, the serious ones included, in the same category as Chupacabras, ghosts and so forth? If so, that's really all I need to know.

I have a beer full of cold fridge (or vice-versa) and lots of other things to do.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 09:14:12 EDT
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:10:35 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>from: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 00:12:40 -0300
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 17:36:43 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 10:22:50 -0700
>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>Robert Nathan, BTW, also analyzed the photos for any evidence
>>>>of thread suspension of a model, and didn't find anything. My
>>>>preliminary analysis of the parallax in photos #2 and #3 would
>>>>place a model only 1 or 2 feet beyond the car mirror or maybe
>>>>5 feet from Heflin. It would have taken a very, very thin
>>>>thread indeed to have hidden it from the camera. The human eye,
>>>>e.g., would fairly easily see a typical thread at that distance.

>>>>Most of you know that I am a professional photographer and
>>>>technical expert on photography. Because I have had a
>>>>commercial photography studio for many years, I have learned
>>>>many of the tricks of the trade, and have written about many
>>>>of them.

>>>>The trick to suspending a model so that the suspension thread"
>>>>doesn't show up in photos is to use very fine, nonreflective
>>>>tungsten wire. I keep a couple of spools of it in two
>>>>thicknesses on hand in my studio for just this purpose. When
>>>>someone wants a photo of a product suspended in mid air, this
>>>>is what I use. It is actually an old trick from the movie
>>>>industry in Hollywood. A very light object such as a balsa
>>>>wood model can be suspended from the thinnest of these wires
>>>>and there will be no sign of the support wires in the photograph.

>>>>Now I am not arguing for or against these photos, I'm just
>>>>saying that the absence of a visible support thread means
>>>>nothing, particularly in Polaroid photos which do not have
>>>>very high resolving power.

>>I was going to go to some site and find a copy of one of these
>>Heflin photos and do a blow-op, etc. to look for just that
>>support cable. You've saved me the time. I wondered about
>>Polaroid res as well.

<snip>

>the film is ASA 3000, 3-1/4 x 4-1/4 inch print size, which
>they blew up to 8 x 10 inch and scanned. The paper said they
>were into the grain when scanning at 300 dpi. According to my

>calculations, this means the grain size was on the order of 25
>to 30 grains per millimeter on the original film, which is
>pretty grainy.

Nice estimates David, but we must consider much more:

One has to exceed the grain size by a considerable factor in order to do any analysis of the type that's described here. The actual grain size, would have to be determined using a reflected light microscope to see exactly what the character of the grain is. Based upon that, one would then do a scan that would exceed the grain size observed (2000 dpi+). There's also the effects caused by the inconsistent sizes of the grains: grains can vary by as much 7 fold, that I've seen. Therefore, we do not know which order of grain size they are possibly perceiving in the scan: The largest of ones, which? Given that the grain sizes vary from one grain to the next (mozaic-like pattern), a linear-like feature will have a much harder time being detected congruently, especially when you've factored in what I've written below. Because of the impact of varying grain sizes, one is also forced into a situation of having to exceed, not only the grain size, but the bit depth of the scan too. In order to detect subtle changes in shading, one should exceed the normal 256 shades of gray, which are 8 bit and try to go higher (true 16 bit can detect 64,000 shades of gray). And, even if you looked at a 16 bit image, the eye can detect no more that 200 of them_all the more reason analysis has to be done by computer_ to detect these much more subtle differences and put them within the 200 we can detect or use color enhancements to aid detection as well.

<snip>

>If a model was outside the window and about 10 times further
>away then the size of the film (or about 3.5 feet away), this
>means every millimeter at the plane of the model corresponds to
>2.7 grains on the film (call it 3) or one-third millimeter per
>grain (or 330 microns). This is a little wider than a typical
>sewing thread (about 0.2 mm or 200 microns).

>Does this mean that any support wire or thread thinner than the
>film grain cannot be seen? No, because the thread still blocks
>light, so the grains where the thread is still receive less
>light than those not so-blocked. As a result there will still be
>a faint line of darkening corresponding to where the thread is
>in the picture. The film grain can't resolve the thread itself,
>but it can still detect the presence of its "shadow."

<snip>

A thin wire will diffract light (light will rap around the object) and cause interference like fringing to appear and spread the effects of shadowing over a larger region of space thereby reduce the contrast considerably. If there is a wire present, it may also be oriented differently too: like a close-line. In other words, the line could be oriented toward the camera (into the blur zone) and away, in which case, light-effects will have to be considered from other orientation pathways.

>The same is true for the human eye. We can still detect a dark
>line on a light background much thinner than our retinal grain,
>by a factor of about 10 times thinner. If the thread gets too
>thin, then the darkening becomes too slight for the human visual
>system to detect the contrast difference.

The human eye is perceiving subtle changes dynamically (constantly moving and comparing) in normal settings. This setting is a static one.

I'm not suggesting these are fake, but I'm simply pointing out how much work really has to be done and understood to complete a study. I've already pointed out the considerable unlikelihood that the photographer could have accidently compensated for the motion of the object from one image to the next such that the object overlaps in a 3D stereo at the widow (car aligned position). I've also pointed out the importance of the sequence of the images and the effects of motion that can be detected that may contraindicate that which was reported by the observer, thus the importance of 3D stereo at the horizon point too. (TWO, 3D stereo images can be done in this setting, not just ONE, which I've already pointed in an earlier posting.

Unfortunately, all these factors have to be taken under consideration. I advocate wholeheartedly trying to prove them genuine which is the approach I've been taking. And, as a UFO believer, I genuinely hope them authentic.

Regards,

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:51:51 -0700
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:14:57 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Hatch

>Source: Peter Farley's Site

><http://www.4truthseekers.net/art2.htm>

>01 January 2006

<snip>

>Little Green Men: The Cover-up Continues
>by Peter R. Farley

<snip>

Please forgive the snips, but this is a sore point with me.

"Little Green Men?"

As one highly regarded web page puts it:

" Q-14: How about Little Green Men?

This database has thousands of 'entity' sightings listed, of various and often dubious merits.

Having scoured the literature for two decades at least, *U* doesn't register a single Little Green Man (LGM).

The origin of the term is very obscure. Almost invariably, LGM is used as an inexpensive form of ridicule, or to change the subject without further discussion. The surest way to display complete ignorance of these matters is to bring up Little Green Men. "

That's my own web page by-the-way, and I suppose I'm the only one highly-regarding it.

<http://www.larryhatch.net/UFOFAQO.html#LGM>

LGM is a straw man. In most cases, whoever uses the term implies that ufologists 'believe' in LGM as a rule when nothing could be further from the truth.

I strongly doubt that any living being would ever come here from light-years distances when highly intelligent probes could do the job.

Others may well argue into the night about 'wormholes in space' and similar but that's not the point here.

I maintain that LGM is as much a false and comforting chimera now, as caricatures of buck-teethed Japanese were in 1939. Both are/were beside the point, wrong-minded, and just plain wrong. I hope I never see the term LGM in print any more. Maybe there is a special place in Eternal Local Sports* for people who write LGM stuff.

Best

- Larry Hatch

* I was a Music major and suffered for that. My version of Hell is a never-ending sports report.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:14:07 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:16:56 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 21:24:33 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Ann Druffel <Anndruffel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 02:48:14 EDT
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>If the typical height of telephone poles is about 22 feet (from
>telephone lineman manual) and measures about 55mm in length on
>my computer screen and the width of the UFO in the sky is indeed
>in the opposite side of the road and measures about 15mm, then
>the diameter of this UFO would about 6 feet. The raised central
>dome would be about 4 feet across.

Nick,

This is a very pertinent observation.

>Such a tiny crew compartment
>would be too cramped for even a single 3 foot tall ET occupant
>laying on its side!

But this is a red herring. We are not debating the physiology of hypothetical ETs, we are trying to decide whether the Heflin photos are valid objective evidence or a hoax. A 6-foot wide discoidal object flying over Myford Rd and kicking up a dust cloud in 1965 would be a remarkable UFO in my opinion.

>Since there is no obvious large shadow of this UFO on the ground
>immediately to the left of the apparent ground disturbance,

Some commentators have in fact said that they discern a shadow, so maybe this is debateable?

>then
>we can reasonably conclude that the UFO was much closer to the
>truck window and thus much smaller (the size of a hub cap?).

Not at all. You could equally conclude that it was further away and tens of feet across - as Heflin said.

>If the UFO was much closer or much further than the disturbance on
>the ground (a dust devil?), then this disturbance had no direct
>association with the UFO.

Obviously.

>The fourth picture that Rex Heflin took which depicts a smoke
>ring must have been taken at another place or time, possibly at
>an airshow after an explosion on the ground from the simulated
>bombing by a passing aircraft.

"Must have been"? Baseless assertion. "Possibly"? That's more

like it, but not good enough.

>If this UFO Heflin photographed three (or four) times in period
>of a few minutes from the time he first noticed it to the time
>it departed was indeed a distant massive object with an apparent
>angular size much bigger than the full Moon (the Moon would
>appear much smaller and show less detail than the UFO in
>Heflin's photos), it should have been seen and reported by
>others.

Yes, well this is an issue that arises again and again in connection with countless cases of various kinds over the years and has long ago come to be recognised as part of the phenomenology of UFO reporting. There are sociological factors at work obviously, and possibly also some unexplained "Oz factor" (to borrow from Jenny Randles) in some cases. If the internal evidence in the case is strong - it may or may not be, but your arguments here are insufficient to establish anything - then this factor becomes one more thing in need of explanation, possibly as part of a common pattern.

>Although it is one of my favourite UFO photographic cases, since
>this UFO sighting was a single witness case and there's doubts
>raised by the dubious and very different fourth photo of this
>series,

Dubious _and_ very different? By "different" do you mean the cloud background? If this were explainable, as it may be - by a combination of auto exposure metering and by the differing cloud conditions west and east of the site, as I suggested in a recent post (I now see this same idea was raised before in the JSE paper and elsewhere) - would it cease being "dubious"? There's nothing else dubious about it AFAIK. True, Heflin didn't produce it straight away - is this what you mean? But is this dubious? If he'd faked his photos around a prior airshow smoke-ring - including the clever touch of putting a very subtle broken "smoke trail" in photo #3 that took 35 years and digital enhancement for anyone to find - why would he hold back the smoke ring, the keystone of his hoax? _That_ would be dubious. In fact he said the the 3 UFO shots seemed like "enough" for people to swallow at the time and so he was reticent about it.

>I would follow the generally accepted guidelines by Dr.
>J. Allen Hynek and other ufologists and reject it as an example
>of a "real" UFO or TRUFO.

True, Hynek deprecated single witness photo cases as a general rule, but not because he rejected them as "not real UFOs" . The point is about probative evidence. A single photo from a single witness may have little probative value. But a single photo with multiple witnesses, or multiple photos with a single witness, can both be in a different class because of the possibility of literal and metaphorical triangulation of different lines of sight. There's enough potential latent information in the Heflin case IMO to take it way out of the category of the average single witness case.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: Welsh UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 15:09:31 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:22:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Welsh UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained

UFO UpDates - Toronto wrote:

>Source: The Western Mail - Cardiff, Wales, UK

><http://tinyurl.com/f779g>

>May 27 2006

>UFO Sightings Of 30 Years Ago Explained
>Sam Burson
>Western Mail

>A spate of mysterious UFO and alien sightings which gripped a
>Welsh community 30 years ago may have finally been explained.
>A former US Navy sailor claims the furore gripping the Broad
>Haven area of Pembrokeshire in the late 1970s was caused by an
>officer in a special fireproof uniform, and new RAF jets.

>The sailor, who served in the area shortly after most of the
>sightings, says a fellow officer admitted he had been
>responsible.

<snip>

>He added that a contemporary report of a UFO sighting in
>Pembrokeshire, which suggested the craft could not be man-made
>because of its gentle swaying and hovering motion, exactly
>fitted a description of the Harrier Vertical Take-off and
>Landing jet, which had been used in the UK since 1969.
>Dr David Clarke, who teaches folklore at Sheffield Hallam
>University, is the man who last year uncovered the MoD's secret
>1970s investigation into Welsh UFOs, and this year discovered a
>more recent Government investigation, which concluded UFOs are
>probably caused by atmospheric phenomenon.

<snip>

Anyone who has ever seen a Harrier hovering would not mistake it for a "flying saucer". They are extremely loud. You have to keep your fingers in your ears or risk permanent hearing loss. And they don't make a practice of hovering over bushes and scrub or trees for that matter because of the intense downward heat produced by the jets. The Harrier, in peacetime, doesn't land in clearings and then take off again on a whim. That's a myth. The Harrier carries distilled water for landing vertically on runways or a carrier deck which is injected into the blast to cool the exhaust gases so as not to melt paved tarmacs, crack/spall concrete or set decks afire. This maneuver in peacetime would be carried out only during an emergency, if there was time.

So had a Harrier landed as suggested by the student witnesses, there would have been no doubt of it either because of the large burnt out area or fire that would have resulted. The fire department showing up shortly afterwards to put out the fire would be another tip-off. Perhaps even the wreck of a harrier would be found in the middle of the fire site as well. Then there would be the investigation carried by the CAA and the MoD, etc. the reports in a few dozen newspapers.

Here's another from the expert who claims to have been using a fire suit.

He said, "Steve told me that while serving on the fire team of his division, he would often don the asbestos suit and oxygen breathing apparatus provided."

Steve sounds more like a wannabee to me, trying to be important. Anyone in fire fighting knows you don't use oxygen tanks around fire. It's a straight air mixture otherwise you would be carrying a bomb around on your back and would lose you face inside the mask as well..

The prop in Star Wars was built, tested and used on a sound stage. How would anyone report these as a sighting?

This must have been the reporters first piece. Not much critical thinking going on there.

Also we have the report that solved everything:

>Dr David Clarke, who teaches folklore at Sheffield Hallam
>University, is the man who last year uncovered the MoD's secret
>1970s investigation into Welsh UFOs, and this year discovered a
>more recent Government investigation, which concluded UFOs are
>probably caused by atmospheric phenomenon.

Folklore is right. Only this time the MoD is promoting it. This report has been out for several weeks now. The reporter could have at least read a bit of it. The more you read, the more it discredits itself.

I don't know what the good people of that area of Wales saw but they don't need some smug reporter "solving" it for them with flawed information and throwing around amateurish theory, MoD reports, that explains nothing and only raises more questions about why it was done in the first place.

Then there's UFO expert, Clarke's quote: "It used to be perceived as fairies and little folk, but now we're in the space age and everybody's seen Battlestar Galactica and Star Wars, everything is aliens and space ships." This is a bit insincere. People explain phenomenon in the vernacular and the belief systems of the day. In the late 1800s it was airships in the 1,700s it was large vessels in the sky. Clarke is as well aware of that as the rest of us.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:48:43 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:23:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report? - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 12:31:25 EDT
>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 15:23:58 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 08:45:37 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sat, 20 May 2006 11:32:20 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Specific Cases In Condign Report?

>>>>You and Bruce are wasting your time. No matter how you slice
>>>>this report, it's still pseudoscience. All it represents is a
>>>>psychological mindset all too familiar among self-styled
>>>>skeptics (i.e., debunkers).

>>>>However, some like to get caught up in the insanity of something
>>>>and we call them comedie - though they're just as brilliant. :)

>>>>The filter in which they couch their arguments is too narrow,
>>>>but the degree to which they overanalyze their narrow mindedness
>>>>is an impressive display but yet it does not justify their
>>>>limited input.

>>>>Yes Dick, I agree so far. But will wait final judgment until I
>>>>get through the entire report. But, I can't tell you how many
>>>>times I've laughed!

>>>>Since you agree that any detailed comment is only a waste of
>>>>time on the part of narrow-minded comedians I won't expect to
>>>>hear anything more from you on this subject.

>Hey Martin,

>I think you left what follows out from my earlier comments? I'm
>not trying to dredge this up again, just want it included for
>the sake of completeness. I had already sent this to you
>privately...

>"I'm not attacking anyone here and value all opinions greatly and
>we all fully realize our dilemmas. It's unfortunate that once
>again we have to expend a lot of resources to countermand the
>appearance of good science from the vantage point of (Media
>defined) repressed ufological dreamers. More power to you guys."

Victor,

Fine, but since you do bring it up let me also add this "for the
sake of completeness". Maybe I let the double-whammy of Dick's
"waste of time" criticism and your immediate endorsement rattle

my cage too easily.

I acknowledge that you did indeed add the qualification about "not attacking anyone here and value all opinions greatly"

But despite such mollifying faint praise I stand by my right to take umbrage at having a couple of perfectly sensible criticisms of a major new document characterised in patronising tones as "unnecessary" and "'unjustified" "over-analysis" of "meaningless detail" by a "narrow-minded" individual sadly lacking your own and Dick's "creativity".

But there, umbrage taken and done with. Let's get back to work.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 16:47:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:26:55 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:46:55 +0000
>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

<snip>

>I suspect that people who were spiritually inclined in the first
>place would be more likely to find something positive in an
>abduction experience, and people who were inclined to buy into
>the scientific, secular worldview (like me) would be more likely
>to be scared by it.

Question: Why is there any conflict between religious faith and the
"scientific, secular world view"?

I've taken science courses, and I'm a confirmed Christian. I just don't
see any conflict. To me, science is about learning the details of how
God set this universe up.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:05:23 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:29:57 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:38:57 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>What Greg Sandow describes here looks like an example of what
>is sometimes called "applied social science" - which is
>actually a somewhat misleading term, because what is being
>applied is a research methodology, not a corpus of knowledge.

>But in a way, that illustrates the problem, because in the
>social sciences there is no corpus of knowledge to apply.
>It's when claims are made for such a corpus of knowledge, or
>for theories supposedly based on such a corpus of knowledge,
>that the claims made by social scientists begin to look more
>than a little dodgy.

<snip>

>As for examples of social sciences work which matches Ray
>Dickenson's description, I should say pretty much anything
>published within the paradigms of Freudian Psychoanalysis,
>Behaviorism and Cognitive Psychology, and about ninety
>percent of what is published under the rubric of Evolutionary
>Psychology.

Which is one reason I didn't pick any examples from those
fields. Evolutionary anything is pretty much a game preserve,
these days, for wild speculation, bolstered by the high prestige
that evolutionary thought has these days.

But sociology, in my experience with it, tends to be grounded in
real research.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:32:42 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:33:20 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:11:18 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>I just don't see how putting this (Mr. X) in a book about
>>Roswell contributes to making things any clearer, considering
>>the circus Roswell has become. That's if that's what Jesse is
>>doing. To me, Mr. X is of no value in determining the truth
>>about Roswell.

>>Rarely can what these type of guys say ever be tracked down or
>>verified, provided, of course, they say anything interesting at
>>a

>I see nothing in Horn's article that says the story noted is in
>the book. Why are you jumping to conclusions? Have you read the
>book?

Stan:

I don't think I'm jumping to any conclusions at all as to what's
in Jesse's book. I thought when I said, "That's if that's what
Jesse is doing." that it would be clear to all that I'm not sure
if Jesse was going to put the Mr. X stuff in his book. I wrote
that sentence to indicate I don't know if it's included and to
indicate it may not even be so. Your reply makes it (falsely)
look like I jumped to the conclusion it was in his book.

>You have commented about MJ-12. Have you rebutted the new
>chapter in TOP SECRET/MAJIC 2nd Edition that deals with a host
>of objections? Or are yours, which you haven't spelled out,
>different from those expressed in the new chapter or in, Update
>On Majestic 12, on my website at www.stantonfriedman.com ?

No, Stan, I do not have any new objections! And I'm familiar
with your rebuttals to the objections. It's simply that I don't
agree with what you see as rebuttals. You believe your rebuttals
knock the objections down, or as you have said on occasion,
demolishes them. I don't agree! I'm not as confident as you are
that what you see as a 'demolishing rebuttal' to an objection
does the job you are convinced it does.

I'm familiar with the objections and I'm familiar with your
rebuttals. I have all your books, as well as many others (such
as Kevin Randles' 'UFO Crash at Roswell' and a host of others).
It's simply that you haven't convinced me. I feel the evidence
leads to different conclusions than those you've made. I have no
new objections so I have no interest in debating again on this
List things that have been gone over many times before. You
won't convince me and I won't convince you! I simply disagree
with you - can't I do that without having to have new
objections?

>Nothing wrong with having opinions, but on what are they based?
>Readers would like to know.

In a sentence: the tons of anti-Roswell literature that's out there that makes as much, and in some instances, more sense to me (as well as to many other people) as the literature you've produced!

>You seem to have an anti-alien phobia... What is the big deal?
>What are your specific objections to Roswell and on what are
>they based?

No, not at all. I believe aliens are out there. I believe aliens can easily get here. I believe it has happened. I want aliens to be here. I'd be surprised if ET wasn't behind at least part of the UFO phenomenon. I've stated this publicly many times. But I want proof and I want to know that anything I believe is based on fact and evidence and isn't merely faith. You've been convinced. I haven't. I don't think, from the evidence to date, we can conclude anything with certainty yet.

It's even less clear when it comes to Roswell. Even funny-looking dead bodies in the desert aren't necessarily ET. When you show me how they could definitely not possibly be evolved here on Earth (assuming you've convinced me the bodies exist) and an show me an appropriate study report indicating their biology to be ET then I'll accept your conclusions.

I woke up one night more than two decades ago - and believe me I was awake - to a bunch of funny-looking short little guys around the sides of my bed (big bald heads, large black eyes, three feet tall - you know the drill) while inside a mist (within the room) and strange light that made them hard to distinguish. (While sleeping, I became annoyed by a squeaking noise - one that penetrated right into my sleeping state - that eventually made me start dreaming of a rat but the squeaking noise persisted until it made me wake up and discover what was going on.)

At the foot of the bed, was a single taller skinny being that had a neck so fragile-looking I wondered how it could support its head and I was overwhelmed with such a compassion for this thing - I felt so sorry for it, it is unexplainable how strong this feeling was - that the feeling persisted for many months afterward. I can't convey the pity I felt for it and there was some bond created right there to the point that I felt empty without the thing around for months afterward.

I was scared at first but when I spotted the tall one I was overwhelmed with pity for it, felt bonded to it, and had the unmistakable feeling of something ancient - something 'dinosaur'.

The important point is that I had this very powerful feeling that this thing was extremely old. It felt ancient, or like it represented something very ancient. While the experience was going on, I felt the impression 'dinosaur' strongly in my mind while it was present. I found this, at the time, extremely surprising because at that point in my life I believed firmly in aliens being behind everything like this.

That experience was the first of a few more to come that made me start to rethink my preconceived notions of aliens and UFOs. I confess I don't have a clue as to what's going on but that experience was as real to me as the ones other people say they are having. And the impressions I got at the time shook up my little world view of things. Yet there was something about that experience - and the UFO encounters I've had - that I can't put my finger on (something subtle) - there was something 'different' about 'reality' at the time.

So, no, I don't have an "alien phobia" - just reasons to justify questioning what the majority in the field has assumed is going on.

Nobody to date has provided any convincing reason why creatures like the prehistoric raptors couldn't have evolved intelligence long before us. If they did, and are still here, they'd probably have a vested interest in keeping us believing they were from outer space. So would other races of hominids - the discovery of H. flores shows us that we don't have the big understanding of

evolution on this planet that we think we do, even when it comes to just hominids.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 20:01:50 -0300
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 09:05:50 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Friedman

>Source: Peter Farley's Site

><http://www.4truthseekers.net/art2.htm>

>01 January 2006

>Little Green Men: The Cover-up Continues
>by Peter R. Farley

>As any UFO researcher will tell you, the roadblocks set up in
>his or her way in seeking to understand the subject are
>numerous. The roadblocks set up to confuse and delude the
>interested public on the other hand, are often even more
>insidious and certainly equally as effective.

<snip>

>Last but not least comes the most deceptive, least noticeable,
>and certainly least publicized type of roadblock set up to
>hinder the inquiring mind from ultimately finding its own truth.
>This is the roadblock set up by the local businessmen and women
>of a community under the guise of making an honest dollar.
>Herein lies the realm of those most nefarious little roadblocks
>known in UFO circles as "the little green men."

>Standing all of 5 to 6 inches tall, weighing no more than a few
>ounces at best, made of malleable green plastic and cast in the
>image of that most ubiquitous of all aliens - the Grays from
>Zeta Reticuli-this little alien intruder represents possibly the
>greatest danger of all to the free and unrestricted discussion
>of issues surrounding UFOs and extraterrestrial visitation.
>Representative of a whole broad range of tourist treasures
>ranging from T-shirts and key chains to refrigerator magnets and
>>false alien IDs, these little green men represent to many
>investigators, authors, and other persons interested in this
>field of study, the complete trivialization of the whole alien
>question.

<snip>

>One might expect that this would certainly not be the case in
>Roswell, New Mexico, the world's most recognizable name in terms
>of its association with the UFO phenomena that has swept the
>world, particularly over the past five years. To put this kind
>of assumption on Roswell may be a little unfair, however, since
>no one in Roswell ever necessarily chose to be the center of
>this, in certain segments of the population, often unwanted
>world attention. This small southeastern New Mexico city of
>around 50,000 people has inherited the role as much as by
>default as anything else after the alleged crash of a flying
>saucer north of the city on or around July 4th, 1947.

>It was not the crash itself that brought on so much of the
>attention, however. Rather it was the article that appeared the
>following day in the local newspaper, the Roswell Daily Record,
>after a receiving a press release from the local army air base
>saying in fact that they had recovered the wreckage of a flying
>saucer from the crash site. This admission was almost
>immediately retracted on orders from higher echelons of command.

>It remains, however, the one slip in an otherwise consistent
>wall of denial by the government of the existence of UFOs. It,
>therefore, remains to this day the one chink in the armor to
>which the whole world clings in hope of finding out the truth
>about the whole enigmatic phenomenon of UFOs, and ultimately
>whether or not we are alone in the Universe.

Methinks Mr. Farley protests too much. This was written quite a while ago. He seems to be angry. One would think only the Roswell paper carried the story. It was headline News front page in th Chicago Daily News, the Spokane Chronicle, The Los Angeles Herald express and many other papers.

>Whether or not this incident really occurred or not is of little
>or no consequence in the grander scheme of things. Almost any
>day of the year these days there seem to be credible eyewitness
>accounts of UFOs and cases of cattle mutilations and abductions
>that would lead any reasonable human being to believe that we
>are being visited by extraterrestrial lifeforms. Crop circles
>appear overnight in various parts of the world and in shapes and
>sizes that could not be duplicated with anywhere near the
>complexity using any of the known terrestrial technology.

Physical trace cases, more than 4000 collected by Ted Phillips from 70 countries, are far more significant because they involve observation of the UFO prior to later observation of changes in the soil and vegetation beneath where it was seen.

>So, as the Mecca for experiencers and those who want to believe
>alike from all over the world, Roswell is also perhaps the first
>city in the world to witness and have to deal with the
>trivialization of the issues surrounding UFOs to a greater
>extent and on a larger scale than has ever been dealt with
>before - even among those who purport to know better.

>First opened in 1992 against initial resistance from a staunchly
>conservative and deeply religious farming community, the
>International UFO Museum and Research Center in Roswell now
>attracts as many as 200,000 people a year, and is one of New
>Mexico's newest major attractions.

>While it houses an interesting and creative display of artifacts
>from the 1947 incident, the museum devotes almost equally as
>much space to displays of flying saucer-like hubcaps, newspaper
>cartoons, Hollywood memorabilia, and even fake pieces of UFO
>wreckage once pawned off on an eager public as being genuine.
>Admission is free to the public, and the museum is described as
>an educational, non-profit institution. It is supported entirely
>by donations and the income garnered from a small but incredibly
>well-stocked gift store where both educational materials and the
>requisite "little green men" type souvenirs are sold. The gift
>store's manager is reluctant to say exactly how much is brought
>in by the store, but rumors have it that it is considerable.
>Obviously the fun souvenirs of the "little green men" type
>outsell the educational materials - though the ratio is not
>readily known.

The museum has been the largest buyer of my books, which I do consider educational materials. I saw lots of souvenir shops in Fredericksburg, Virginia, dealing with a very bloody civil war battle. People want souvenirs.

>It is not uncommon for one to see a tourist bus unloading
>passengers at the museum and hordes of anxious sightseers lining
>up to sign in and then heading straight for the gift shop,
>bypassing the museum displays altogether. All this for the sake
>of getting little Johnny or the folks back home a mandatory
>souvenir of the museum. In Tom Robbin's cult-classic 1971 novel
>Another Roadside Attraction, every little town in America was
>almost required to have some kind of tourist attraction with
>which to make people stop, at least just long enough to spend
>some much-needed money in their community. Along these lines,
>Roswell has found itself a goldmine.

Considering that Roswell is 200 miles from Albuquerque, Amarillo, and El Paso, those tour buses are there to visit the museum. Roswell really isn't on the way to anywhere.

>In Roswell's case, however, the town has managed to tap into
>something much deeper in the human consciousness than just a
>desire to relieve some overworked kidneys and gaze at a two-

>headed boa-constrictor. They instead have tapped into the whole
>thirst for knowledge by almost every individual on the planet to
>know why they exist, and whether or not we are alone in the
>Universe. The question is, does Roswell help to answer these
>questions for the people attracted to the town's hype, or does
>it indeed set up another roadblock along the way to the
>disclosure of this very vital information?

>The much-publicized 1997 50th anniversary celebration of the
>Roswell Incident drew an impressive list of speakers on various
>aspects of the subject. Subsequent festivals have drawn, at
>best, small crowds to what were little more than city-wide fairs
>centered more around kitsch than serious speakers and honest
>discussion of the issues. Guided as they have been by local
>businessmen, and focusing on "scientific" researchers such as
>the notorious Dr. Stanton Friedman, these events and the museum
>itself have now placed their focus heavily on "scientific" fact
>rather than on what seems to be of most interest to the public
>in general--personal experiences and broad-ranging answers to
>honest questions about life and existence in the Universe.

I have never referred to myself as Dr., corrected Larry King and others when they tried to do so. Notorious has a negative connotation. Where is the problem? Is he jealous?

>It is this scientific method that, though having an obvious
>validity in uncovering some of the clues to help in solving the
>larger issues, has itself few if any of the answers to explain
>any of the phenomena it purports to study. It is a limited view
>in which everything is still an apparent mystery, but by calling
>it so, the scientists are then able to perpetuate their own
>superior roles as controllers of the information.

Who says scientists think everything is an apparent mystery?

>Meanwhile, potential speakers such as Gregg Braden, author of
>Awakening to Zero Point, and renowned for the depth and
>integrity of his research on the areas of pole shifts and
>planetary movements, have been dismissed as being "too far out"
>to be recruited among possible speakers for the museum events.
>Well-documented abductees such as those written about in by
>psychotherapist, author, and well-known convention speaker
>Constance Clear in her book, Reaching for Reality, have also
>been casually dismissed, along with the remark that they "only
>say they have been abducted."

Who are these dismissers? Budd Hopkins has been a speaker at Roswell...

>One case of this bias that involved the author of this article
>brought home the depths to which this roadblock mentality can
>sink. After a recent standing-room only talk at the museum for
>the Roswell UFO Festival during which I did my best to cover the
>immense field of alien involvement in human origins in the short
>time available, my talk was attacked by Dr. Friedman as being
>"unscientific," and by a fringe-element religious group in the
>city as being alien-cult related. Covering the ideas of much-
>vaunted researchers such as Zecharia Sitchin and Laurence
>Gardner, the material succeeded in putting together the pieces
>of what obviously is a very complex puzzle. These comments came
>among almost universally positive feedback from everyone else
>who attended, though as usual it is the negative complaints that
>get passed along and not the positive ones. A subsequent request
>by me to do a book signing at the museum one weekend was denied
>on the basis, and I quote, that the museum "didn't want anything
>to do with the paranormal" in its facility. How ironic coming
>from supposedly the world's foremost UFO museum.

Another free doctorate.

>It seems as though if something is not immediately reproducible
>in the laboratory or does not agree with the accepted scientific
>community's view, then it is not fit to be heard by the public,
>those who can always vote with their feet should they not like
>what is being presented. This is the same public who have made
>shows about the paranormal a staple part of our entertainment
>diets on both television and in movies, as well as in the books
>that it reads and that it buys. Subjective experiences such as
>the more than 17,000 UFO sightings on the museum's database and
>more than 2,000 personally reported to museum personnel should
>then, by these definitions, also be dismissed because these

>people only say they have witnessed a UFO.

Who are these dismissers and where do they make these claims??

>Arthur Miller's famous play The Crucible, a standard in most
>high schools or universities, is based exactly on this kind of
>witch-hunting suppression of freedom of speech and free
>discussion of ideas.

<snip>

>As Dr. Friedman was so vocal in making known at his recent
>Roswell appearance, he did not care for the inclusion of so-
>called "New Age" speakers among serious speakers at the recent

Another doctorate!. What I said was that indeed I was not
impressed by the new age speakers at the 2nd Turkish UFO
symposium which was not nearly as well attended as the first. I
thought the reason was a wrong assumption that the same people
interested in serious ufology (as demonstrated at the first
Symposium)are interested in New Age stuff.

>UFO symposium held in Istanbul, Turkey. In almost the same
>breath he publicly stated, with no apologies to former President
>Bush or other government and military figures who have used the
>term, that he believed there was no such thing as the New World
>Order or its conspiracy.

I think this is totally out of context.

>The real truth of the matter will only be found with the input
>of all those concerned, and with no information being dismissed
>as irrelevant. The public should be informed that not only are
>they the victims of so many of these roadblocks and cover-ups
>meant to keep them blind to the knowledge around them, but they
>are also the cause of roadblocks such as those created by the
>"little green men" syndrome. They need to be reminded that the
>lines in the old song are true, "There are none so blind as
>those who will not see."

The writer of this is a good 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Ann Druffel <Anndruffel.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 20:32:40 EDT
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 09:40:14 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

[Non-Subscriber Post]

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 09:42:50 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Ann Druffel <Anndruffel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 02:48:14 EDT
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <ballesterolmos.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 09:21:53 +0200 (CEST)
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 17:30:54 +0100
>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>>Regarding your questions about the Heflin 1965 photos, I am the
>>present custodian of the originals. Rex Heflin entrusted them to
>>me shortly after he received them under unexplained
>>circumstances in the 1990s, as detailed in the paper written by
>>myself, Dr. Robert M. Wood and Dr. Eric Kelson, appearing in the
>>Journal Of Scientific Exploration (JSE), Vol. 4, No. 14, 2000.
>>They are archived in my own UFO files.

>My thanks to Ann Druffel for her dogged persistence over the
>many years, including the Heflin case. Incidentally, the JSE
>paper can be found at the following URL:

><http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

>For those people who think Heflin was a hoaxer, I suggest they
>read it through from beginning to end (40 pages). But for those
>in a hurry, just check out Figure 17, which is an enhancement of
>photo 3. This shows the object trailing a ring of black smoke,
>exactly as Heflin claimed happened, and a perfect tie-in to
>photo 4 of the large black smoke ring Heflin said he
>photographed a mile down the road 2 or 3 minutes later. How did
>Heflin hoax that?

>Also enhancement shows a wedge of light on the bottom of the
>object in photo 2 (Figure 18), again agreeing with Heflin's
>story of seeing a beam of light coming out the bottom and
>sweeping around. Heflin was one clever hoaxer!

Dear David,

Thank you for the reply to certain persons who have been
questioning the validity of the Heflin photos, and also
questioning Heflin's undoubted honesty. Yes, the object in Photo

#3, showing a trail of black particles (smoke?) did answer the doubts of Dr. James E. McDonald, regarding whether the smoke-ring in Photo #4 really was taken within the same period of time (2 minutes) as the first three photos.

It is my own impression, however, that people who want to question the validity of the Heflin photos should take the time to read the entire JSE article, not just Figure 17. All of their questions would probably be answered if they did take the time. You can feel free to send this around to whomever you wish.

Thank you again.

All best wishes,

Ann
anndruffel.nul
www.anndruffel.com
ann.nul (alternate email)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome's - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <fadeddiscs.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:33:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 09:48:18 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome's - Connors

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 08:31:55 -0400
>Subject: 'Little Green Men Syndrome'

>Source: Peter Farley's Site

><http://www.4truthseekers.net/art2.htm>

>01 January 2006

>Little Green Men: The Cover-up Continues
>by Peter R. Farley

>As any UFO researcher will tell you, the roadblocks set up in
>his or her way in seeking to understand the subject are
>numerous. The roadblocks set up to confuse and delude the
>interested public on the other hand, are often even more
>insidious and certainly equally as effective.

><snip>

>...the International UFO Museum and Research Center in Roswell
>now attracts as many as 200,000 people a year, and is one of New
>Mexico's newest major attractions.

>While it houses an interesting and creative display of
>artifacts from the 1947 incident, the museum devotes almost
>equally as much space to displays of flying saucer-like hubcaps,
>newspaper cartoons, Hollywood memorabilia, and even fake pieces
>of UFO wreckage once pawned off on an eager public as being
>genuine. Admission is free to the public, and the museum is
>described as an educational, non-profit institution. It is
>supported entirely by donations and the income garnered from a
>small but incredibly well-stocked gift store where both
>educational materials and the requisite "little green men" type
>souvenirs are sold. The gift store's manager is reluctant to say
>exactly how much is brought in by the store, but rumors have it
>that it is considerable. Obviously the fun souvenirs of the
>"little green men" type outsell the educational materials -
>though the ratio is not readily known.

>It is not uncommon for one to see a tourist bus unloading
>passengers at the museum and hordes of anxious sightseers lining
>up to sign in and then heading straight for the gift shop,
>bypassing the museum displays altogether.

><snip>

>The question is, does Roswell help to answer these questions
>for the people attracted to the town's hype, or does it indeed
>set up another roadblock along the way to the disclosure of this
>very vital information?

><snip>

>A subsequent request by me to do a book signing at the
>museum one weekend was denied on the basis, and I quote,
>that the museum "didn't want anything to do with the

>paranormal" in its facility. How ironic coming from
>supposedly the world's foremost UFO museum.

<snip>

>Attached to the museum is also a research library with more
>than 3,000 books, videos, and sundry files and reports, many of
>them donated by noted UFO researcher of almost 50 years, George
>Fawcett. Fawcett's contributions came from his own personal
>library and included many books of a philosophical or
>metaphysical bent, covering the whole field of paranormal
>phenomena. Librarians at the research center, all with little or
>no experience in the subject field, freely admit that they think
>much of the donated material and books such as those dealing
>with planetary sacred sites, extradimensional phenomena, and
>metaphysical studies, shouldn't be in the library because "it
>has nothing to do with UFOs."

<snip>

>Where commercialism is concerned, we find the trivialization
>of the subject matter at hand-"the little green men" syndrome.
>Where either religion or science are allowed to control the
>areas or topics for debate, the honest search for truth is also
>trivialized or made impotent by the narrowness of focus.

Listarians,

The UFO museum in Roswell is a commercial venture operated by non-professional people totally devoid of expertise in the field of ufology and museum management. The museum funds no research projects, just itself for the glory of the nepotistic in-crowd. It has a nice library run by uninformed volunteers. It keeps the tourist, who were uninformed as they entered, even more confused after being greatly nudged to leave via the Gift Shop

You won't find ufology there or the truth within. Even the "Little Green Men" aren't produced by the good people of Roswell.

It's a tourist trap that doesn't deliver.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore -

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 13:38:44 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 10:26:57 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore -

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:38:57 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 00:55:36 -0400
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 22:45:49 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>Hope this doesn't offend anybody: "psychology and sociology"
>>>are not sciences, just bunches of opinions collected (and
>>>discarded) more or less at the whim of fashion.

<snip>

>>This isn't offensive. But it's more than a little silly. I'd
>>love to see Ray give five or six examples of serious
>>sociological work that fits his description.

<snip>

>>In trying to figure these things out, I've shared data with a
>>sociologist at Princeton University, and exchanged ideas with
>>him a lot. His approach is exactly the opposite of what Ray
>>imagines sociology is like. He's about the last person I know
>>who'd venture a wild opinion about anything in his field. He
>>won't accept anything that's not supported by solid data, and he
>>also spends a lot of time making sure that data really is solid.

>What Greg Sandow describes here looks like an example of what is
>sometimes called "applied social science" - which is actually a
>somewhat misleading term, because what is being applied is a
>research methodology, not a corpus of knowledge.

>But in a way, that illustrates the problem, because in the
>social sciences there is no corpus of knowledge to apply. It's
>when claims are made for such a corpus of knowledge, or for
>theories supposedly based on such a corpus of knowledge, that
>the claims made by social scientists begin to look more than a
>little dodgy.

>Applied social science works precisely because it is both
>rigorously empirical and completely atheoretical, and I
>certainly agree that there are people who operate like this.
>Unfortunately they are the exception, not the rule. If you don't
>believe me, just take a look through the latest edition of just
>about any social science journal - and check out just how much
>of what is published depends on assumption, unsupported
>generalization, and cultural consensus.

>As for examples of social sciences work which matches Ray
>Dickenson's description, I should say pretty much anything
>published within the paradigms of Freudian Psychoanalysis,
>Behaviorism and Cognitive Psychology, and about ninety percent
>of what is published under the rubric of Evolutionary

>Psychology.

Hi, can understand where Greg's coming from - and maybe the best intentioned people try to apply some form of 'scientific rigor'. I once had a US neighbor who passed her 'US Psychiatry Today' magazines on to me, and a girlfriend was a practising psychologist (not just on me).

But when the facts are analyzed, think these fields are not capable of scientific prediction and verification.

Note: Clinical or Behavioral stuff is an exception - when it only deals with lab facts.

Would recommend 'Buckle on Metaphysics' (also Googled by 'metaphysics examined') which was written about hundred and fifty years ago. Don't think the situation's changed much.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:41:04 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 10:29:47 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
To: ufoupdates.nul
Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 09:14:12 EDT
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Nice estimates David, but we must consider much more:

>One has to exceed the grain size by a considerable factor in order
>to do any analysis of the type that's described here. The actual
>grain size, would have to be determined using a reflected light
>microscope to see exactly what the character of the grain is.
>Based upon that, one would then do a scan that would exceed the
>grain size observed (2000 dpi+). There's also the effects caused
>by the inconsistent sizes of the grains: grains can vary by as
>much 7 fold, that I've seen. Therefore, we do not know which
>order of grain size they are possibly perceiving in the scan:
>The largest of ones, which? Given that the grain sizes vary from
>one grain to the next (mosaic-like pattern), a linear-like
>feature will have a much harder time being detected congruently,
>especially when you've factored in what I've written below.
>Because of the impact of varying grain sizes, one is also forced
>into a situation of having to exceed, not only the grain size,
>but the bit depth of the scan too. In order to detect subtle
>changes in shading, one should exceed the normal 256 shades of
>gray, which are 8 bit and try to go higher (true 16 bit can
>detect 64,000 shades of gray). And, even if you looked at a 16
>bit image, the eye can detect no more that 200 of them_all the
>more reason analysis has to be done by computer_ to detect these
>much more subtle differences and put them within the 200 we can
>detect or use color enhancements to aid detection as well.

It is important to understand how Polaroid 3000 film works. Like all Polaroid peel-apart films, when you take a photograph the actual exposure is made onto a sensitized paper "negative". This holds the latent image until you pull the tab and then pull the photo out between the rollers. The metal rollers sandwich this negative with a receiver sheet, and smear developing agent between the two. The rollers are held in a metal frame that keeps them at a precise distance from one another. During development, the image moves from the negative to the receiver sheet through a process called diffusion transfer. The receiver sheet has no inherent grain of its own, just a smooth gelatin coating. The diffusion transfer process "smears" the grain and obscures fine detail in the process.

Much of what has been discussed here about these images would apply to traditional photographic negatives, but really does not apply to Polaroid images. It would have been helpful if the "negative" sheets had been retained, but I'm sure those were discarded because people just don't realize their value.

Talking about grain, grain size, etc., really does not apply when analyzing peel-apart Polaroid prints.

<snip>

>A thin wire will diffract light (light will rap around the object)
>and cause interference like fringing to appear and spread
>the effects of shadowing over a larger region of space thereby

>reduce the contrast considerably. If there is a wire present,
>it may also be oriented differently too: like a close-line. In
>other words, the line could be oriented toward the camera
>(into the blur zone) and away, in which case, light-effects will
>have to be considered from other orientation pathways.

The tungsten wire I mentioned earlier is made for this purpose and is dead black, light absorbing. It does not diffract light, or produce any fringing. This is why the Hollywood SFX guys loved it so much in the days before CGI.

I'm not sure the source of your statement that the human eye can resolve only 200 shades of gray, but I think it is not an absolute at all and would depend on quite a number of variables in viewing conditions. I know photographers who say they can discriminate much finer shading.

Anyway, my original point was that it is futile to look for artifacts of support strings or wires in Polaroid images, particularly with Polaroid 3000, which has the lowest resolving power of any Polaroid film.

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 14:19:33 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 10:33:54 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hall

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:05:23 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:38:57 +0100
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>What Greg Sandow describes here looks like an example of what
>>is sometimes called "applied social science" - which is
>>actually a somewhat misleading term, because what is being
>>applied is a research methodology, not a corpus of knowledge.

>>But in a way, that illustrates the problem, because in the
>>social sciences there is no corpus of knowledge to apply.
>>It's when claims are made for such a corpus of knowledge, or
>>for theories supposedly based on such a corpus of knowledge,
>>that the claims made by social scientists begin to look more
>>than a little dodgy.

>>As for examples of social sciences work which matches Ray
>>Dickenson's description, I should say pretty much anything
>>published within the paradigms of Freudian Psychoanalysis,
>>Behaviorism and Cognitive Psychology, and about ninety
>>percent of what is published under the rubric of Evolutionary
>>Psychology.

>Which is one reason I didn't pick any examples from those
>fields. Evolutionary anything is pretty much a game preserve,
>these days, for wild speculation, bolstered by the high prestige
>that evolutionary thought has these days.

>But sociology, in my experience with it, tends to be grounded in
>real research.

Indeed sociology and psychology (those portions of same which
are worthwhile) are grounded in real research. I was astounded
to read Cathy's assertion that there is no corpus of knowledge
in social science. Funny; I wonder what all that stuff was that
I read and abstracted for Psychological Abstracts for about six
years.

There is a lot of junk in all scientific fields, including
Cathy's field in all probability. I have also done abstracting
in medical science and aging (physiological and otherwise)
literature.

At APA we used to joke about "rat psychology" and the latest
treatment fads much in the literature.

Junk science exists everywhere (and especially in the
spectacularly mis-named field of "ufology", but that does not
mean there is no good science and good knowledge in these fields
(again including UFO research).

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Sudbury Man Keeps An Eye On The Sky

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 10:41:13 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 10:41:13 -0400
Subject: Sudbury Man Keeps An Eye On The Sky

Source: The Sudbury Star - Ontario, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/mmlf6>

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

[Image of Michel & object @ site]

Sudbury Man Keeps An Eye On The Sky

UFO researcher is writing a book about sightings in Northern Ontario

By Laura Stradiotto/The Sudbury Star
For: www.thesudburystar.com

Michel Deschamps, a UFO researcher/historian, has spent several years compiling data on UFO sightings in Sudbury and Northern Ontario.

He has investigated abductions, UFO crash sites and obtained "official" UFO documents.

Deschamps has witnessed 17 sightings since the age of nine.

He encourages people to contact him with their experiences and is currently writing a book on the history of flying objects, abductions, crop circles and other paranormal activities across Northern Ontario.

Deschamps shared his findings at a workshop during the weekend at Rayvin's Eclectic Enchantments. It was the first one he has presented in six years.

Only a handful of people attended, but one could tell by the binders of documents he hauled in with him that Deschamps takes his work very seriously.

He stood behind a podium and said when it comes to the subject of UFOs, people are more "close-minded" than they were 15 years ago.

Today, people are reluctant to admit they've seen something unusual hovering in the skies overhead and are even more reluctant to leave their name with him.

Glancing at Sudbury Star newspaper clippings, it's surprising the amount of space that was dedicated to reports of flying objects.

Eye witnesses are clearly identified, including their exact address.

In 1948, for example, Joe Caruso of 294 Albinson St., spotted a "long oval-shaped black object with 20-foot orange-coloured

sparks shooting out from the rear."

"To me, newspaper articles are our history a history that is not spoken of often," Deschamps said.

Most people are skeptical of his work and tell Deschamps there's no physical evidence of close encounters of the first, second, third or fourth kind.

With encounters of the first kind, there is no interaction between the eyewitness and UFO, while encounters of the second kind involve actual landings often involving scorched ground.

Encounters of the third kind include sightings of aliens or human-like entities, while abductions are characteristic of encounters of the fourth kind.

The largest number of UFO sightings in Sudbury occurred during the summer of 1967, when there were eight incidents reported.

While it became known as the (psychedelic) summer of love, the 1967 sightings were so vivid eyewitnesses often called the Ontario Provincial Police and the Canadian Forces station at Falconbridge to report what they saw.

In one incident, police were called to investigate a report of an attempted UFO landing, but when they tried to contact headquarters there was "heavy radio interference", the Sudbury Star reported.

Often a UFO sighting was corroborated by other people who saw the object from different areas of the city.

It was 1974 when Deschamps, then nine years old, had his first UFO encounter.

He was playing with friends at the end of Pharand Street in Hanmer when something caught his eye.

"I remember seeing this metallic silver-looking ball above the tree line. It was probably no more than one-metre wide. I thought it was an advertising balloon, so I looked to see if it was tied down. It wasn't."

Years later, Deschamps bought a book about UFOs and one chapter discussed sightings in the Sudbury area, particularly sightings during the first few weeks of July 1974 the time he figures he saw the UFO.

"Up until then, I thought I had imagined it," he said.

That's when Deschamps started spending considerable time conducting research.

"I still get bugged at work," said Deschamps, who works at Wal-Mart.

Deschamps created posters of physical evidence to show skeptics, including: cow mutilations, sketches of eyewitness accounts and photographs of crop circles one of which was discovered in Spring Bay on Manitoulin Island in the early 1990s.

Called a hoax by non-believers, to this day Deschamps says there's no way it was a joke. The imprints look like they were burned and they're located off a beaten path.

Surely if it was a hoax, the jokers would have placed the crop circles in an area frequented by passersby, he said.

Shortly after that experience, Deschamps joined the UFO Network, an Internet-based initiative designed to unite researchers across the world. He is also a member of the Mutual UFO Network.

Many UFO sightings have occurred in mining areas like Copper Cliff, Garson and Falconbridge, he said.

Deschamps said that's because a mining centre gives alien life an indication of our technology base.

"If NASA is interested in us, I'm sure others are curious, 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 28](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 09:49:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 10:59:35 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:22:51 -0700
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 15:40:22 +0100
>>Subj: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>>From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:03:40 +0100
>>>Subj: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>Without searching the Internet for the 'Journal of American
>Folklore', I would like to know if the JAF covers topics outside
>of Ufology, Mothman, Bigfoot and the like.

>Does the JAF extend their purview to matters like meteors and
>meteorites, long considered old-wives tales? How about
>Kugelblitzen or ball lightning? Never properly defined.

Larry, with all due respect, these questions make no sense. I would guess that you are not especially familiar with the idea of folklore, which is not synonymous with "stuff that doesn't exist," though that's how it gets used in popular discourse and even by some... well... we won't mention whom for fear of new flaming threads.

In any event, folklore is the study of traditional (i.e., passed down and circulated over time) ideas, expressions, stories, music, games, rituals, concepts about life, the universe, and everything -- and, beyond that, the role of such traditions in both individual and larger cultures. It does not exist as an exercise in poking fun at people who hold non-mainstream views or tastes or who report unorthodox experiences. Rather the opposite is usually the case, in fact.

>Back on topic; does the JAF deal with matters once considered
>occult but now commonly accepted as factual?

This question, again, is meaningless.

>What I'm driving at is this:

>Does the JAF place UFO studies, the serious ones included, in
>the same category as Chupacabras, ghosts and so forth? If so,
>that's really all I need to know.

Sigh. No, it isn't all you need to know. You need to know, first, what folklore is about, which is not ridicule or dismissal. Aside from that, you also need to read William Corliss on the subject of anomaly snobbism, an example of which is in evidence in the above-quoted paragraph.

Cordially,

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 12:32:28 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:36:26 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:33:20 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:11:18 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>I just don't see how putting this (Mr. X) in a book about
>>>Roswell contributes to making things any clearer, considering
>>>the circus Roswell has become. That's if that's what Jesse is
>>>doing. To me, Mr. X is of no value in determining the truth
>>>about Roswell.

>>>Rarely can what these type of guys say ever be tracked down or
>>>verified, provided, of course, they say anything interesting at
>>>a

>>I see nothing in Horn's article that says the story noted is in
>>the book. Why are you jumping to conclusions? Have you read the
>>book?

>Stan:

>I don't think I'm jumping to any conclusions at all as to what's
>in Jesse's book. I thought when I said, "That's if that's what
>Jesse is doing." that it would be clear to all that I'm not sure
>if Jesse was going to put the Mr. X stuff in his book. I wrote
>that sentence to indicate I don't know if it's included and to
>indicate it may not even be so. Your reply makes it (falsely)
>look like I jumped to the conclusion it was in his book.

>>You have commented about MJ-12. Have you rebutted the new
>>chapter in TOP SECRET/MAJIC 2nd Edition that deals with a host
>>of objections? Or are yours, which you haven't spelled out,
>>different from those expressed in the new chapter or in, Update
>>On Majestic 12, on my website at www.stantonfriedman.com ?

>No, Stan, I do not have any new objections! And I'm familiar
>with your rebuttals to the objections. It's simply that I don't
>agree with what you see as rebuttals. You believe your rebuttals
>knock the objections down, or as you have said on occasion,
>demolishes them. I don't agree! I'm not as confident as you are
>that what you see as a 'demolishing rebuttal' to an objection
>does the job you are convinced it does.

Eugene, how about providing some specifics either as to what
your specific objections are or or what is specifically wrong
with my rebuttals?. You know, some facts, some data?

>I'm familiar with the objections and I'm familiar with your
>rebuttals. I have all your books, as well as many others (such

>as Kevin Randles' 'UFO Crash at Roswell' and a host of others).

I take it you have read my 9000 word review of Kevin's book and have specific difficulties?

>It's simply that you haven't convinced me. I feel the evidence
>leads to different conclusions than those you've made. I have no
>_new_ objections so I have no interest in debating again on this
>List things that have been gone over many times before. You
>won't convince me and I won't convince you! I simply disagree
>with you - can't I do that without having to have new
>objections?

How about specifying why you disagree, what the other conclusions you have come to are. My goal is to put the discussion out in the open. Why is it too difficult for you to do so? I have written a great deal and done one heck of a lot of research?

>>Nothing wrong with having opinions, but on what are they based?
>>Readers would like to know.

>In a sentence: the tons of anti-Roswell literature that's out
>there that makes as much, and in some instances, more sense to
>me (as well as to many other people) as the literature you've
>produced!

Can't you be specific? Charismatic handwaving won't do. I certainly disagree with Kevin's objections and have specified in great detail in writing, why. But at least he put them out there. I haven't seen any papers or books from you. Are you afraid to put some light on them?. I am trying to get to the truth about Roswell and MJ-12. Specific criticisms may have merit and certainly give a focus for further research as I have noted in detail.

>>You seem to have an anti-alien phobia... What is the big deal?
>>What are your specific objections to Roswell and on what are
>>they based?

>No, not at all. I believe aliens are out there. I believe aliens
>can easily get here. I believe it has happened. I _want_ aliens
>to be here. I'd be surprised if ET wasn't behind at least part
>of the UFO phenomenon. I've stated this publicly many times. But
>I want proof and I want to know that anything I believe is based
>on fact and evidence and isn't merely faith. You've been
>convinced. I haven't. I don't think, from the evidence to date,
>we can conclude anything with certainty yet.

Where do I appeal to faith in my writings about MJ-12, or Roswell??

>It's even less clear when it comes to Roswell. Even funny-
>looking dead bodies in the desert aren't necessarily ET. When
>you show me how they could definitely not possibly be evolved
>here on Earth (assuming you've convinced me the bodies exist)
>and an show me an appropriate study report indicating their
>biology to be ET then I'll accept your conclusions.

>I woke up one night more than two decades ago - and believe me I
>_was_ awake - to a bunch of funny-looking short little guys
>around the sides of my bed (big bald heads, large black eyes,
>three feet tall - you know the drill) while inside a mist
>(within the room) and strange light that made them hard to
>distinguish. (While sleeping, I became annoyed by a squeaking
>noise - one that penetrated right into my sleeping state - that
>eventually made me start dreaming of a rat but the squeaking
>noise persisted until it made me wake up and discover what was
>going on.)

>At the foot of the bed, was a single taller skinny being that
>had a neck so fragile-looking I wondered how it could support
>its head and I was overwhelmed with such a compassion for this
>thing - I felt so sorry for it, it is unexplainable how strong
>this feeling was - that the feeling persisted for many months
>afterward. I can't convey the pity I felt for it and there was
>some bond created right there to the point that I felt empty
>without the thing around for months afterward.

>I was scared at first but when I spotted the tall one I was
>overwhelmed with pity for it, felt bonded to it, and had the

>unmistakeable feeling of something ancient - something
>'dinosaur'.

>The important point is that I had this very powerful feeling
>that this thing was extremely old. It felt ancient, or like it
>represented something very ancient. While the experience was
>going on, I felt the impression 'dinosaur' strongly in my mind
>while it was present. I found this, at the time, extremely
>surprising because at that point in my life I believed firmly in
>aliens being behind everything like this.

>That experience was the first of a few more to come that made me
>start to rethink my preconceived notions of aliens and UFOs. I
>confess I don't have a clue as to what's going on but that
>experience was as real to me as the ones other people say they
>are having. And the impressions I got at the time shook up my
>little world view of things. Yet there was something about that
>experience - and the UFO encounters I've had - that I can't put
>my finger on (something subtle) - there was something
>'different' about 'reality' at the time.

>So, no, I don't have an "alien phobia" - just reasons to justify
>questioning what the majority in the field has assumed is going
>on.

How is it you know what the majority in the field assume is
going on as opposed to having deduced it from the evidence? What
are the reasons?

>Nobody to date has provided any convincing reason why creatures
>like the prehistoric raptors couldn't have evolved intelligence
>long before us. If they did, and are still here, they'd probably
>have a vested interest in keeping us believing they were from
>outer space. So would other races of hominids - the discovery of

There is surely a great deal of evidence that manufactured
vehicles under intelligent control have flown up up and away.
That means somebody built them. That requires a great deal of
technological effort. Have you seen any evidence of advanced
technological beings building advanced technological craft on
earth in civilizations about which we know nothing?

>H. flores shows us that we don't have the big understanding of
>evolution on this planet that we think we do, even when it comes
>to just hominids.

I agree, and have said so, that there is a great deal we don't
know about evolution or development of life and civilization on
this planet. I don't see how that connects with manufactured
high tech craft or specific documents. Equally I don't see why
you feel it is enough to just say you don't agree with my data
or rebuttals. But you can't be bothered with specifics. In other
words, how about some evidence?. Beliefs are for religion or for
beauty or sports competitions. Vitamin C was discovered long
after it was found that scurvy could be prevented by adequate in
take of citrus fruits. Pernicious anemia was cured by feeding
people liver long before Vitamin B-12 was isolated. We don't
need the answers to all questions, especially the why and how
ones, to establish reasonable conclusions. What are your
factual, data based, objections to what I have written??

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:57:25 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:40:55 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 09:14:12 EDT
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>>the film is ASA 3000, 3-1/4 x 4-1/4 inch print size, which
>>they blew up to 8 x 10 inch and scanned. The paper said they
>>were into the grain when scanning at 300 dpi. According to my
>>calculations, this means the grain size was on the order of 25
>>to 30 grains per millimeter on the original film, which is
>>pretty grainy.

>Nice estimates David, but we must consider much more:

>One has to exceed the grain size by a considerable factor in order
>to do any analysis of the type that's described here. The actual
>grain size, would have to be determined using a reflected light
>microscope to see exactly what the character of the grain is.
>Based upon that, one would then do a scan that would exceed the
>grain size observed (2000 dpi+). There's also the effects caused
>by the inconsistent sizes of the grains: grains can vary by as
>much 7 fold, that I've seen. Therefore, we do not know which
>order of grain size they are possibly perceiving in the scan:
>The largest of ones, which? Given that the grain sizes vary from
>one grain to the next (mosaic-like pattern), a linear-like
>feature will have a much harder time being detected congruently,

The emulsion carries no useful information on scales smaller than the grain size. Yes effective image grain size and the silver halide crystal size are two different things. Usually with photo emulsions you are never looking at the actual individual crystal scale, even when you enlarge beyond the point of evident grain. The "grain" we usually mean - and presumably the also the grain referred to in the JSE paper - is the structure made by quite large clumps and filaments of silver halide particles. But this is the effective limit of resolution for images. And I don't think you can talk in terms of a "mosaic" at this scale, this is a three-dimensional random suspension with clumps of varying sizes all over the place, shadowing one another. This structure is the film noise level, like radio static. Below the nominal grain scale signal information is surely irrecoverable, not because it isn't "there" in some sense but just because you can't distinguish it from the random noise background. Indefinitely enlarging the scale will not pull the signal out of the noise; it will amplify the noise.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 18:05:54 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:42:32 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 14:19:33 +0000
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

<snip>

>Indeed sociology and psychology (those portions of same which
>are worthwhile) are grounded in real research. I was astounded
>to read Cathy's assertion that there is no corpus of knowledge
>in social science. Funny; I wonder what all that stuff was that
>I read and abstracted for Psychological Abstracts for about six
>years.

There's a corpus of research findings - that is not the same
thing as having a corpus of knowledge.

There are at least two good reasons why I think one can say
there is no corpus of knowledge within the social sciences.
(Actually there are probably others, but two is enough to be
going on with.)

Firstly, one only has to look at what is done when the social
sciences are applied to specific real-world problems. In this
respect, Greg Sandow's classical music example makes the point
spectacularly well - just read through his description of his
sociologists friend's modus operandi, and note that it contains
absolutely no reference to any sort of cumulative knowledge
base, or to any corpus of sociological theory. It is, purely and
simply, a research methodology, which is applied de novo to a
whole series of specific, clearly delineated, and largely
unconnected problems. Theory, and "knowledge", are wholly
irrelevant to the process.

The thing is Richard, this is what the social sciences are
evolving into, and the process has been going on now for at
least twenty years.

Secondly, one can look at how the social sciences handle
controversies in the light of evidence. In science,
controversies arise all the time, everyone has an opinion and
there is plenty of room for argument and interpretation. But
eventually, the sheer weight of accumulated evidence decides the
question one way or the other and the controversy stops.

But in the social sciences, this does not happen. Controversies
in the social sciences are never resolved, but simply go on,
decade after decade, very much like controversies in philosophy
- or Ufology, for that matter.

In fact, if you like, I'll set you a little challenge, Richard.
Using your six years of experience editing and compiling
abstracts, see if you can come up with even a single example of
a controversy in the social sciences which has been settled
decisively, one way or the other, on the basis of evidence. Then
see how many issues you can think of which are still every bit
as hotly debated today as they were ten, twenty, thirty or more
years ago.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Direct Link To John Mack Piece On IF Website

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:36:11 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:47:04 -0400
Subject: Direct Link To John Mack Piece On IF Website

Foward:

From: John W. Horton <songrighter.nul>
To: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 11:03:45 -0700 (PDT)
Subject: Direct link to John Mack Piece on IF website

Richard,

Budd asked me to send you the direct link to the John Mack Piece (Special Report # 8) and if you could post it to UFO UpDates. As mentioned IF wanted to give UFO UpDates participants a chance to read it. Thank you again.

Link:

[http://www.intrudersfoundation.org/John Mack UAATE.htm](http://www.intrudersfoundation.org/John_Mack_UAATE.htm)

John W. Horton
IF Advisory Committee
IF Bulletin Editor and Webmaster

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:54:05 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:49:04 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 16:47:20 -0400
>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:46:55 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>I suspect that people who were spiritually inclined in the first
>>place would be more likely to find something positive in an
>>abduction experience, and people who were inclined to buy into
>>the scientific, secular worldview (like me) would be more likely
>>to be scared by it.

>Question: Why is there any conflict between religious faith and the
>"scientific, secular world view"?

>I've taken science courses, and I'm a confirmed Christian. I just don't
>see any conflict. To me, science is about learning the details of how
>God set this universe up.

Eleanor,

You just demonstrated the difference. Putting on my philosopher
hat for the moment:

You believe in the existence of God on faith and basically
deduce various things from your belief or assumption. Science at
the most fundamental level (not to be confused with careless or
erroneous applications) assumes only the validity of logic and
mathematics (essentially that both x and non-x cannot be true at
the same time). Somewhat over-simplified, but I think you will
get the point.

You believe God to be real (if typically totally undefined;
which God from all the variant religions?) Science does not
require or endorse acceptance of the God hypothesis. A scientist
may be a Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, Atheist, Agnostic, etc.,
but if he/she sticks to strict scientific method he/she will not
use belief or non-belief in God (or a god) as a starting point
or as a touchstone for ascertaining truth.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson

From: **Jeff Olson** <jlolson.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:50:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:33:20 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 25 May 2006 18:11:18 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>I was scared at first but when I spotted the tall one I was
>overwhelmed with pity for it, felt bonded to it, and had the
>unmistakeable feeling of something ancient - something
>'dinosaur'.

Your compassion seems rather over-developed if it extends to things that break into your bedroom at night.

In any case, in comparing your beliefs, insofar as they're spawned from feelings from visions or encounters of this kind, and Friedman's beliefs, which appear derived in large part from cool logic, the choice for me isn't terribly difficult.

What might be of interest to me would be objections to Friedman's MJ-12/Roswell stance that are based on substantive argument (consisting of evidence and sound reasoning). Intuitions and feelings reveal a lot about an individual, and may be experienced as persuasive by that individual, but they provide little or no reason for anyone else to be persuaded.

Best,

Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 19:39:05 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:52:16 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>other details pretty clearly rule out
>hoax in my mind. The most important of these is the smoke ring
>Heflin said the object left behind and which he photographed
>(his photo 4), but which now also turns out to also be evident
>in his photo 3. See Figure 17 in the JSE paper, which is an
>enhancement of photo 3, and in which it can be clearly seen that
>the object is leaving behind a dark smoke ring, also in line
>with Heflin's testimony of what he saw (the object seemed
>to separate from the ring of smoke as it began to depart).

Hi David!

When a uniformly lit white background was photographed, these early instant Polaroid film photos would exhibit fuzzy patches throughout the frame. What you interpret as a "dark smoke ring" to the right of the saucer shaped craft in photo 3 may very well be an emulsion/developing artifact and not a real object like the faint and very indistinct/broken smoke ring you see in the same general vicinity of the sky the craft appeared in photo 2.

After Rex Heflin drove one or two hundred yards closer to the ring that had formed where the craft had been in earlier and got out of his truck to take a picture of it (photo 4), he judged the dark smoke ring was 3 to 4 times larger in diameter than the craft. Did Rex simply comparing the relative sizes of the craft in his first three photos with the size of the dark smoke ring in photo 4 or was the ring indeed 3 to 4 times the diameter of the craft? If the ring had grown to such a much larger diameter by then, it should be even less distinct than your suspected smoke ring in photo 3. The very tight dark smoke ring in photo 4 is typical of smoke rings seen and photographed by others soon after explosions, not many minutes later as this one was.

If you do a Google Images search using the words "smoke" "ring" and "airshow" or "explosion", you will find several dark smoke rings identical to the one in Rex's photo 4 (and the one I saw and photographed at an airshow after an a simulated aerial bombing).

It is interesting to note that Rex thought what he saw was an experimental airplane. Could this be why he did not take additional photos of the dark smoke ring as it rose and drifted away in the sky?

If the alleged smoke ring in photo 3 is "the most important" evidence that Rex's four pictures rule out a hoax in your mind, I would suggest you rethink things out.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:41:49 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:54:45 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Hatch

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 09:49:23 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:22:51 -0700
>>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

<snip>

>>Without searching the Internet for the 'Journal of American
>>Folklore', I would like to know if the JAF covers topics outside
>>of ufology, Mothman, Bigfoot and the like.

>>Does the JAF extend their purview to matters like meteors and
>>meteorites, long considered old-wives tales? How about
>>Kugelblitzen or ball lightning? Never properly defined.

>Larry, with all due respect, these questions make no sense. I
>>would guess that you are not especially familiar with the idea
>of folklore, which is not synonymous with "stuff that doesn't
>exist," though that's how it gets used in popular discourse and
>even by some... well... we won't mention whom for fear of new
>flaming threads.

Hello Jerry:

Admittedly, I put that forth poorly.

It is that very same tacit assumption that folklore and 'stuff
that ain't there' are one and the same that upsets me.

By pointing out the obvious folklore about UFOs and space aliens,
some people (again un-named to avoid flames) imply that there
is nothing to UFOs besides folklore and urban legend.

Does the existence of folklore about meteors imply that meteors
are imaginary? Not at all. Ditto with sea monsters. If a giant
squid isn't a sea monster, I don't know what is. Ditto again
with ball lightning and all sorts of Fortean. The folklore does
not rule out the anomalies.

But UFOs? Ah, that's different, for some people at least.

And yes, it would be useful for me to know more about
folklore. It might help untangle genuine anomalies from the
lore and legend that stick to them like lint.

Only time constraints prevent a deeper study of folklore here.

>In any event, folklore is the study of traditional (i.e.,
>passed down and circulated over time) ideas, expressions,
>stories, music, games, rituals, concepts about life, the
>universe, and everything -- and, beyond that, the role of such
>traditions in both individual and larger cultures. It does not
>exist as an exercise in poking fun at people who hold non-
>mainstream views or tastes or who report unorthodox experiences.

>Rather the opposite is usually the case, in fact.

>>Back on topic; does the JAF deal with matters once considered
>>occult but now commonly accepted as factual?

>This question, again, is meaningless.

I respectfully disagree. Worded differently, I could have asked:
"Does folklore stop being folklore if/when its basis (meteorites
etc.) becomes accepted as fact?"

That's a rhetorical question, probably unanswerable. I agree
that folklore is a separate study, and that its not intended to
put down non-mainstream views.

I just hate to see ufos too entirely mixed up with the
paranormal, the supernatural, ghosts goblins chupacabras new-age
stuff and what have you, until solid flying objects, ones that
really should not be there, evaporate into myth.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

The Missing Science Of Ball Lightning

From: Gary C. Matteson <mystrius.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 18:51:01 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:58:01 -0400
Subject: The Missing Science Of Ball Lightning

EBK:

Thought this might be of interest to researchers; this is from
Journal of Scientific Exploration, 2003.

Regards,

Gary C. Matteson

The Missing Science of Ball Lightning
David J. Turner,
Condensation Physics,
3435 Plum Point Road,
Huntingtown, MD 20639
USA

One of the main problems in understanding ball lightning is that its properties, taken together, seem to be inconsistent with the laws of physics. This long-standing problem is completely eliminated once it is accepted that a plasma is both a phenomenon of physics and a mixture of chemicals. The processes occurring in the coolest regions surrounding a wet air-plasma will depend greatly on the temperature and on trace contaminants present in the air. This may explain why ball lightning usually forms unexpectedly and unreproducibly. Under appropriate chemical and physical conditions, a number of unusual nitrogen-oxidation reactions become possible. Phenomena result which are thermodynamically inevitable but, at first sight, totally unexpected. There can explain qualitatively all the seemingly impossible behaviour. To get much further, we need to be able to achieve, in the laboratory, conditions that will start the vital processes. We do not know how to do this and it is suggested that the reasons for our ignorance are complex and important. Considerable technological benefits might well be reaped from an ability to make ball lightning. The basic problems cast doubt on the mathematical modelling of any rate process involving the simultaneous presence of ions and saturated water vapour. If these problems were solved, light might well be thrown on other poorly understood phenomena as well, ranging all the way from star formation to the destructive power of some tornadoes and the existence of phenomena often classed as paranormal.

Keywords: missing physical chemistry, thermodynamics, reaction rates, vapour phase electrochemistry, ball lightning, UFOs, Spontaneous Human Combustion, tornadoes, star formation

Full Text:

The Missing Science of Ball Lightning

<http://www.scientificexploration.org/jse/abstracts/v17n3a3.php>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:21:03 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 05:59:36 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:14:07 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 21:24:33 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>>If the typical height of telephone poles is about 22 feet (from
>>telephone lineman manual) and measures about 55mm in length on
>>my computer screen and the width of the UFO in the sky is indeed
>>in the opposite side of the road and measures about 15mm, then
>>the diameter of this UFO would about 6 feet. The raised central
>>dome would be about 4 feet across.

>This is a very pertinent observation.

>>Such a tiny crew compartment
>>would be too cramped for even a single 3 foot tall ET occupant
>>laying on its side!

>But this is a red herring. We are not debating the physiology of
>hypothetical ETs, we are trying to decide whether the Heflin
>photos are valid objective evidence or a hoax. A 6-foot wide
>discoidal object flying over Myford Rd and kicking up a dust
>cloud in 1965 would be a remarkable UFO in my opinion.

I was not implying that this discoidal object could not be a
remote controlled craft.

To the annoyance of his neighbours, flying saucers even smaller
than this would unexpectly appear outside the home of Wilbert B.
Smith in Bells Corner, a suburb of Ottawa, during meetings about
UFOs with friends, colleagues and government officials over a
decade earlier than the Rex Heflin sighting. Although they would
not kick up a cloud of dust, they would damage trees and create
other disturbances like the radio interference Rex reported.

>>If the UFO was much closer or much further than the disturbance on
>>the ground (a dust devil?), then this disturbance had no direct
>>association with the UFO.

>Obviously.

Do you rule out what looks like a dust/dirt disturbance directly
beneath the craft in photo 1 as being the result of the presence
of this craft (much just like the blast from a hovering British
Harrier jump jet)?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 21:03:40 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 06:02:31 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:41:04 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>The tungsten wire I mentioned earlier is made for this purpose
>and is dead black, light absorbing. It does not diffract light,
>or produce any fringing. This is why the Hollywood SFX guys
>loved it so much in the days before CGI.

>I'm not sure the source of your statement that the human eye can
>resolve only 200 shades of gray, but I think it is not an
>absolute at all and would depend on quite a number of variables
>in viewing conditions. I know photographers who say they can
>discriminate much finer shading.

>Anyway, my original point was that it is futile to look for
>artifacts of support strings or wires in Polaroid images,
>particularly with Polaroid 3000, which has the lowest resolving
>power of any Polaroid film.

>Bob Shell

Thanks for the Polaroid information... I see your point, but:

There are many factors to consider which includes experimenting
with similar setups so that one will know, and not simply say,
such a such is or isn't possible. One must exceed limits to know
what the actual limits are. I simply brought up several points
that must be entertained as factors.

Light diffracts around obstacles _there's no argument here ? How
it's perceived by the eye and on film is another matter... let's
find out, etc. The orientation on the alleged cable is relevant.
And, just because someone says they can perceive more than 200
shades of gray doesn't make it so. My point is that we can go
way beyond these restrictions and consider that which isn't
perceived normally. There are things outside human perception
that must be wrestled with and included within the scope of an
investigation.

I'm an experimenter by heart and don't take anything for
granted. And, why else would I be able to see stereographically
without the aid of special glasses? Because I was confronted
once with a problem and I solved it! And that's the beauty of 3D
from flat 2D film... who would've guessed that all that
information was wrapped up inside waiting to be discovered _in
another realm of perception. This illustrates my point more than
anything.

Regards,

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 22:09:45 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 06:05:34 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Friedman

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:51:51 -0700
>Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome'

>>Source: Peter Farley's Site

>><http://www.4truthseekers.net/art2.htm>

>>01 January 2006

><snip>

>>Little Green Men: The Cover-up Continues
>>by Peter R. Farley

><snip>

>Please forgive the snips, but this is a sore point with me.

>"Little Green Men?"

>As one highly regarded web page puts it:

>" Q-14: How about Little Green Men?"

>This database has thousands of 'entity' sightings listed, of
>various and often dubious merits.

>Having scoured the literature for two decades at least, *U*
>doesn't register a single Little Green Man (LGM).

>The origin of the term is very obscure. Almost invariably, LGM
>is used as an inexpensive form of ridicule, or to change the
>subject without further discussion. The surest way to display
>complete ignorance of these matters is to bring up Little Green
>Men. "

>That's my own web page by-the-way, and I suppose
>I'm the only one highly-regarding it.

><http://www.larryhatch.net/UFOFAO.html#LGM>

>LGM is a straw man. In most cases, whoever uses the term implies
>that ufologists 'believe' in LGM as a rule when nothing could be
>further from the truth.

>I strongly doubt that any living being would ever come here
>from light-years distances when highly intelligent probes could
>do the job.

I tend to agree with you about LGM. But there are alien beings coming here. They may be stationed on mother ships in the area or on bases. Taking advantage of Time Dilation should also make things very much easier. Why assume they just came from Zeta Reticuli.? To use my homey example I once did 25 lectures in 35 days in 15 dates. I went from lecture to lecture. NOT from Home to Lecture to Home to lecture etc.

We may at this moment in time be the only primitive society in the neighborhood whose major activity is tribal warfare and going through the difficult phase from being stuck on its own planet to being able to bother more advanced civilizations in the neighborhood. Call out the troops....

>Others may well argue into the night about 'wormholes in space' and similar but that's not the point here.

>I maintain that LGM is as much a false and comforting chimera now, as caricatures of buck-teethed Japanese were in 1939. >Both are/were beside the point, wrong-minded, and just plain >wrong. I hope I never see the term LGM in print any more. >Maybe there is a special place in Eternal Local Sports* for >people who write LGM stuff.

How difficult is interstellar travel? Just remember Dr. Campbell who was too high by a factor of 300 million when he calculated the required initial launch weight of a rocket able to get a man to the and back.

Some people have suggested nobody would travel because it is so much cheaper to send signals. So why were the flights I took to Australia from California quite full?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: **Franck Boitte** <Franckboitte.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 07:19:40 EDT
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 07:45:38 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

Removed at Moderator's discretion

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 04:12:56 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 08:01:34 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome' - Hatch

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 22:09:45 -0300
>Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome'

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhatch.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 06:51:51 -0700
>>Subject: Re: 'Little Green Men Syndrome'

>>>Source: Peter Farley's Site
>>><http://www.4truthseekers.net/art2.htm>
>>>01 January 2006
>><snip>

>>>Little Green Men: The Cover-up Continues
>>>by Peter R. Farley

>><snip>

>>Please forgive the snips, but this is a sore point with me.
>>"Little Green Men?"

>><http://www.larryhatch.net/UFOFAQO.html#LGM>

<snip>

>>LGM is a straw man. In most cases, whoever uses the term implies
>>that ufologists 'believe' in LGM as a rule when nothing could be
>>further from the truth.

>>I strongly doubt that any living being would ever come here
>>from light-years distances when highly intelligent probes could
>>do the job.

>I tend to agree with you about LGM. But there are alien beings
coming here. They may be stationed on mother ships in the area
or on bases. Taking advantage of Time Dilation should also make
things very much easier. Why assume they just came from Zeta
Reticuli.? To use my homey example I once did 25 lectures in 35
days in 15 dates. I went from lecture to lecture to lecture. NOT
from Home to Lecture to Home to lecture etc.

>We may at this moment in time be the only primitive society in
the neighborhood whose major activity is tribal warfare and
going through the difficult phase from being stuck on its own
planet to being able to bother more advanced civilizations in
the neighborhood. Call out the troops....

>>Others may well argue into the night about 'wormholes in space'
>>and similar but that's not the point here.

>>I maintain that LGM is as much a false and comforting chimera

>>now, as caricatures of buck-teethed Japanese were in 1939.
>>Both are/were beside the point, wrong-minded, and just plain
>>wrong. I hope I never see the term LGM in print any more.

<snip>

>How difficult is interstellar travel? Just remember Dr.
>Campbell who was too high by a factor of 300 million when he
>calculated the required initial launch weight of a rocket able
>to get a man to the and back.

>Some people have suggested nobody would travel because it is so
>much cheaper to send signals. So why were the flights I took to
>Australia from California quite full?

Hi Stan:

I presume interstellar travel would be way easier for any presumed advanced society than it is or will be for us. I question the need for sending natural alien beings in the flesh however.

Yes, time dilation could greatly reduce travel time for the spacemen, both ways in fact. But, when they got back home, they would find scores if not hundreds of years had elapsed there, probably the most profound case of 'culture shock' imaginable.

Add to that problems of complex and bulky life support systems, nutrition, and don't forget the effects of boredom over years if not decades of black-space travel.

For these and similar reasons, I find the reasoning and logic of Edward Ashpole attractive. Ashpole suggests highly intelligent probes, probably along the lines of spacecraft we ourselves may send out to the stars eventually.

Sufficiently intelligent and semi-autonomous, exploratory craft would be unburdened of all the natural human or live-alien problems.

If we see 'space aliens', they could conceivably be entirely artificial. If they walk on legs, that might be for camouflage (if imperfectly), or simply to get the entities over uneven terrain where wheels would get stuck. The 'aliens' could even be a combination of cybernetics and biological engineering for all I know.

Barring some extremely exotic and speculative technology like wormholes in space, I doubt that the more-or-less natural inhabitants of another solar system would come here in person. Instead, they could send their best technology while they stay home and smell the roses.

Over time, an immense river of information about other stars and planets would stream back, with or without alien astronauts on board.

Seeing the relentless advances in artificial intelligence now, and assuming some new propulsion better than chemical rockets, I would bet we send super-intelligent and entirely cybernetic probes out to the stars in the next 100 to 300 years, all unmanned.

It is science fiction and Hollywood that most typically insist on a live crew. SF so there can be some decent dialogue, and Hollywood for the great looking lady in a tight-fitting space suit.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 12:16:54 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 08:02:55 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:21:03 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:14:07 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 21:24:33 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>>>If the typical height of telephone poles is about 22 feet (from
>>>telephone lineman manual) and measures about 55mm in length on
>>>my computer screen and the width of the UFO in the sky is indeed
>>>in the opposite side of the road and measures about 15mm, then
>>>the diameter of this UFO would about 6 feet. The raised central
>>>dome would be about 4 feet across.

>>This is a very pertinent observation.

>>>Such a tiny crew compartment
>>>would be too cramped for even a single 3 foot tall ET occupant
>>>laying on its side!

>>But this is a red herring. We are not debating the physiology of
>>hypothetical ETs, we are trying to decide whether the Heflin
>>photos are valid objective evidence or a hoax. A 6-foot wide
>>discoidal object flying over Myford Rd and kicking up a dust
>>cloud in 1965 would be a remarkable UFO in my opinion.

>I was not implying that this discoidal object could not be a
>remote controlled craft.

I'm sorry, you appeared to be saying that the photos were hoaxed
using something the size of a hubcap because Heflin dishonestly
misrepresented photo #4.

>Do you rule out what looks like a dust/dirt disturbance directly
>beneath the craft in photo 1 as being the result of the presence
>of this craft (much just like the blast from a hovering British
>Harrier jump jet)?

Now I'm confused. I thought you were ruling out a 6-foot
object on the basis of absent shadow, saying that it was
"reasonable to conclude" that it was a little thing the size of
a hubcap. Are you now saying that Heflin took honest photos of a
hubcap-sized RPV-type "craft" that happened to be flying by (but
lied about the smoke ring)?

If so then I'm interested in how single-witness uncorroborated
photo evidence contaminated by at least one dishonestly
misrepresented photo (in your opinion) is of probative value in
establishing the existence of hubcap-sized RPVs in 1965.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 08:29:23 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 17:15:31 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 21:03:40 EDT
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>And, just because someone says they can perceive more that 200
>shades of gray doesn't make it so.

And just because you say the human eye can only discern 200
shades of gray doesn't make it so, either. I asked you where you
came by that piece of information, which I have not encountered
before, and you ignored my question. Where does this bit of
information come from?

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 08:39:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 17:17:12 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
To: <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:57:25 +0100
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>The emulsion carries no useful information on scales smaller
>than the grain size. Yes effective image grain size and the
>silver halide crystal size are two different things. Usually
>with photo emulsions you are never looking at the actual
>individual crystal scale, even when you enlarge beyond the point
>of evident grain. The "grain" we usually mean - and presumably
>the also the grain referred to in the JSE paper - is the
>structure made by quite large clumps and filaments of silver
>halide particles. But this is the effective limit of resolution
>for images.

All of which would be true if we were discussing a photographic negative. However, we're talking about Polaroid prints. See my earlier post on how Polaroid film works. There is no photo emulsion in a Polaroid print, no silver halide crystals, just a somewhat blurred, diffusion transferred image. The effective limit of resolution in such a print is very low, much lower than from a photographic negative of similar ISO speed.

I haven't read the whole JSE paper, but in giving it a quick lookover, I have the impression that the authors don't know much about Polaroid prints.

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 15:11:18 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 17:19:36 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 19:39:05 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>When a uniformly lit white background was photographed, these
>early instant Polaroid film photos would exhibit fuzzy patches
>throughout the frame. What you interpret as a "dark smoke ring"
>to the right of the saucer shaped craft in photo 3 may very well
>be an emulsion/developing artifact and not a real object like
>the faint and very indistinct/broken smoke ring you see in the
>same general vicinity of the sky the craft appeared in photo 2.

It may or may not be possible to rule out an artifact on
examination of the original Polaroids. But at the moment this
"smoke trail" stands as a striking coincidence. There is also
the fluffy-looking structure rising off the top surface of image
#2 that I pointed out.

>After Rex Heflin drove one or two hundred yards closer to the
>ring that had formed where the craft had been in earlier and got
>out of his truck to take a picture of it (photo 4), he judged
>the dark smoke ring was 3 to 4 times larger in diameter than the
>craft. Did Rex simply comparing the relative sizes of the craft
>in his first three photos with the size of the dark smoke ring
>in photo 4 or was the ring indeed 3 to 4 times the diameter of
>the craft? If the ring had grown to such a much larger diameter
>by then, it should be even less distinct than your suspected
>smoke ring in photo 3.

This inference presumes a great deal of theoretical "back story"
about the nature of the object and whatever mechanism might be
used to lift and propel it. It had been crossing slowly left to
right between #1 and #2, then between #2 and #3 turned back to
head NE, still quite slowly. This is one application of whatever
flight controls it has (ex hypothesi), associated with a faint
"smoke" emission. It then at some point accelerated and climbed
away to the NE, associated with a denser smoke emission (the #4
ring). Unless you can explain in detail how a UFO propulsion
system works I don't see that you can justify your claim that
there is something inconsistent here.

>The very tight dark smoke ring in photo 4
>is typical of smoke rings seen and photographed by others soon
>after explosions, not many minutes later as this one was.

This is all very confused. So the tight dark smoke ring does not
look the way an airshow "bomb" smoke ring should look after many
minutes, therefore it can't be connected to the UFO and must be
an airshow "bomb" smoke ring?

Assuming that there is some invisible logic here let's look at

your premise: The ring had been dissipating for "many minutes"? Even if Heflin drove your "one or two hundred yards" towards the cloud at only 15 mph he would arrive below it in about 13 - 27 seconds.

But maybe we can help you out because actually the distance might have been greater. The JSE paper (possibly your source) mentions this "100-200 yard" figure, but Hartmann's 1968 map shows about 1500 yds. The former figure would only take Heflin about as far as the 3rd telephone pole in photo #1, not even half way to the underpass; but the smoke ring photo position was about 1100 yds beyond the underpass as shown to Hartmann by Heflin during interview and site visit in 1967. This is where the orange trees were, one of which was matched with the photo tree by NICAP in Oct 1965. Well if the drive was that distance we can allow for a little acceleration, say an average of only 25 mph. That gives a little over 2 minutes, not "many minutes".

Also we don't know that the UFO must already have deposited the "smoke ring" by the time Heflin set off. Asked if he spotted the "smudge" before driving off Heflin said he wasn't sure. He only said that he spotted it before going through the freeway underpass, so we don't know that the ring was there fully 2 minutes before he photographed it even if it did take him this long to drive there. Well, surely he would have seen the UFO in the act of depositing the ring if this were the case? But remember that he wasn't able to track the object into the distance because it was lost in the smog haze. At 1500 yards it would be at three times the distance of the vehicles on the freeway in #1 and an object twice as big as one of those trucks (say 20 ft) would only intercept an angle one third as wide or about 12 arc mins. This is a small visual angle. Once lost in the smog it could have been difficult to pick it up again or notice the appearance of the smoke ring bearing in mind that Heflin was driving at the time and also operating the now-recovered radio. In other words we can make a fair argument that the smoke ring could have been there for less than 2 minutes. Not "many minutes".

>If you do a Google Images search using the words "smoke" "ring" >and "airshow" or "explosion", you will find several dark smoke >rings identical to the one in Rex's photo 4 (and the one I saw >and photographed at an airshow after an a simulated aerial >bombing).

>It is interesting to note that Rex thought what he saw was an >experimental airplane. Could this be why he did not take >additional photos of the dark smoke ring as it rose and drifted >away in the sky?

I take it you find the absence of more shots of the remarkable smoke ring suspicious? I think this is rather a weak point, partly for the reason you yourself suggest - Heflin may not have thought the smoke ring was very remarkable in itself, certainly not (if we are to believe him) some weird alien anomaly, rather just the aftermath of a test vehicle. Anyway, does anyone know how many shots were available in the Polaroid pack? How many frames did he have left after #4? Also I wonder how many shots of his hypothetical airshow smoke ring you think he took? Two or three? Ten? Might we not have been given a couple of those if he had them? If he only had one, would that seem strange? How many photos did you take of that smoke ring you told us about? You refer to one photo.

>If the alleged smoke ring in photo 3 is "the most important" >evidence that Rex's four pictures rule out a hoax in your mind, >I would suggest you rethink things out.

So you do think it was a hoax then, not a hubcap-sized RPV?

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 10:17:17 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 17:21:46 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Sandow

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 18:05:54 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>Firstly, one only has to look at what is done when the social
>sciences are applied to specific real-world problems. In this
>respect, Greg Sandow's classical music example makes the
>point spectacularly well - just read through his description
>of his sociologists friend's modus operandi, and note that it
>contains absolutely no reference to any sort of cumulative
>knowledge base, or to any corpus of sociological theory. It
>is, purely and simply, a research methodology, which is
>applied de novo to a whole series of specific, clearly
>delineated, and largely unconnected problems. Theory, and
>"knowledge", are wholly irrelevant to the process.

Cathy, I'm amazed at you. Up to now, I've admired your posts here. But I didn't pretend, not for a moment, to be giving a complete account of how my friend does his professional work. And I can't imagine why you're jumping to the conclusion you jump to here. You don't know this man's name, you don't know anything about his history, you haven't read his publications. How can you assume that everything he does is ad hoc, without reference to theory or accumulated data?

So, for the record - what you're saying about him isn't true. Because I'm not a professional sociologist, I'm not familiar with the accumulated data or the theoretical work my friend draws on. So I wouldn't try to describe it. It's not my field. I talked about the empirical work he does, because I can easily comprehend that.

Cathy Reason, of all people, jumping to a completely unwarranted conclusion, without any data. I'm really shocked.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 14:56:24 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 18:05:52 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:21:03 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:14:07 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>Do you rule out what looks like a dust/dirt disturbance directly
>beneath the craft in photo 1 as being the result of the presence
>of this craft (much just like the blast from a hovering British
>Harrier jump jet)?

Let's set the record straight on this before it takes on a life of its own. There was no disturbance beneath the UFO. Our (NICAP) investigators visited the site repeatedly, measured everything, took comparative photos, re-enacted the sighting with Heflin, etc. We were quite thorough.

What appeared to be a disturbance turned out to be a patch of dead grass still visible there. No significance related to the sighting at all. I think all of you assumers and presumers ought to read my summary of the case, which includes clear prints from the original photos supplied by Ann Druffel, in The UFO Evidence, Vol. II, pages 284-86. It contains a great deal of factual information that trumps way-after-the-fact guesswork.

Importantly, a very thorough background and character check was conducted that decisively ruled out any likelihood of a hoax. There is a long record of people apparently trying to falsify the evidence in this case, which I also report.

When I find time I will try to submit a copy oif the summary here, but meanwhile those of you who have access to UFOE-II have my permission as copyright holder to reproduce the summary on this list if you wish.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 29](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 12:45:48 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 18:09:58 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:14:07 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 21:24:33 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Ann Druffel <Anndruffel.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 02:48:14 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>If the typical height of telephone poles is about 22 feet (from
>>telephone lineman manual) and measures about 55mm in length on
>>my computer screen and the width of the UFO in the sky is indeed
>>in the opposite side of the road and measures about 15mm, then
>>the diameter of this UFO would about 6 feet. The raised central
>>dome would be about 4 feet across.

Hi Nick,

Just one observation. First of all these are power poles, all of them are. The telephone companies rent space on the poles from the power companies. And there is no set height for power poles; their height depends on topography, measured distance between poles for clearance sake [wire sag etc.]and the turning of corners [bracing or anchoring] and public safety. Typically, in this province [Nova Scotia] they are about 40 feet tall* from the datum point to the top of the pole. I worked as an apprentice lineman when I first got out of high school, for about 16 months. Looking at that photo does not suggest 22 feet to me, the scale doesn't look right. That's pretty low for a power pole. Telegraph poles along railway lines were shorter however, but they weren't as prevalent in the 60s and not on public highways. Right in front of the truck there is a black line that looks like the next pole in line's shadow on the ground reaching from the bush shadows to the edge of the pavement. If this is a shadow it suggests that the Sun was on the right and was casting a shadow perpendicular to the road [no crosstree shadow] and also would give the Sun's elevation. If the truck was facing north I would disagree with the time at being 12:30 PM. The Sun's shadow suggests that it was before Noon. BUT that only applies if that is the Sun's shadow across the road in front of the truck.

The sky appears hazy to me which would mean that the Sun's rays would be defused eliminating hard shadows. It certainly isn't great visibility suggesting either haze [smog?] or even misty conditions akin to fog-but I doubt that. The lateral visibility across the field doesn't look to be more than a mile.

Since haze is a combination of moisture and particulate matter

[dust] in the atmosphere that means cloud would be present. A ring could then form if the proper influences were applied.

Don Ledger

*Went across the road and measured the power pole. My 1-1/4 inch wide 25 foot tape measure made it to about 10 feet from the top of the pole, suggesting this was a 35 foot pole plus two feet of soil banked up the pole at the bottom.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 13:39:02 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 06:34:19 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 12:32:28 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>Can't you be specific? Charismatic handwaving won't do. I
>certainly disagree with Kevin's objections and have specified in
>great detail in writing, why. But at least he put them out
>there. I haven't seen any papers or books from you. Are you
>afraid to put some light on them?.

Afraid to put them out there? No! They are already out there!
Many others have already pointed out valid objections. If you're
aware of Kevin's objections and have put out your reasons why
you disagree (as is so) then you already know a lot of what I'm
talking about. I simply agree with them and disagree with
you. You are trying to draw me into a discussion over MJ-12 and
aspects of Roswell that I don't have the time nor interest in.

Roswell, to me, has become a circus, and, while I certainly
don't dismiss it, I don't lean very strongly towards it. Thus,
it is not a case I have any real interest in diverting time or
energy towards. And, if I did want to use resources on Roswell,
it certainly would not be by endlessly debating over and over
again on this listserv issues that have been gone over here many
times already.

It's not fear! It's not charismatic handwaving! It's simply
'disagreeing' and 'lack of enough interest in the case' to spend
time on it. Can't I disagree with Stan Friedman and believe
others, like Kevin Randle, without being accused of things like
'charismatic handwaving'? You already know the objections and
have objected back. Me joining hands with you and Kevin and
getting in on the dance isn't going to generate anything
productive!

And, no, you probably won't ever see any papers by me on
Roswell. As I said, not a case I'm big on interest in. I'm still
open to it but am swayed more by the objections against Roswell
and the MJ-12 documents than I am by the arguments for them. I
don't have anything new to add so there is no point in me
rehashing here what you, Kevin, and others have already debated
before - here and elsewhere.

Sorry, Stan, I don't see Roswell as important. It's not a big
case to me. The circus that has sprung up around it is what's
big though. If I want to go to a circus, I'll take the kids to
Hinchey's Rides and Amusements - it's in town right now! Aside
from the circus aspects, I keep my eye on the case while
concentrating on other things - maybe someone at a future time -
perhaps even you - will come up with something that convinces me
one way or the other. That's as far as I want to involve myself
with Roswell right now. If you see that as charismatic
handwaving then you're welcome to do so.

>>So, no, I don't have an "alien phobia" - just reasons to justify
>>questioning what the majority in the field has assumed is going
>>on.

>How is it you know what the majority in the field assume is
>going on as opposed to having deduced it from the evidence? What
>are the reasons?

I don't think it's a big stretch to say most people in this field link UFOs with ET and spaceships. The majority do! Do you agree with this?

I also don't think that's it's possible yet to deduce this from the 'evidence.' Maybe you can do so if you just look at the 'high tech vehicle' cases and ignore everything else the UFO phenomenon has thrown at us. But the high tech cases aren't just their own neat little category clearly separate from all the others. They blend into the bizzare stuff! That's the reason!

Take the October 16, 1976, Sackville, Nova Scotia Webster/Bedford case. At 11:45 p.m., Constable P. Pharand responded to the call for assistance phoned into the Bedford detachment of the RCMP by Mrs. Percy Webster.

The constable arrived to find three UFOs in a holding pattern over the Webster's house - they were round in shape, had flashing red lights on the bottom, plus a flashing white light. An odd green light seemed to shine through the skin of the UFOs. When they eventually moved (increased their altitude), the light became more turquoise in color. The constable watched them, along with the Webster's, for for an amazing two hours (they were still there when he left). Binoculars were also used. The sky was clear. Nothing showed on the radar of Halifax International Airport. There was no sound heard by any of the witnesses.

The Webster's reported they had seen the UFOs earlier in the evening - describing them as both round and cigar-shaped. Each displayed four lights and, in fact, four rows of long windows were clearly discernable. The UFOs appeared to be docking one on top of the other and would fly off in different directions. A "strong nuts and bolts case."

There were two other witnesses to the incident! They were Mr. and Mrs. Robert Bedford living next door. They heard the constable rap at their door and would only talk to him at the door, not invite him in. The Bedford's didn't step outside either - because they didn't want to! Before the knock at the door, they were hiding upstairs with the blinds drawn. Their house was being harassed by a loud persistent roaring noise unlike anything they had ever heard before, by, according to Mr. Bedford, something low over their suburban home.

Mr. Bedford - employed by the DND as a naval architect and having considerable experience with such equipment - stated it was not anything like a helicopter or conventional aircraft. The threatening noise stopped as soon as the constable rapped on their door.

How does a police constable and several witnesses stand outside and watch a two-hour demonstration of 'nuts and bolts' UFOs over a house - hovering and maneuvering in complete silence - while just next door, inside their house, two other witnesses are hiding in fear with their blinds drawn while their house is harrassed by a loud violent roaring noise (which stops when the constable comes to the door)?

Maybe high technology! Maybe just nobody noticed the director operating the projector (playing two different movies for two different audiences) present in the background.

>There is surely a great deal of evidence that manufactured
>vehicles under intelligent control have flown up and away.
>That means somebody built them. That requires a great deal of
>technological effort.

Maybe! But until you provide the answer to the above case (and cases just like it) then these are just premature conclusions, even if you don't think so!

>Have you seen any evidence of advanced
>technological beings building advanced technological craft on
>earth in civilizations about which we know nothing?

Nope! But, as you're fond of saying, absense of evidence isn't evidence of absense! I wasn't around when the raptors, or early hominids, were running about. Don't know what went on way, way back then. That's why I don't rule them out!

>>H. flores shows us that we don't have the big understanding of
>>evolution on this planet that we think we do, even when it comes
>>to just hominids.

>I agree, and have said so, that there is a great deal we don't
>know about evolution or development of life and civilization on
>this planet. I don't see how that connects with manufactured
>high tech craft or specific documents.

Then you're helping to make my point! Older Earch civilizations could be behind the high tech craft (if that's what they indeed are) and they don't have to be ET. So, it's not that I have an "alien phobia."

Add to all this, the work of Alvin Lawson and others, and you have an enigma that definitely hasn't been explained yet. The high tech craft could be high tech something elses. Or just something else!

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 10:42:31 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 06:38:38 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:54:05 +0000
>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 16:47:20 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:46:55 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>I suspect that people who were spiritually inclined in the
>>>first place would be more likely to find something positive in an
>>>abduction experience, and people who were inclined to buy into
>>>the scientific, secular worldview (like me) would be more likely
>>>to be scared by it.

>>Question: Why is there any conflict between religious faith
>>and the "scientific, secular world view"?

>>I've taken science courses, and I'm a confirmed Christian. I
>>just don't see any conflict. To me, science is about learning
>>the details of how God set this universe up.

>Eleanor,

>You just demonstrated the difference. Putting on my philosopher
>hat for the moment:

>You believe in the existence of God on faith and basically
>deduce various things from your belief or assumption. Science at
>the most fundamental level (not to be confused with careless or
>erroneous applications) assumes only the validity of logic and
>mathematics (essentially that both x and non-x cannot be true at
>the same time). Somewhat over-simplified, but I think you will
>get the point.

>You believe God to be real (if typically totally undefined;
>which God from all the variant religions?) Science does not
>require or endorse acceptance of the God hypothesis. A scientist
>may be a Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, Atheist, Agnostic, etc.,
>but if he/she sticks to strict scientific method he/she will not
>use belief or non-belief in God (or a god) as a starting point
>or as a touchstone for ascertaining truth.

May Heaven forbid I barge in to your conversation with
meddlesome quibblings of my own, but even a scientific premise
comes from a human (thank God!) belief like x and non-x can't
both be true. I suppose even that basic belief was also
disproven by the assumptions of Werner Karl Heisenberg!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 15:54:03 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 06:42:19 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 12:32:28 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>Eugene, how about providing some specifics either as to what
>your specific objections are or or what is specifically wrong
>with my rebuttals?. You know, some facts, some data?

<snip>

>Equally I don't see why
>you feel it is enough to just say you don't agree with my data
>or rebuttals. But you can't be bothered with specifics. In other
>words, how about some evidence?. Beliefs are for religion or for
>beauty or sports competitions. Vitamin C was discovered long
>after it was found that scurvy could be prevented by adequate in
>take of citrus fruits. Pernicious anemia was cured by feeding
>people liver long before Vitamin B-12 was isolated. We don't
>need the answers to all questions, especially the why and how
>ones, to establish reasonable conclusions. What are your
>factual, data based, objections to what I have written??

Vitamin C? Pernicious anemia? C'mon, Stan, these aren't the same scenarios at all and are different balls of wax than the UFO enigma. It's like talking about minnows and oceans. You know this, or should.

There are several issues here that you're rolling into one. The first is Roswell/MJ-12, the second is the apparent high tech cases and their supposed occupants, and the third is the whole UFO phenomenon in general, or, in total.

I reread my latest post containing my reply to you after I submitted it and realized that the way I worded parts of it were misleading, in that it wasn't strong enough in conveying what I was trying to say .

When I say I lean away from Roswell but remain open to it, that's not clear enough. It doesn't convey how far away from it I actually lean. Though I don't dismiss it, I'm as close to dismissing it as one can come without actually doing so.

I am more of the viewpoint of researchers like Daniel Cohen - lots of cynicism when it comes to Roswell.

This started off as me making skeptical (maybe cynical is a better word) comments on 'insiders' like Mr. X (and others of that ilk) and about people reporting what these insiders say without using their real names - as well as taking - on their good word - the statements of even very nice people like Jesse Marcel. It's turning into another Roswell/MJ-12 debate.

I'm not going to go there. This thread ends here for me if we're going to keep discussing Roswell or MJ-12. Simply because I don't put too much value in Roswell and none at all in MJ-12. Thus, I'm not going to debate what I see as a waste of time.

As to the apparent high tech vehicle cases and the UFO

phenomenon in total, the only way you can justify your conclusions is if you ignore most of what is happening and ignore the work of many others (like Alvin Lawson) and concentrate on a very small part of the very big picture - picking and choosing only the high tech vehicle cases, as you call them. This approach might be valid if the high tech vehicle cases were clearly a separate category. But they're not! They blur into other more bizarre aspects of the phenomenon.

No, you don't need all the answers before establishing reasonable conclusions. But you do need some answers. And these answers don't exist at all when it comes to the bigger overall UFO picture. You can only make sense of it (with your conclusions) when you crop most of the picture away and use only the so-called high tech vehicle cases. And your conclusions even then can't be trusted because you can't be sure older Earth civilizations aren't behind the high tech cases. You need some answers. And some evidence.

And let's be specific about the evidence. We have evidence that there appears to be structured high tech craft (never mind there is lots of other evidence that says this category may have characteristics more unusual). But that's simply evidence, at best, that we have high tech craft. That's not evidence we are dealing with high tech ET craft. Because we were feeding people liver to cure pernicious anemia before discovering Vitamin B-12, or eating citrus to prevent scurvy before we found Vitamin C, is not a reason to jump to this big a conclusion about the pilots of the high tech vehicles, if that is what they are.

It's you and your supporters that need to provide the evidence of your claims of ET spacecraft. You're the ones with the beliefs (i.e. the claims) and are required to produce the evidence of same. I'm merely pointing out that the apparent high tech vehicle cases represent only a small part of the total UFO phenomenon. And that you can't ignore these other parts. Your conclusions are extremely premature in view of these other components of the UFO phenomenon. These 'other components' exist and this fact alone justifies my questioning your conclusions. This fact alone comprises the "factual, data based, objections to what [you] have written" - the "some facts, some data" which you requested of me and the "evidence" you accuse me of lacking.

And, this fact alone, justifies me not wanting to waste time debating with you the Roswell/MJ-12 objections and counter-objections (which have, and are, been and being discussed all over the place already anyway) since you never consider these other components of the UFO phenomenon.

I'll continue discussing the UFO phenomenon (even the apparent high tech vehicle cases) with you if you want but for me Roswell and MJ-12 are almost certainly non-entities and I've no interest in going down that path - just as I've no interest in getting into a debate over George Adamski, for example.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Direct Link To John Mack Piece On IF Website -

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 12:08:03 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 06:49:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Direct Link To John Mack Piece On IF Website -

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:36:11 +0000
>Subject: Direct Link To John Mack Piece On IF Website

>Foward:

>From: John W. Horton <songrighter.nul>
>To: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 11:03:45 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Direct link to John Mack Piece on IF ebsite

>Richard,

>Budd asked me to send you the direct link to the
>John Mack Piece (Special Report # 8) and if you
>could post it to UFO UpDates.
>As mentioned IF wanted to give UFO UpDates
participants a chance to read it. Thank you again.

>Link:

[http://www.intrudersfoundation.org/John Mack UAATE.htm](http://www.intrudersfoundation.org/John%20Mack%20UAATE.htm)

After reading Hopkins' opinion on abduction (I did not read his thoughts on Mack):

It is the human's response to the experience that makes it transformative. It is an experience only a fool would want. Hopkins comes closest to understanding the experience from the view of an outsider.

I personally have no respect for "abductees" seeking to be the "star" of public lectures and have wondered for years whether they were plants attempting to manipulate how the abduction events are viewed by the public.

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:46:03 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 06:50:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>I was scared at first but when I spotted the tall one I was
>>overwhelmed with pity for it, felt bonded to it, and had the
>>unmistakeable feeling of something ancient - something
>>'dinosaur'.

>Your compassion seems rather over-developed if it extends to
>things that break into your bedroom at night.

If you were as well-versed in these types of things as you seem
to think you are, you'd know that emotions which are extremely
out of context (inappropriate considering the circumstances)
toward the 'intruders' is often a component of the experience.

>In any case, in comparing your beliefs, insofar as they're
>spawned from feelings from visions or encounters of this kind,
>and Friedman's beliefs, which appear derived in large part from
>cool logic, the choice for me isn't terribly difficult.

My "beliefs"? I wasn't implying dinosaurs were in my room - only
that my reality may have been altered by the phenomenon behind
UFOs. This was intended as a caution to not accept the
appearance of things. There are no "beliefs" here on this end
regarding this experience.

My caution (as opposed to "beliefs") was not based on a
"feeling" or "intuition" from a vision. It was based on an
observation that there seemed to be a subtle change in reality
while the sightings and encounters were going on. This subtle
change of reality has been noticed in many, many UFO events. It
is often a component in even so-called nuts and bolts cases.

You might want to take note of this component if you really want
to discover the truth about UFOs and really be using "cool
logic" when you assess the UFO phenomenon.

>What might be of interest to me would be objections to
>Friedman's MJ-12/Roswell stance that are based on substantive
>argument (consisting of evidence and sound reasoning).

There's a lot of it out there. I'm sure if you're really
"interested" then you'll find it. However, nobody is going to
lure me into another Roswell/MJ-12 debate. But are you sure
you'd recognize "evidence" and "sound reasoning" if you came
across it? Because you don't seem to be recognizing it here. You
obviously have your mind made up on MJ-12/Roswell and anything
that speaks against, it you don't like. I haven't provided
objections against any specific aspect of Roswell/MJ-12, other
than question outright Stan's conclusions about ET spacecraft,
which, if you accepted there was more to the UFO enigma than

Stan's nuts and bolts apparent high tech vehicles, then you wouldn't be jumping on me for cautioning against taking things at face value.

For someone who speaks so strongly in favor of "evidence" and "sound reasoning" you seem to be either unaware of a lot of the evidence, or simply ignoring it.

>Intuitions and feelings reveal a lot about an individual, and >may be experienced as persuasive by that individual, but they >provide little or no reason for anyone else to be persuaded.

I haven't been persuaded of anything yet. Or haven't you been listening?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 20:47:29 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 06:55:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Allan

>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:33:20 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>I was scared at first but when I spotted the tall one I was
>>overwhelmed with pity for it, felt bonded to it, and had the
>>unmistakeable feeling of something ancient - something
>>'dinosaur'.

>Your compassion seems rather over-developed if it extends to
>things that break into your bedroom at night.

>In any case, in comparing your beliefs, insofar as they're
>spawned from feelings from visions or encounters of this kind,
>and Friedman's beliefs, which appear derived in large part from
>cool logic, the choice for me isn't terribly difficult.

>What might be of interest to me would be objections to
>Friedman's MJ-12/Roswell stance that are based on substantive
>argument (consisting of evidence and sound reasoning).
>Intuitions and feelings reveal a lot about an individual, and
>may be experienced as persuasive by that individual, but they
>provide little or no reason for anyone else to be persuaded.

It is possible to refute each and every one of Stan Friedman's arguments for both Roswell and MJ-12 reality. By this I mean it is possible to advance a perfectly sound, alternative, scenario that does not involve either ET visitors or a Top Secret Majic committee under Pres. Truman. Others can, and have, done this but it takes time & effort, and (most important) is probably of little interest to the majority on this list. It is hard to believe anyone has, or will want to, delve into official archives & libraries to the extent that Stan has. However, despite this, we do not have to accept his conclusions as gospel.

I have read most of Stan's rebuttals and articles and, whilst they look persuasive in places, I do not feel they are unanswerable.

It is much more likely that people are bored with the whole Roswell/MJ-12 saga and want to get on with other matters. Thus nobody is sufficiently motivated to research and rebut in detail Stan's arguments in a public forum.

I will, however, cite one of Stan's frequent claims: He insists two crashes occurred in NM that day in July 47 (Roswell & Plains of San Augustin). His sole (yes sole) evidence for the San

Augustin crash is an anecdote told to him in 1978 by someone he met at a lecture. This person (Mr Maltais) did not witness the event but only heard of it via someone else, since deceased (Barney Barnett).

But Barnett never told Maltais the story until several years afterwards, according to Maltais. In turn, Maltais could not recall when the alleged 'crash' had taken place. There is not one iota of evidence (real evidence) to suppose the crash, if it occurred at all, took place in July 1947 or on any other specific day. Even the year 1947 was 'plucked from the air' (just like the UFO) from another party, a Mr Fleck Danley, Barnett's boss, who again is only a second-hand source. But even Danley, if you read his testimony, does not mention any bodies, any crash of a UFO, or that the UFO was seen on the ground at all! Even if we accept at face value Danley's statement: "It had to have been sometime in the early summer of 1947", how does "early summer" equate to July 3? (When does summer begin in New Mexico?) Remember also that the interviews with Danley were not conducted until 1979. Remember also that, unlike Roswell, there was no newspaper mention of this second crash, none whatever. There is not even an entry in Barnett's diary, as supplied by his wife for that summer. An incredible omission, assuming the event indeed took place.

Yet this is the 'evidence' Stan wishes to advance in promoting the San Augustin crash. He still insists that not only was there a second crash in NM but that it occurred on the same day as the Roswell crash! This, of course, assumes that the latter date is known with any certainty.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Is The Truth Out There In Northern Saskatchewan

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:14:39 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:14:39 -0400
Subject: Is The Truth Out There In Northern Saskatchewan

Source: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation - Saskatchewan

<http://www.cbc.ca/sask/story/sk-ufos060529.html>

May 29 2006

Is The Truth Out There In Northern Saskatchewan

Armed with a Polaroid camera and a variety of electronic gear, Barb Campbell is on the hunt for unidentified flying objects in northern Saskatchewan.

The UFO researcher from Maidstone is focusing her search these days on the northern reserve of Waterhen Lake, where strange lights have been spotted for years and where there have recently been vivid tales of close encounters.

Night watchman Kenny Lapratt said he was on duty one night several weeks ago when he saw what he believes were spaceships hovering over the lake, which is about a four-hour drive north of Prince Albert.

"It's kind of like a Frisbee, two Frisbees on top of another, like an orange in the middle," he said.

"And they were turning at an incredible rate. It was just like you could see the windows turning one way and the ship, the bottom part, turning the other way. And whatever way on top it was like glowing. I don't know what it was but it was beautiful."

Lapratt said he saw several objects landing on the lake, then zipping away at high speed toward the treeline.

Then they shot straight up.

"I just panicked ... I didn't know what to do," he said. He called the police.

Campbell hasn't seen any lights on the reserve yet, but many other people there on the reserve have seen them and have told her their stories.

One woman showed her a video showing more than three minutes of moving lights.

"This really looks genuine," she said as she watched the video again. "I'm really impressed."

Some of the people who have observed the lights don't know what they were looking at, but Lapratt said he doesn't have any doubts.

"They were UFOs," he said. "They couldn't be anything else."

[Thanks to Greg Boone 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:20:08 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:57:25 +0100
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 09:14:12 EDT
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>><snip>

>>>the film is ASA 3000, 3-1/4 x 4-1/4 inch print size, which
>>>they blew up to 8 x 10 inch and scanned. The paper said they
>>>were into the grain when scanning at 300 dpi. According to my
>>>calculations, this means the grain size was on the order of 25
>>>to 30 grains per millimeter on the original film, which is
>>>pretty grainy.

>>Nice estimates David, but we must consider much more:

>>One has to exceed the grain size by a considerable factor in order
>>to do any analysis of the type that's described here. The actual
>>grain size, would have to be determined using a reflected light
>>microscope to see exactly what the character of the grain is.
>>Based upon that, one would then do a scan that would exceed the
>>grain size observed (2000 dpi+). There's also the effects caused
>>by the inconsistent sizes of the grains: grains can vary by as
>>much 7 fold, that I've seen. Therefore, we do not know which
>>order of grain size they are possibly perceiving in the scan:
>>The largest of ones, which? Given that the grain sizes vary from
>>one grain to the next (mosaic-like pattern), a linear-like
>>feature will have a much harder time being detected congruently,

>The emulsion carries no useful information on scales smaller
>than the grain size. Yes effective image grain size and the
>silver halide crystal size are two different things. Usually
>with photo emulsions you are never looking at the actual
>individual crystal scale, even when you enlarge beyond the point
>of evident grain. The "grain" we usually mean - and presumably
>the also the grain referred to in the JSE paper - is the
>structure made by quite large clumps and filaments of silver
>halide particles. But this is the effective limit of resolution
>for images. And I don't think you can talk in terms of a
>"mosaic" at this scale, this is a three-dimensional random
>suspension with clumps of varying sizes all over the place,
>shadowing one another. This structure is the film noise level,
>like radio static. Below the nominal grain scale signal
>information is surely irrecoverable, not because it isn't
>"there" in some sense but just because you can't distinguish it
>from the random noise background. Indefinitely enlarging the
>scale will not pull the signal out of the noise; it will amplify
>the noise.

I mostly agree with this, but just want to clarify the concept of resolution a bit more. There are various types of resolution. Usually it refers to the minimum distance between two things such that they can still be discerned as separate instead of one. Thus, in astronomy, e.g., it might refer to the ability (minimum angle of separation) at which a telescope can resolve a double star into two separate stars instead of appearing as one star. In photography, such resolution would be limited by film grain.

However, there is a simpler resolution task of being to detect the presence of something in isolation. This was the sense in which I was using it in terms of being able to "resolve" or detect a suspension thread. This is much better than separation resolution. E.g., I said that humans can still detect a high contrast thin line against a dark background when it is less than 10% of the retinal "grain" and suggested that cameras would probably have similar capability, i.e., one could still detect the presence of a thread even though its image would be much thinner than the film grain. The reason is, the thread still casts a shadow on the film, so you can still detect a contrast difference between the shadow and the surround (unless the contrast gets too small).

Now here's some proof. I conducted a simple experiment where I created a light grey, slightly yellowish background with my paint program (to simulate the hazy, smoggy conditions of the Heflin photos). Then I taped three different sewing threads (black, white, and light gray) and a dark hair on the screen. I then took my 5 MegaPixel digital camera (2592 pixels wide) and moved it about 57 inches from the screen (a comparable distance, if not more, to what Heflin might have filmed a hoax model outside his van window.) At that distance, every inch on the screen corresponds to about one degree of angular distance. My camera has a 53 degree field, so there are $2592/53 = 49$ pixels/degree or for every inch of screen. Every millimeter of screen is thus represented by $49/25.4 = 1.93$ pixels/mm, call it 2 pixels/mm. This can then be used to calculate how many pixels wide the thread and hair were when photographed by the camera. Here is a table summarizing the results:

	Thickness (microns)	Pix wide (5MegPix)	Visible (comments)
Black thread	~200	.4	Yes, easy
White thread	~200	.4	Yes, easy
Light gray thread	~200	.4	Yes, but harder (low contrast)
Dark hair	~50	.1	Yes, just visible

In all cases the test filaments are a fraction of a pixel wide on the screen. In the case of the hair, it is only about 1/10th pixel wide, yet it is still definitely visible in the resulting picture, even without photo enhancement. The dark hair and the thicker light gray thread are perhaps about equally difficult to make out. In the case of the gray thread, it blends in well with the light gray background, so the resulting contrast is low.

I also reduced my camera resolution to 3 megapixel (2046 pixels wide) and did the same thing. All still remained visible even without enhancement, though the gray thread and dark hair were now getting really hard to see. (The hair, in this case, would now be about .08 pixel wide, yet is still detectable by eye in the picture as a faint line).

I also wanted to use some clear nylon sewing thread (which besides being transparent is also thinner than ordinary thread), but didn't have any around, unfortunately. I suspect that this wouldn't have been detectable.

I then took a look at some of the finer details in the Heflin photos in the JSE article (and I'm sure the original prints are much better quality than those pdf reproductions). In particular I looked at the enlargement of the object in the #2 photo that is contrast enhanced and shows some of the misty "filament"-like things seeming to "steam" off the top. (Note, I copied the JSE pdf photo at 600% size, which works out to about 700 pixels per degree.) My calculations indicate the smallest details are comparable to thread thickness had Heflin photographed a model at about 50 inches from the camera.

I'd guesstimate the resolution of these Polaroids as comparable to my 5 Megapixel camera, which is what I originally estimated

based on the comments about resolution in the original JSE paper. Bob Shell then commented that strictly speaking these old B&W Polaroids don't have any film grain, because the image is transferred from the original photo paper to the print when you pull the picture out of the camera. I'll take his word for it, but even if they strictly don't have silver-halide grain, they do have an ultimate resolution to them, and it seems to be good enough to make out a suspension thread, even a low-contrast one, as in my experiment.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 01:57:18 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:21:48 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Reason

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 10:17:17 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>Cathy, I'm amazed at you. Up to now, I've admired your posts
>here. But I didn't pretend, not for a moment, to be giving a
>complete account of how my friend does his professional work.
>And I can't imagine why you're jumping to the conclusion you
>jump to here. You don't know this man's name, you don't know
>anything about his history, you haven't read his publications.
>How can you assume that everything he does is ad hoc, without
>reference to theory or accumulated data?

Greg, please take a look again at what I actually said. The
example you gave is a very good example of empirical social
science, but I cannot, and did not, comment on what else your
friend might get up to. You're right - I know nothing about him,
and nothing about the rest of this work. But I wasn't commenting
on that. What I can say is this - that if he is doing science,
then he won't be making use of sociological theory or
accumulated "knowledge". To the extent he is making use of
sociological theory and accumulated "knowledge", then he isn't
doing science.

>So, for the record - what you're saying about him isn't true.
>Because I'm not a professional sociologist, I'm not familiar
>with the accumulated data or the theoretical work my friend
>draws on. So I wouldn't try to describe it. It's not my field. I
>talked about the empirical work he does, because I can easily
>comprehend that.

Let's look at this way - you offered an example of a research
problem, which entailed a hypothesis, and a rigorous way of
testing that hypothesis (possibly - let's leave aside the knotty
problem of Cauchy convergence for now). And I agreed, and still
do, that the methodology you described is essentially sound.

The issue is whether social scientists generally work that way,
and on the whole, they don't. It seems you're now saying your
friend may not always work that way either. Ok, that's fine. My
only comment is that when he is not working that way, then he
isn't doing science.

>Cathy Reason, of all people, jumping to a completely unwarranted
>conclusion, without any data. I'm really shocked.

Ok, let's establish once and for all that I have no idea what
your sociologist friend actually does, except what you've told
me, and never intended to suggest that I did. But the
methodology you described conforms to a readily identifiable
practice, which is sometimes referred to as applied social
science - and that practice is both rigorously empirical and
completely atheoretical. The point being that as soon as you
introduce theory into the social sciences, they cease to be
empirical.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 22:04:09 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:25:06 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:41:04 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>The tungsten wire I mentioned earlier is made for this purpose
>and is dead black, light absorbing. It does not diffract light,
>or produce any fringing. This is why the Hollywood SFX guys
>loved it so much in the days before CGI.

>I'm not sure the source of your statement that the human eye can
>resolve only 200 shades of gray, but I think it is not an
>absolute at all and would depend on quite a number of variables
>in viewing conditions. I know photographers who say they can
>discriminate much finer shading.

>Anyway, my original point was that it is futile to look for
>artifacts of support strings or wires in Polaroid images,
>particularly with Polaroid 3000, which has the lowest resolving
>power of any Polaroid film.

Thanks for the Polaroid information... I see your point, but:

There are many factors to consider which includes experimenting
with similar setups so that one will know, and not simply say,
such a such is or isn't possible. One must exceed limits to know
what the actual limits are. I simply brought up several points
that must be entertained as factors.

Light diffracts around obstacles _there's no argument here ? How
it's perceived by the eye and on film is another matter... let's
find out, etc. The orientation on the alleged cable is relevant.
And, just because someone says they can perceive more than 200
shades of gray doesn't make it so. My point is that we can go
way beyond these restrictions and consider that which isn't
perceived normally. There are things outside human perception
that must be wrestled with and included within the scope of an
investigation.

I'm an experimenter by heart and don't take anything for
granted. And, why else would I be able to see stereographically
without the aid of special glasses? Because I was confronted
once with a problem and I solved it! And that's the beauty of 3D
from flat 2D film... who would've guessed that all that
information was wrapped up inside waiting to be discovered _in
another realm of perception. This illustrates my point more than
anything.

Regards,

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 22:37:04 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:26:23 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 08:29:23 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 21:03:40 EDT
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>And, just because someone says they can perceive more than 200
>>shades of gray doesn't make it so.

>And just because you say the human eye can only discern 200
>shades of gray doesn't make it so, either. I asked you where you
>came by that piece of information, which I have not encountered
>before, and you ignored my question. Where does this bit of
>information come from?

>Bob Shell

Thanks Bob,

Here you go. It's a good read for everyone.

<http://www.dspguide.com/ch25/3.htm> . . .

Regards,

viktor golubik

Regards,

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 23:02:15 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:27:36 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 14:56:24 +0000
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:21:03 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:14:07 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>><snip>

>>Do you rule out what looks like a dust/dirt disturbance directly
>>beneath the craft in photo 1 as being the result of the presence
>>of this craft (much just like the blast from a hovering British
>>Harrier jump jet)?

>Let's set the record straight on this before it takes on a life
>of its own. There was no disturbance beneath the UFO. Our
>(NICAP) investigators visited the site repeatedly, measured
>everything, took comparative photos, re-enacted the sighting with
>Heflin, etc. We were quite thorough.

>What appeared to be a disturbance turned out to be a patch of
>dead grass still visible there. No significance related to the
>sighting at all. I think all of you assumers and presumers ought
>to read my summary of the case, which includes clear prints from
>the original photos supplied by Ann Druffel, in The UFO
>Evidence, Vol. II, pages 284-86. It contains a great deal of
>factual information that trumps way-after-the-fact guesswork.

This apparent "disturbance" on the ground directly below the
craft would be an effect very difficult for a hoaxer to fake.
With this disturbance now positively identified as "a patch of
grass" only further strengthens the devil advocate's case that
the craft was a small model suspended by a thin line from a
stick or fishing pole.

Thanks Richard for proving that this disturbance was not some
anomalous effect from the craft itself.

The overall appearance of the craft that Rex Heflin photographed
in 1965 was very different to the many other flying saucers
captured on film or that were depicted in cartoons up until then
and is another reason to doubt.

According to my limited knowledge, it was not until 1967 that
flying saucers identical looking to Rex Heflin's craft appeared
in the popular TV series 'The Invaders'. Do any of the drawings
and alleged photos of Nazi German flying saucers that also very
closely resemble Rex Heflin's craft predate his 1965 UFO
sighting?

>Importantly, a very thorough background and character check was

>conducted that decisively ruled out any likelihood of a hoax.
>There is a long record of people apparently trying to falsify
>the evidence in this case, which I also report.

As a cautious and thorough investigator yourself, why would you quickly dismiss Christopher Allan's very important revelation that Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing them as "poppycock" but fully accept the opinions of NICAP investigators on this single witness UFO case? Could it be that what UK ITV aired in May 1968 is an embarrassing fact overlooked by NICAP's thorough investigation that ruled out any likelihood of a hoax by Rex Heflin?

Although it has been over a dozen years since my mother passed away, I continue to learn many new facts and amazing things about this person I lived most of my life with and thought I knew very well! The NICAP investigators certainly did not know Rex Heflin better or for as long as I knew my mother.

Although Rex Heflin's photos are still among my favourite ones which depict 'nuts and bolts' type UFOs, there are still too many doubts in my mind to accept them as real, especially photo 4 which is identical to the dark smoke ring I (as well as many others) once photographed at an airshow.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 20:23:14 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:29:29 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 19:39:05 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:56:37 -0700
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>><snip>

>>other details pretty clearly rule out
>>hoax in my mind. The most important of these is the smoke ring
>>Heflin said the object left behind and which he photographed
>>(his photo 4), but which now also turns out to also be evident
>>in his photo 3. See Figure 17 in the JSE paper, which is an
>>enhancement of photo 3, and in which it can be clearly seen that
>>the object is leaving behind a dark smoke ring, also in line
>>with Heflin's testimony of what he saw (the object seemed
>>to separate from the ring of smoke as it began to depart).

>When a uniformly lit white background was photographed, these
>early instant Polaroid film photos would exhibit fuzzy patches
>throughout the frame. What you interpret as a "dark smoke ring"
>to the right of the saucer shaped craft in photo 3 may very well
>be an emulsion/developing artifact and not a real object like
>the faint and very indistinct/broken smoke ring you see in the
>same general vicinity of the sky the craft appeared in photo 2.

If that were the case, I think we'd be seeing these "artifacts"
all over the photos. But no, we only see what looks like a
broken ring immediately adjacent to the object in #3 and also
what looks like fainter material streaming off the top and
directly to the right of the object in #2, and it took 35 years
and computer enhancement to bring this out. Further, by amazing
coincidence, even though this can't be seen by eye in unenhanced
prints, it just happens to coincide with Heflin's story of the
object around photo #3 picking up speed and seeming to leave the
smoke ring behind, which he then photographed about a mile down
the road (thus probably about 2 minutes later) in photo #4.

>After Rex Heflin drove one or two hundred yards closer to the
>ring that had formed where the craft had been in earlier and got
>out of his truck to take a picture of it (photo 4), he judged
>the dark smoke ring was 3 to 4 times larger in diameter than the
>craft. Did Rex simply comparing the relative sizes of the craft
>in his first three photos with the size of the dark smoke ring
>in photo 4 or was the ring indeed 3 to 4 times the diameter of
>the craft? If the ring had grown to such a much larger diameter
>by then, it should be even less distinct than your suspected
>smoke ring in photo 3. The very tight dark smoke ring in photo 4
>is typical of smoke rings seen and photographed by others soon
>after explosions, not many minutes later as this one was.

No, this is not true. I've seen large smoke rings generated at
the Burning Man festival in northern Nevada. They are very
stable and last for 4 or 5 minutes (or even longer if there is
little or no wind). So the smoke ring could easily have been

lingering around 2 minutes or so after Heflin took his photo 3.

Further, as the smoke rings rise they expand in size and the ring becomes progressively thinner, forming a very beautiful, large thin ring at high altitudes (these things rise to several thousand feet before dissipating).

To illustrate this, I've temporarily added a page to my web site showing two photos relatively thick smoke ring probably about 30 seconds or so after it's formation and one probably 3 to 5 minutes old at much higher altitude, a very large and thin ring. Go to:

www.roswellproof.com/Smoke_rings.html

Also compare these to very "young" and thick Burning Man smoke rings probably only 10-20 seconds after their creation at the following website (also shows the machine that creates them):

<http://photos.weschan.com/gallery/785745/7>

Also at my new web page I've added two movies. The first shows a smoke ring starting maybe 30 to 40 seconds after it was made, and then shows how it changes over the next 90 seconds (the time is marked at the bottom). As it rises, it gets progressively wider and thinner. The second shows the progression of another smoke ring over only 25 seconds. If you don't have the time or inclination to download the movies (in WMV format), I've also made montages of a few screen captures from both movies showing changes over time. For the second movie montage, I've also included the Heflin smoke ring for comparison, since it seems to have a similar stage of development.

The smoke ring in the Heflin photo looks to be of intermediate thickness compared to those at Burning Man, a rising smoke ring still in progress maybe 1-1/2 or so minutes after formation when I compare it to my Burning Man material.

In the case of the first movie, I've measured smoke ring diameter and rate of rise, corrected diameter for distance (assuming constant rate of rise), and found the diameter of the ring more than doubles in size over a two minute period (projecting back to its origins). Guessing that the ring generator was about 2000 feet away, the ring is about 90 in diameter in the first frame (and about 300 feet high) and grows to about 150 feet in diameter 90 seconds later and about 1200 feet high). (These values would all be cut in half if the generator was only 1000 feet away.)

So Heflin would have been right that the smoke ring would have been larger than the diameter of the craft that generated it, since the smoke ring would have expanded in size as it rose and evolved. Remember that Heflin was just giving eyeball estimates of the relative size, so whether the relative size was twice as large or his 3 to 4 times as large I don't consider to be very important.

>If you do a Google Images search using the words "smoke" "ring" >and "airshow" or "explosion", you will find several dark smoke >rings identical to the one in Rex's photo 4 (and the one I saw >and photographed at an airshow after an a simulated aerial >bombing).

Well I guess that proves it! You can find smoke ring photos on the Net and you once photographed one at an air show, therefore Heflin's had nothing to do with his UFO photos.

>It is interesting to note that Rex thought what he saw was an >experimental airplane. Could this be why he did not take >additional photos of the dark smoke ring as it rose and drifted >away in the sky?

I don't understand the point. You already seem to have your mind made up that this must be a hoax, so what difference would additional photos have made?

>If the alleged smoke ring in photo 3 is "the most important" >evidence that Rex's four pictures rule out a hoax in your mind, >I would suggest you rethink things out.

I was probably at a half dozen airshows in the late 1950s and

early 1960s, complete with many explosions and nary a smoke ring to be seen. But let's assume there was an occasional smoke ring generated at an air show back then. Just how likely was it that Heflin would have seen one back in 1965, photographed it as part of a very elaborate UFO hoax, and then to compound his great luck, just also happened to have "photo artifacts" on his photo 3 (and also his photo 2) visible only after enhancement that then agreed with his fabricated story? I call this the too clever by half theory of hoaxing.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 23:38:17 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:30:17 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 12:45:48 -0300
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 18:14:07 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 21:24:33 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>>>If the typical height of telephone poles is about 22 feet (from
>>>telephone lineman manual) and measures about 55mm in length on
>>>my computer screen and the width of the UFO in the sky is indeed
>>>in the opposite side of the road and measures about 15mm, then
>>>the diameter of this UFO would about 6 feet. The raised central
>>>dome would be about 4 feet across.

<snip>

>Just one observation. First of all these are power poles, all of
>them are. The telephone companies rent space on the poles from
>the power companies. And there is no set height for power poles;
>their height depends on topography, measured distance between
>poles for clearance sake [wire sag etc.]and the turning of
>corners [bracing or anchoring] and public safety. Typically, in
>this province [Nova Scotia] they are about 40 feet tall*

<snip>

>*Went across the road and measured the power pole. My 1-1/4 inch
>wide 25 foot tape measure made it to about 10 feet from the top
>of the pole, suggesting this was a 35 foot pole plus two feet of
>soil banked up the pole at the bottom.

Hi Don!

You are correct that power (and telephone) poles are not all of
one standard size. Only my recent trip to Ottawa and back by
train I noticed power poles along the side of the tracks that
were so low, a tall person could easily reach and touch the
glass insulators that the high voltage lines rested on.

Thank God you did not use a 50 foot steel tape when you went
across the road to measure that 35 foot tall power pole in your
neighbourhood!

Yesterday while visiting the old CFB Downsview/DeHavilland
Aircraft site I approached a modified Canadian Forces Dash 8
radar plane that was newly painted navy blue or black and asked
if I could come inside. This plane was fitted with 6 radar
screens for training purposes but I forgot to ask if they had

ever spotted and tracked UFOs in flight. I suspect that this aircraft's main mission (one of four now in use with the Canadian military) is to track all potential threats to our troops deployed in the Middle East and prevent more casualties from "friendly" fire.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore -

From: Ray Dickenson <ray.dickenson.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 12:00:49 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 07:33:16 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore -

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 10:17:17 -0400
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>So, for the record - what you're saying about him isn't true.
>Because I'm not a professional sociologist, I'm not familiar
>with the accumulated data or the theoretical work my friend
>draws on. So I wouldn't try to describe it. It's not my field. I
>talked about the empirical work he does, because I can easily
>comprehend that.

>Cathy Reason, of all people, jumping to a completely unwarranted
>conclusion, without any data. I'm really shocked.

Greg,

Sorry to say, think you're being disingenuous or worse - maybe
even trying to set someone up.

Also think it's fairly obvious, to informed folk, why we cannot
accept psychology / sociology as 'scientifically' predictive or
verifiable.

Those aren't sciences - and anyone claiming they are is either
deluded or, like many so-called "professionals", doing so with
ulterior motives.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 12:13:55 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 08:21:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 10:42:31 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:54:05 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>From: Eleanor White <eleanor.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 16:47:20 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:46:55 +0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

<snip>

>>>Question: Why is there any conflict between religious faith
>>>and the "scientific, secular world view"?

>>>I've taken science courses, and I'm a confirmed Christian. I
>>>just don't see any conflict. To me, science is about learning
>>>the details of how God set this universe up.

>>Eleanor,

>>You just demonstrated the difference. Putting on my philosopher
>>hat for the moment:

>>You believe in the existence of God on faith and basically
>>deduce various things from your belief or assumption. Science at
>>the most fundamental level (not to be confused with careless or
>>erroneous applications) assumes only the validity of logic and
>>mathematics (essentially that both x and non-x cannot be true at
>>the same time). Somewhat over-simplified, but I think you will
>>get the point.

>>You believe God to be real (if typically totally undefined;
>>which God from all the variant religions?) Science does not
>>require or endorse acceptance of the God hypothesis. A scientist
>>may be a Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, Atheist, Agnostic, etc.,
>>but if he/she sticks to strict scientific method he/she will not
>>use belief or non-belief in God (or a god) as a starting point
>>or as a touchstone for ascertaining truth.

>May Heaven forbid I barge in to your conversation with
>meddlesome quibblings of my own, but even a scientific premise
>comes from a human (thank God!) belief like x and non-x can't
>both be true. I suppose even that basic belief was also
>disproven by the assumptions of Werner Karl Heisenberg!

Rick,

I'm not sure what you are saying or implying here. If it is that humans are fallible and make errors, well of course that's true. That's why scientific method is set up the way it is to require logical analysis and double checking of everything to avoid self-deception (which is exceedingly common in human affairs).

Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle applies to physics, not to logic. There are mathematical proofs of the validity of logic (Principia Mathematica). Would you argue that both x and non-x can be true at the same time? Either there is a table in front of you (x) or there is not a table in front of you (non-x). The only way around that is to engage in dodgy semantics.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

The Park Hypothesis

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 09:19:06 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 09:19:06 -0400
Subject: The Park Hypothesis

Source: The Space Review - Rockville, Maryland, USA

<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/629/1>

Tuesday, May 30, 2006

The Park Hypothesis
by Michael Huang

Bob Park will be remembered as a persistent human spaceflight critic, a leader of the anti-human-spaceflight movement. But he could also help solve one of the great space mysteries of all time: Do intelligent aliens exist, and if so, where are they?

First, some background information. The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI) is challenged by an idea called the Fermi Paradox. Enrico Fermi thought that if intelligent alien civilizations existed, they would inevitably colonize the galaxy. Travelling slower than the speed of light, they would still colonize the galaxy in a relatively short time. And if our galaxy was colonized, we would know all about it. Fermi concluded that intelligent aliens do not exist.

The Fermi Paradox drew a wide range of speculative hypotheses. Maybe intelligent aliens did exist, but they became extinct before they reached us. Maybe they have isolated us for observation and study (the zoo hypothesis). Maybe they are waiting until our civilization reaches a certain developmental stage (the sentinel hypothesis). Or could there be another explanation?

Since the only intelligent civilization that we know of is our own, our experiences may provide insights into how intelligent aliens behave. We regularly have a debate over what to send to space. It is known as the humans versus robots debate, or the manned versus unmanned debate, or with a more accurate description it could be called the both-humans-and-robots versus robots-only debate. Now, if an intelligent civilization such as ours is having this debate, then it is possible that intelligent alien civilizations are doing the same thing. Of course, they wouldn't call it a humans versus robots debate. From their perspective it would be an our-species versus robots debate, and from our perspective it would be an aliens versus robots debate. And like our intellectuals, their intellectuals may conclude that alien spaceflight is obsolete, and a robots-only space policy would be sensible, logical, and right. They would dismiss colonization as a hopeless fantasy.

If this is true, then aliens would be very difficult to detect. A robot probe is much harder to detect than worlds colonized by aliens. The communication between a robot probe and its homeworld would be a much weaker signal than the communication between a homeworld and its colonies. Aliens that resolved to stay on their home planet would leave a very small footprint on the galaxy, one easily overlooked.

The Park hypothesis states that intelligent alien civilizations do exist, but they have not colonized the galaxy because they don't want to. It neatly resolves both the Drake Equation, which indicates that intelligent aliens are likely to exist, and the Fermi Paradox: no colonization means we don't see them.

A criticism of the Park hypothesis is that while some alien civilizations act in accordance with Bob Park's principles, it would be unrealistic to expect all of them to comply. The analogy is that some people support Bob Park, but others disagree with him, sometimes quite strongly. This is a valid criticism, but the counter-argument is that unanimity is not required. If a dominant civilization, or group of civilizations, bans colonization throughout the galaxy, then it will not take place, no matter how much other civilizations protest. Since colonization is difficult to accomplish anyway, the addition of legal and political impediments will make it near impossible.

If there are Parkist (or Park-like) civilizations in the galaxy, what should we expect of them? One characteristic of one-planet civilizations is their elevated rate of extinction. Every civilized planet in the galaxy is susceptible to planetary disasters, such as collision with other bodies, and large-scale nuclear or biological war. Two-planet civilizations have a reduced rate of extinction, and three-planet civilizations have further reductions. But since Parkist civilizations have decided to put all their eggs in one basket, their rate of extinction is significantly higher. This translates to a low value for L (civilization lifetime) in the Drake Equation. If we detect signs of a Parkist civilization, unfortunately they may not be around to see us.

A galaxy that is predominantly inhabited by Parkist civilizations could be called a Parkist galaxy. Such a galaxy could be identified by its unique appearance: a few scattered single planets of intelligent life, amid vast areas either devoid of life or occupied by simple organisms only. In contrast, a galaxy with Fermi's alien civilizations would be filled with intelligent life.

I have previously mentioned that we have the humans versus robots debate, and aliens may have its equivalent. Now that we have the Park hypothesis, it could also be possible that aliens have its equivalent too, perhaps named after a famous anti-alien-spaceflight activist of its world. At this very moment, aliens could be thinking about a civilization like ours, wondering whether we exist, where we are in space, and why Parkism is so popular here.

Michael Huang (fhprize.nul) is the inventor of the anti-human-spaceflight robot, The New Humans Vs. Robots Debate: Introducing The FH Prize, February 13, 2006:

<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/554/1>

He believes that Bob Park is obsolete.

[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

UFO Photo 'Proof'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:14:21 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:14:21 -0400
Subject: UFO Photo 'Proof'

Source: The Selby News - Yorkshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/sxtfe>

30 May 2006

[Image @ site]

UFO Photo 'Proof'

This X-Files image shows what is believed to be a UFO hovering over a well-known Selby beauty spot.

The photo =96 taken by Selby resident Jody Holden =96 has been described by friend and fellow UFO enthusiast Russell Kellett as "one of the most powerful UFO images ever captured".

The duo are both members of the British UFO Hunters but insist they don't have to do much hunting to find extra terrestrial activity in the town.

Russell said the image of an alien spacecraft looking down on Brayton Barff was captured a month ago.

He added: "At first Jody looked and thought it was an aeroplane, but on closer inspection he saw it was a saucer with a two-tier effect."

The 42-year-old Filey resident explained he was ready to give up his research after he believed his work wasn't being taken seriously enough.

"People around the world have been sending us messages and e-mails telling us not to give up. This is a very powerful image, one of the best I've ever seen. We know it's not simply plasma making this happen; we've heard this all before.

"People need to be aware just what's going on, or at least that there's something a little bit mysterious occurring."

A report released by the MOD recently revealed 15 per cent of UFO sightings in 2005 occurred in North Yorkshire.

As exclusively revealed in the Selby Times last year, the town recorded an unprecedented 33 cases of X-File phenomena in 2004, shooting the district to third spot in the British UFO Hunters' activity top ten.

Any budding extra terrestrial seekers out there are urged to contact Russell's hotline on 01723 514700 with reports of sightings, or visit the www.UFO=96paranormal.co.uk website.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 08:27:57 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:17:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Kaeser

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 20:47:29 +0100
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 11:33:20 -0300
>>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>>I was scared at first but when I spotted the tall one I was
>>>>overwhelmed with pity for it, felt bonded to it, and had the
>>>>unmistakeable feeling of something ancient - something
>>>>'dinosaur'.

>>>>Your compassion seems rather over-developed if it extends to
>>>>things that break into your bedroom at night.

>>>>In any case, in comparing your beliefs, insofar as they're
>>>>spawned from feelings from visions or encounters of this kind,
>>>>and Friedman's beliefs, which appear derived in large part from
>>>>cool logic, the choice for me isn't terribly difficult.

>>>>What might be of interest to me would be objections to
>>>>Friedman's MJ-12/Roswell stance that are based on substantive
>>>>argument (consisting of evidence and sound reasoning).
>>>>Intuitions and feelings reveal a lot about an individual, and
>>>>may be experienced as persuasive by that individual, but they
>>>>provide little or no reason for anyone else to be persuaded.

>>>>It is possible to refute each and every one of Stan Friedman's
>>>>arguments for both Roswell and MJ-12 reality. By this I mean it
>>>>is possible to advance a perfectly sound, alternative, scenario
>>>>that does not involve either ET visitors or a Top Secret Majic
>>>>committee under Pres. Truman. Others can, and have, done this
>>>>but it takes time & effort, and (most important) is probably of
>>>>little interest to the majority on this list. It is hard to
>>>>believe anyone has, or will want to, delve into official
>>>>archives & libraries to the extent that Stan has. However,
>>>>despite this, we do not have to accept his conclusions as
>>>>gospel.

>>>>I have read most of Stan's rebuttals and articles and, whilst
>>>>they look persuasive in places, I do not feel they are
>>>>unanswerable.

>>>>It is much more likely that people are bored with the whole
>>>>Roswell/MJ-12 saga and want to get on with other matters. Thus

>nobody is sufficiently motivated to research and rebut in detail
>Stan's arguments in a public forum.

<snip>

May I suggest that those who would like to read the debate between Stanton Friedman and Kevin Randle need only refer to several years worth of UFO Update archives. To be quite honest, both are opinions and deserve to be heard, but neither will win out in a winner-take-all debate.

It seems that this discussion has devolved into an attack on the messenger, rather than the message, and that's unfortunate.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 12:52:33 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:19:08 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 23:02:15 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 14:56:24 +0000
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>><snip>

>>>Do you rule out what looks like a dust/dirt disturbance directly
>>>beneath the craft in photo 1 as being the result of the presence
>>>of this craft (much just like the blast from a hovering British
>>>Harrier jump jet)?

>>Let's set the record straight on this before it takes on a life
>>of its own. There was no disturbance beneath the UFO. Our
>>(NICAP) investigators visited the site repeatedly, measured
>>everything, took comparative photos, re-enacted the sighting with
>>Heflin, etc. We were quite thorough.

>>What appeared to be a disturbance turned out to be a patch of
>>dead grass still visible there. No significance related to the
>>sighting at all.

<snip>

>This apparent "disturbance" on the ground directly below the
>craft would be an effect very difficult for a hoaxer to fake.
>With this disturbance now positively identified as "a patch of
>grass" only further strengthens the devil advocate's case that
>the craft was a small model suspended by a thin line from a
>stick or fishing pole.

No it does not, given all the facts of the case.

>>Importantly, a very thorough background and character check was
>>conducted that decisively ruled out any likelihood of a hoax.
>>There is a long record of people apparently trying to falsify
>>the evidence in this case, which I also report.

>As a cautious and thorough investigator yourself, why would you
>quickly dismiss Christopher Allan's very important revelation
>that Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing
>them as "popycock" but fully accept the opinions of NICAP
>investigators on this single witness UFO case? Could it be that
>what UK ITV aired in May 1968 is an embarrassing fact overlooked
>by NICAP's thorough investigation that ruled out any likelihood
>of a hoax by Rex Heflin?

This is a weird paragraph of assumption and illogic. Allan's
statement in the first place has no documentation whatsoever and
comes from an outspoken skeptic. Is that your definition of an
"important revelation?" In the second place, we (NICAP) spent
months--even years--investigating all aspects of the case.

Our conclusions at NICAP were not merely the opinions of

investigators; they were based on hard facts, thorough photoanalysis, and careful investigation by the field investigators. Certainly that is far more than what someone of unknown background and credentials said on TV. And what does the single witness comment have to do with anything?

Also note the lack of response from Christopher Allan about my challenge that he obtain some documentation of the anonymous person's apparently totally ungrounded claim. I suspect it is merely someone's skeptical guesswork, not based on any investigation whatsoever.

>Although it has been over a dozen years since my mother passed >away, I continue to learn many new facts and amazing things >about this person I lived most of my life with and thought I >knew very well! The NICAP investigators certainly did not know >Rex Heflin better or for as long as I knew my mother.

No comment.

>Although Rex Heflin's photos are still among my favourite ones >which depict 'nuts and bolts' type UFOs, there are still too >many doubts in my mind to accept them as real, especially photo >4 which is identical to the dark smoke ring I (as well as many >others) once photographed at an airshow.

>Nick Balaskas

That's your privilege, but a least try to think clearly about the relative merits of thorough investigation vs. off-the-wall guesswork.

- 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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 30](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Bob Shell** <bob.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:03:19 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:21:20 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 22:37:04 EDT
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Here you go. It's a good read for everyone.

><http://www.dspguide.com/ch25/3.htm> . . .

Thanks, Victor. The pertinent quote is:

"...humans can distinguish about 20 to 200 shades of gray between the blackest black and the whitest white. The exact number depends on a variety of factors..."

The key word being "about".

Bob Shell

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:28:23 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 20:52:17 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:57:25 +0100
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>The emulsion carries no useful information on scales smaller
>>than the grain size. Yes effective image grain size and the
>>silver halide crystal size are two different things. Usually
>>with photo emulsions you are never looking at the actual
>>individual crystal scale, even when you enlarge beyond the point
>>of evident grain. The "grain" we usually mean - and presumably
>>the also the grain referred to in the JSE paper - is the
>>structure made by quite large clumps and filaments of silver
>>halide particles. But this is the effective limit of resolution
>>for images. And I don't think you can talk in terms of a
>>"mosaic" at this scale, this is a three-dimensional random
>>suspension with clumps of varying sizes all over the place,
>>shadowing one another. This structure is the film noise level,
>>like radio static. Below the nominal grain scale signal
>>information is surely irrecoverable, not because it isn't
>>"there" in some sense but just because you can't distinguish it
>>from the random noise background. Indefinitely enlarging the
>>scale will not pull the signal out of the noise; it will amplify
>>the noise.

>I mostly agree with this, but just want to clarify the concept
>of resolution a bit more. There are various types of resolution.
>Usually it refers to the minimum distance between two things
>such that they can still be discerned as separate instead of
>one. Thus, in astronomy, e.g., it might refer to the ability
>(minimum angle of separation) at which a telescope can resolve a
>double star into two separate stars instead of appearing as one
>star. In photography, such resolution would be limited by film
>grain.

>However, there is a simpler resolution task of being to detect
>the presence of something in isolation. This was the sense in
>which I was using it in terms of being able to "resolve" or
>detect a suspension thread. This is much better than separation
>resolution. E.g., I said that humans can still detect a high
>contrast thin line against a dark background when it is less
>than 10% of the retinal "grain" and suggested that cameras would
>probably have similar capability, i.e., one could still detect
>the presence of a thread even though its image would be much
>thinner than the film grain. The reason is, the thread still
>casts a shadow on the film, so you can still detect a contrast
>difference between the shadow and the surround (unless the
>contrast gets too small).

>Now here's some proof. I conducted a simple experiment where I
>created a light grey, slightly yellowish background with my
>paint program (to simulate the hazy, smoggy conditions of the
>Heflin photos). Then I taped three different sewing threads
>(black, white, and light gray) and a dark hair on the screen. I

>then took my 5 MegaPixel digital camera (2592 pixels wide) and
>moved it about 57 inches from the screen (a comparable distance,
>if not more, to what Heflin might have filmed a hoax model
>outside his van window.) At that distance, every inch on the
>screen corresponds to about one degree of angular distance. My
>camera has a 53 degree field, so there are $2592/53 = 49$
>pixels/degree or for every inch of screen. Every millimeter of
>screen is thus represented by $49/25.4 = 1.93$ pixels/mm, call it
>2 pixels/mm. This can then be used to calculate how many pixels
>wide the thread and hair were when photographed by the camera.
>Here is a table summarizing the results:

	Thickness (microns)	Pix wide (5MegPix)	Visible (comments)
>Black thread	~200	.4	Yes, easy
>White thread	~200	.4	Yes, easy
>Light gray thread	~200	.4	Yes, but harder (low contrast)
>Dark hair	~50	.1	Yes, just visible

>In all cases the test filaments are a fraction of a pixel wide
>on the screen. In the case of the hair, it is only about 1/10th
>pixel wide, yet it is still definitely visible in the resulting
>picture, even without photo enhancement. The dark hair and the
>thicker light gray thread are perhaps about equally difficult to
>make out. In the case of the gray thread, it blends in well with
>the light gray background, so the resulting contrast is low.

>I also reduced my camera resolution to 3 megapixel (2046 pixels
>wide) and did the same thing. All still remained visible even
>without enhancement, though the gray thread and dark hair were
>now getting really hard to see. (The hair, in this case, would
>now be about .08 pixel wide, yet is still detectable by eye in
>the picture as a faint line).

>I also wanted to use some clear nylon sewing thread (which
>besides being transparent is also thinner than ordinary thread),
>but didn't have any around, unfortunately. I suspect that this
>wouldn't have been detectable.

>I then took a look at some of the finer details in the Heflin
>photos in the JSE article (and I'm sure the original prints are
>much better quality than those pdf reproductions). In particular
>I looked at the enlargement of the object in the #2 photo that is
>contrast enhanced and shows some of the misty "filament"-like
>things seeming to "steam" off the top. (Note, I copied the JSE
>pdf photo at 600% size, which works out to about 700 pixels per
>degree.) My calculations indicate the smallest details are
>comparable to thread thickness had Heflin photographed a model
>at about 50 inches from the camera.

>I'd guesstimate the resolution of these Polaroids as comparable
>to my 5 Megapixel camera, which is what I originally estimated
>based on the comments about resolution in the original JSE
>paper. Bob Shell then commented that strictly speaking these old
>B&W Polaroids don't have any film grain, because the image is
>transferred from the original photo paper to the print when you
>pull the picture out of the camera. I'll take his word for it,
>but even if they strictly don't have silver-halide grain, they
>do have an ultimate resolution to them, and it seems to be good
>enough to make out a suspension thread, even a low-contrast one,
>as in my experiment.

Interesting experiment and good points. Can we refer to scales
of known objects in the photos to help estimate angular
resolution? For example the cables (power or phone?) are
resolved in the top right of #1. These are at least as far away
as the next pole whose shadow is visible in front of the truck.
How thick are these cables and how far from the lens are they?
Eg a 0.25" cable at 100 ft gives TAN 0.0002, not much more than
your 200 micron thread at 50 inches = TAN 0.00016, i.e. both in
the order of 1/100 degree.

An experiment with the same model Polaroid would be valuable, if
the camera and film packs are still available anywhere. I know
early investigators did reconstructions and tests with models
using the same type camera but I'm not aware of the results of
any microscopic searches for threads etc on such reconstructions
using models. A test to compare with the JSE digital scan result
would be ideal. (Of course there's still always the possibility
that the "originals" are in fact first gen Polaroid copies of
retouched prints. I don't know how you'd go about ruling this

out?)

Martin Shough

[[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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:07:53 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 20:55:53 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 08:27:57 -0400
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 20:47:29 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>>>What might be of interest to me would be objections to
>>>Friedman's MJ-12/Roswell stance that are based on substantive
>>>argument (consisting of evidence and sound reasoning).
>>>Intuitions and feelings reveal a lot about an individual, and
>>>may be experienced as persuasive by that individual, but they
>>>provide little or no reason for anyone else to be persuaded.

>>It is possible to refute each and every one of Stan Friedman's
>>arguments for both Roswell and MJ-12 reality. By this I mean it
>>is possible to advance a perfectly sound, alternative, scenario
>>that does not involve either ET visitors or a Top Secret Majic
>>committee under Pres. Truman. Others can, and have, done this
>>but it takes time & effort, and (most important) is probably of
>>little interest to the majority on this list. It is hard to
>>believe anyone has, or will want to, delve into official
>>archives & libraries to the extent that Stan has. However,
>>despite this, we do not have to accept his conclusions as
>>gospel.

>>I have read most of Stan's rebuttals and articles and, whilst
>>they look persuasive in places, I do not feel they are
>>unanswerable.

This is called research by proclamation. How does anybody know
they have read most of my rebuttals? Do feelings really matter
here? Why have none been answered?

>>It is much more likely that people are bored with the whole
>>Roswell/MJ-12 saga and want to get on with other matters. Thus
>>nobody is sufficiently motivated to research and rebut in detail
>>Stan's arguments in a public forum.

><snip>

>May I suggest that those who would like to read the debate
>between Stanton Friedman and Kevin Randle need only refer to
>several years worth of UFO Update archives. To be quite honest,
>both are opinions and deserve to be heard, but neither will win
>out in a winner-take-all debate.

>It seems that this discussion has devolved into an attack on the
>messenger, rather than the message, and that's unfortunate.

May I respectfully suggest my Review of Case MJ-12, a 28 page, January 2003 paper. It is posted on my website at:

www.stantonfriedman.com

Or available from UFORI, POB 958, Houlton, ME 04730-0958.(\$4.00) Including S and H) Either way it would be much easier than going back through UPDATES and contains material that is not on Updates. It is far more than just opinions.

It contains evidence that Kevin's statements are often flat out wrong.It also shows that a number of Tim Cooper's purported MJ-12 documents are emulations.

I would also suggest the new Chapter of TOP SECRET/MAJIC

which deals with many specific objections. I wonder how many people on this list who claim that the arguments are just dueling opinions have looked at the facts that are presented.Phil Klass said PICA type wasn't used . I provided a number of examples.

Many said TOP SECRET Restricted wasn't in use. I provided a statement from the GAO that they found a number of examples.

Some complained that all TS documents required control numbers. I provided both examples and statements from an archivist at the Eisenhower Library that they had many such. Kevin didn't like the use of Admiral Hillenkoetter as opposed to rear Admiral. I provided strong evidence that the use of generic ranks was quite common etc etc etc. These aren't opinions. They are facts.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:22:01 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 20:58:05 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:46:03 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>You might want to take note of this component if you really want
>to discover the truth about UFOs and really be using "cool
>logic" when you assess the UFO phenomenon.

>>What might be of interest to me would be objections to
>>Friedman's MJ-12/Roswell stance that are based on substantive
>>argument (consisting of evidence and sound reasoning).

>There's a lot of it out there. I'm sure if you're really
>"interested" then you'll find it. However, nobody is going to
>lure me into another Roswell/MJ-12 debate. But are you sure
>you'd recognize "evidence" and "sound reasoning" if you came
>across it? Because you don't seem to be recognizing it here. You
>obviously have your mind made up on MJ-12/Roswell and anything
>that speaks against, it you don't like. I haven't provided
>objections against any specific aspect of Roswell/MJ-12, other
>than question outright Stan's conclusions about ET spacecraft,
>which, if you accepted there was more to the UFO enigma than
>Stan's nuts and bolts apparent high tech vehicles, then you
>wouldn't be jumping on me for cautioning against taking things
>at face value.

>For someone who speaks so strongly in favor of "evidence" and
>"sound reasoning" you seem to be either unaware of a lot of the
>evidence, or simply ignoring it.

>>Intuitions and feelings reveal a lot about an individual, and
>>may be experienced as persuasive by that individual, but they
>>provide little or no reason for anyone else to be persuaded.

>I haven't been persuaded of anything yet. Or haven't you been
>listening?

You have obviously been persuaded that my writing on MJ-12 and
Roswell has been shown to not stand up, even though you have
provided no examples, not even one.

By the way, why in the world would you imply that for me all
there is to UFOs is high tech hardware?Oops, Sorry... I guess I
shouldn't ask for specifics.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:32:39 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:00:33 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 15:54:03 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 12:32:28 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>It's you and your supporters that need to provide the evidence
>of your claims of ET spacecraft. You're the ones with the
>beliefs (i.e. the claims) and are required to produce the
>evidence of same. I'm merely pointing out that the apparent high
>tech vehicle cases represent only a small part of the total UFO
>phenomenon. And that you can't ignore these other parts. Your
>conclusions are extremely premature in view of these other
>components of the UFO phenomenon. These 'other components' exist
>and this fact alone justifies my questioning your conclusions.
>This fact alone comprises the "factual, data based, objections
>to what [you] have written" - the "some facts, some data" which
>you requested of me and the "evidence" you accuse me of lacking.

>And, this fact alone, justifies me not wanting to waste time
>debating with you the Roswell/MJ-12 objections and counter-
>objections (which have, and are, been and being discussed all
>over the place already anyway) since you never consider
>these other components of the UFO phenomenon.

Obviously you haven't read what I have written.

>I'll continue discussing the UFO phenomenon (even the apparent
>high tech vehicle cases) with you if you want but for me Roswell
>and MJ-12 are almost certainly non-entities and I've no interest
>in going down that path - just as I've no interest in getting
>into a debate over George
>Adamski, for example.

I learned early on when working in industry that most isotopes
aren't fissionable. Fortunately a small % are. I learned most
isotopes when they capture a neutron emit highly penetrating
gamma rays..Fortunately some such as Boron 10 and Lithium 6 give
off a non penetrating alpha particle. I am convinced by the
evidence that SOME ufos are alien spacecraft. Most are not. So
what? My college lecture is "Flying Saucers ARE Real"..More or
less by definition all flying saucers are UFOs, but only a much
smaller percentage of UFOs are flying saucers.I am looking for
gold not dross even though gold ore is worth mining if there is
an ounce of gold (probably only a half ounce now) per ton of
ore.

So I am very happy to end this discussion.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:50:27 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:03:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 20:47:29 +0100
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>>What might be of interest to me would be objections to
>>Friedman's MJ-12/Roswell stance that are based on substantive
>>argument (consisting of evidence and sound reasoning).
>>Intuitions and feelings reveal a lot about an individual, and
>>may be experienced as persuasive by that individual, but they
>>provide little or no reason for anyone else to be persuaded.

>It is possible to refute each and every one of Stan Friedman's
>arguments for both Roswell and MJ-12 reality. By this I mean it
>is possible to advance a perfectly sound, alternative, scenario
>that does not involve either ET visitors or a Top Secret Majic
>committee under Pres. Truman. Others can, and have, done this
>but it takes time & effort, and (most important) is probably of
>little interest to the majority on this list. It is hard to
>believe anyone has, or will want to, delve into official
>archives & libraries to the extent that Stan has. However,
>despite this, we do not have to accept his conclusions as
>gospel.

>I have read most of Stan's rebuttals and articles and, whilst
>they look persuasive in places, I do not feel they are
>unanswerable.

>It is much more likely that people are bored with the whole
>Roswell/MJ-12 saga and want to get on with other matters. Thus
>nobody is sufficiently motivated to research and rebut in detail
>Stan's arguments in a public forum.

>I will, however, cite one of Stan's frequent claims: He insists
>two crashes occurred in NM that day in July 47 (Roswell & Plains
>of San Augustin). His sole (yes sole) evidence for the San
>Augustin crash is an anecdote told to him in 1978 by someone he
>met at a lecture. This person (Mr Maltais) did not witness the
>event but only heard of it via someone else, since deceased
>(Barney Barnett).

>But Barnett never told Maltais the story until several years
>afterwards, according to Maltais. In turn, Maltais could not
>recall when the alleged 'crash' had taken place. There is not
>one iota of evidence (real evidence) to suppose the crash, if it
>occurred at all, took place in July 1947 or on any other
>specific day. Even the year 1947 was 'plucked from the air' (just
>like the UFO) from another party, a Mr Fleck Danley, Barnett's
>boss, who again is only a second-hand source. But even Danley,
>if you read his testimony, does not mention any bodies, any
>crash of a UFO, or that the UFO was seen on the ground at all!
>Even if we accept at face value Danley's statement: "It had to

>have been sometime in the early summer of 1947", how does "early
>summer" equate to July 3? (When does summer begin in New
>Mexico?) Remember also that the interviews with Danley were not
>conducted until 1979. Remember also that, unlike Roswell, there
>was no newspaper mention of this second crash, none whatever.
>There is not even an entry in Barnett's diary, as supplied by
>his wife for that summer. An incredible omission, assuming the
>event indeed took place.

>Yet this is the 'evidence' Stan wishes to advance in promoting
>the San Augustin crash. He still insists that not only was there
>a second crash in NM but that it occurred on the same day as
>the Roswell crash! This, of course, assumes that the latter date
>is known with any certainty.

Not surprisingly, I see more proclamations of having read most
of what I have written about MJ-12 and Roswell. Based on what?

Re. the Plains of San Agustin, I am not surprised that there is
no mention made of the fine and extensive work of Art Campbell,
of the testimony of Alice Knight, Colonel William Leed, Harold
Baca, the Datil Postmistress, etc, etc.

I guess ignorance really is bliss.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:24:16 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:04:34 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 08:41:04 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>The tungsten wire I mentioned earlier is made for this purpose
>and is dead black, light absorbing. It does not diffract light,
>or produce any fringing. This is why the Hollywood SFX guys
>loved it so much in the days before CGI.

Therefore it blocks light and casts a shadow on the film. Thus it is very much like a dark sewing thread viewed against a light background, which in test shots I ran is easily resolvable, even though in my digital camera my ~200 micron test thread at 57 inches calculates out to only 0.3 or 0.4 pixels (at 3 Meg and 5 Meg resolution respectively). In fact, it can still detect a dark hair about a quarter this thick, even though it is only 0.1 pixels or less wide. It shows up as a faint line, so it is approaching the limit of detectability of the camera. For details, see my other post to Martin Shough.

Where I think you are getting confused is assuming that the detection task of the film is resolving two side by side threads. Then they better be separated by at least one pixel, or they are going to be smeared together by "film grain," as well as by camera lens defraction and various lens aberrations.

On the other hand, if you are trying to detect a support thread in isolation, you can detect its presence even if its angular size is much less than grain size (or if you prefer, film resolution). It's shadow image will be smeared by lens diffraction/aberrations to a pixel or more wide (known as the line spread function), but as long as the contrast between the smeared shadow image and the surround is high enough, the thread will still be visible. As a homely example, we can easily see isolated stars and planets in the night sky even though their angular resolution is much less than one photoreceptor wide. So we can't resolve details within the object, but we can certainly see that it is there.

For this reason, with human vision, we can detect a high contrast black thread on a white background down to about 1/10th the angular resolution of our smallest photoreceptors. What this really is a test of our contrast resolution (not our ability to resolve closely spaced things), which leads into the next topic.

>I'm not sure the source of your statement that the human eye can
>resolve only 200 shades of gray, but I think it is not an
>absolute at all and would depend on quite a number of variables
>in viewing conditions. I know photographers who say they can
>discriminate much finer shading.

In vision science this is measured by our contrast sensitivity curve. You are right that it depends on a number of variables (such as brightness or age), but primarily it depends on object size and spacing. It is measured with test gratings of variable contrast, the size being measured in angular spatial frequency or number of grating cycles per degree. Thus if the grating elements are each 10 minutes of arc wide, each cycle of light

and dark grating pairs is 20 minutes and there are 3 such cycles per degree. The spatial frequency is 3 cycles/degree. On the other hand, if the gratings are 1 minute of arc wide, there are 30 such cycles in a degree or a spatial frequency of 30 cycles per degree.

Human vision has optimal contrast sensitivity typically around 3 cycles per degree. In young healthy adults, typically 250 to 300 gray scale gradations (or 0.3%-0.4% contrast difference) can be made out. For higher spatial frequencies (or finer detail), the image is degraded or smeared by diffraction and optical aberrations, so contrast sensitivity steadily decreases as you increase the grating spatial frequency. Near the limit of our acuity, typically around 30 to 40 cycles/degree, we can distinguish only two levels of "gray": black and white. Optical smear reduces their contrast on the retina down to only a fraction of a percent.

So distinguishing "200 shades of gray" would refer to around our optimal spatial frequency range. For a good introduction to this, see:

<http://www.usd.edu/coglab/CSFIntro.htm>

A line in isolation will have similar contrast resolution. It too is smeared by the optics (measured as the "line spread function"), but as long as the resulting image on the retina has a luminance difference with the surround of about 0.3-.4%, it is still detectable by eye.

[To be specific about what is meant by contrast, say the relative luminance of the lighter line is L_1 and the dark line L_2 . Then contrast = $(L_1 - L_2)/(L_1 + L_2)$. Thus if "white" = 100 and "black" = 0, the contrast = $100-0/100+0 = 1.0$ or 100%. If light gray = 75 and dark gray = 25, contrast = $(75-25)/(75+25) = 0.5 = 50%$, etc. This definition of contrast can also be used for an isolated element like a line or circle immersed in a surround of light.]

Cameras are no different than the human eye in that the image will be degraded by diffraction and lens aberrations. This is represented by the modulation transfer function which measures the degradation of gratings as they pass through the optical system (and also used to measure the resolving power of film). Spatial frequency here refers to the number of grating pairs per mm of film distance and the modulation is the percent reduction in contrast from 100% contrast at this spatial frequency. This leads us into the next topic.

>Anyway, my original point was that it is futile to look for
>artifacts of support strings or wires in Polaroid images,
>particularly with Polaroid 3000, which has the lowest resolving
>power of any Polaroid film.

I don't think you are right about this. I'm going to be more specific about the resolving power of Polaroid 3000 film. According to the Polaroid website, the modulation transfer function (MTF) of the Polaroid 3000 film has the contrast of a black and white grating dipping to 40% at only 4 cycles/mm. That's not very good, since very good camera lenses and film may have MTFs of several hundred cycles/mm before the contrast dips this much. However, it doesn't mean detecting a support wire or thread is out of the question.

Since the Heflin Polaroid film is about 80 mm wide, 4 cycles/mm would be 320 grating cycles (or 640 lines) on the film. If the grating was originally 100% contrast, it would be reduced to 40% contrast on the film. Now the MTF tends to fall off reciprocally on the rolloff portion of the curve. Thus if you double the spatial frequency, the contrast of the grating drops by about half. So if you kick the grating frequency up 4 times to 16 cycles/mm or 1280 cycles (2560 lines) over the width of the film, the grating contrast will also drop by about a factor of 4, down to 10%.

2560 lines is now up to the resolution of my 5 Megapixel digital camera, which can easily resolve a black thread only 0.4 pixels wide (or 2.5 times smaller than the camera pixel). That's a similar situation to using a grating with a spatial frequency 2.5 times larger (or lines 2.5x smaller). In the case of the Polaroid 3000 film, a grating with a s.f. 2.5x larger than 1280

cycles/mm would drop the contrast down to about $10\%/2.5 = 4\%$, which is lousy, but still easy to see.

A dark hair about 4 times thinner than the thread (or about only .1 pixels wide) can also be detected by eye when photographed with my digital camera (looks like a faint line). The corresponding contrast with the Polaroid film would be about 1%, which is indeed faint but still above the 0.3%-0.4% limit for human vision and detectable by eye (and even better detected by computer with enhancement if digitized by more than 8 bits as Vi"ktor Golubi" has pointed out).

This supports my previous statements that the Polaroid 3000 film used by Heflin seems to have a comparable resolution to my digital camera. If a support filament has relatively high contrast w.r.t. the background and isn't too thin (i.e., maybe 2 or 3 times thinner than a human hair), its "shadow" will still have enough residual contrast on the film to be detectable.

Another thing to consider is that lines are more detectable than dots either by eye or computer. A dot could be random noise, but a string of dots is not. (Which is why - - - - - are seen as "lines".) Our brains (or proper computer software) can fill in the gaps and reconstruct a line even at extremely low contrasts down at the limits of detectability.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 18:46:52 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:05:52 -0400
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Watson

From: Nigel Watson <nigelwatson1.nul>
To: <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tues. 30 May 2006
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

Hi,

Thanks to Dr David Clarke I have been able to read this journal article that has provoked so much controversy.

In '"A Saucerful of Secrets": An Interdisciplinary Anaylis of UFO Experiences' William Dewan notes that there should be a 3 pronged analysis of UFO experiences:

1. Experience centered approach

It does not matter whether the experiencer observes a natural or supernatural phenomenon. We should 'neither advocate nor refute the claims of respondents.'

2. Anomalous Experience as Folklore

The narratives of experiencers should be viewed in their historical and cultural context.

3. Culture, Perception of Anomalous Experience

Experiencers give cultural meanings to their narrative. Remembering an experience involves 'cultural, social and cognitive facets that occur before, during, and after an experience.'

He goes on to look at how a family perceived UFOs in their community, and how they reacted to them.

In his conclusion he says that such sightings are not made in a cognitive vacuum. He concedes that people do have 'core experiences' that account for UFO-type reports throughout history and throughout diverse populations.

It's good to see folklorists like Dewan dealing with this subject but I would repeat to Jerry that Magonia has advocated the same approach to the subject for more than 30 years.

My own book 'Portraits of Alien Encounters' (1990) actually treats UFO experiencers in the manner suggested by Dewan.

I would also like to add that Dewan does not seem to have a deep knowledge of the subject. For example, he references Vallee's 'Passport to Magonia' as a source for historical UFO-type accounts. Many of his accounts have since been disputed and re-assessed since its publication. He also says that the UFO phenomenon does not seem to represent a mythology, which seems to ignore the writings of the contactees and more extreme abductees.

So, Jerry, why is Dewan right but the rest of us wrong? I know I've simplified Dewan's essay but am I missing something

essential here?

Nigel

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Supreme Court Stomps Whistleblowers

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:16:43 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:08:08 -0400
Subject: Supreme Court Stomps Whistleblowers

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/05/30/politics/main1665605.shtml>

Every day the decisions of this government make me glad I watched those Star Wars movies.

I expect any moment for the moon to be converted into a Death Star or something.

In this latest decision the Supreme Court voting 5-4 has determined that public employees do not have the Constitutional right of free speech pertaining to whistleblowing.

When I was studying law it was my impression that your Constitutional rights didn't end unless you committed certain classes of crimes or national security issues.

So if I go to work I lose my rights? WTH?

So any new disclosures regarding UFOs from whistleblowers is just going to go away for fear of government.

But wait, don't we have a right to freedom from fear of government?

I'm done. Fed up. I've had it.

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Joe Faccenda <Uforth.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:32:43 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:09:37 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 23:02:15 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>The overall appearance of the craft that Rex Heflin photographed
>in 1965 was very different to the many other flying saucers
>captured on film or that were depicted in cartoons up until then
>and is another reason to doubt.

>According to my limited knowledge, it was not until 1967 that
>flying saucers identical looking to Rex Heflin's craft appeared
>in the popular TV series 'The Invaders'. Do any of the drawings
>and alleged photos of Nazi German flying saucers that also very
>closely resemble Rex Heflin's craft predate his 1965 UFO
>sighting?

<snip>

Hi Nick.List,

Flat top Ufos may have been reported from as early as 1947 Nick
see: Twin Falls, Idaho, Times News, August 15th 1947 at:

<http://www.uforth.com/flattop.htm>

No Photos, but an interesting drawing.

Regards,

Joe Faccenda

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: The Park Hypothesis - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catja90024.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:19:33 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:12:47 -0400
Subject: Re: The Park Hypothesis - Kasten

>Source: The Space Review - Rockville, Maryland, USA

><http://www.thespacereview.com/article/629/1>

>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>The Park Hypothesis
>by Michael Huang

>Bob Park will be remembered as a persistent human spaceflight critic, a leader of the anti-human-spaceflight movement. But he could also help solve one of the great space mysteries of all time: Do intelligent aliens exist, and if so, where are they?

<snip>

The Pogo Response:

We have met the alien, and the alien is us!

KK

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: UFO Photo 'Proof' - Bueche

From: Will Bueche <willbueche.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:05:22 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:15:33 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Photo 'Proof' - Bueche

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:14:21 -0400
>Subject: UFO Photo 'Proof'

>Source: The Selby News - Yorkshire, UK

><http://tinyurl.com/sxtfe>

>30 May 2006

>[Image @ site]

I almost bought one of those solar powered lawn-lights last week, myself.

http://images.amazon.com/images/P/B000083DVU.16.SCLZZZZZZZ_SS260.jpg

(I'm not saying that is what the photo is, for sure - the photo as presented in the newspaper is cropped so much as to be useless. But the similarity to lawn lights is uncanny, right down to the cool blue/white LED light temperature).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 16:32:29 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:17:57 -0400
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 12:13:55 +0000
>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 10:42:31 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 20:54:05 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>>From: Eleanor White <eleonor.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 16:47:20 -0400
>>>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99.nul>
>>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>>Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:46:55 +0000
>>>>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

<snip>

>>>>Question: Why is there any conflict between religious faith
>>>>and the "scientific, secular world view"?

>>>>I've taken science courses, and I'm a confirmed Christian. I
>>>>just don't see any conflict. To me, science is about learning
>>>>the details of how God set this universe up.

>>>Eleanor,

>>>You just demonstrated the difference. Putting on my philosopher
>>>hat for the moment:

>>>You believe in the existence of God on faith and basically
>>>deduce various things from your belief or assumption. Science at
>>>the most fundamental level (not to be confused with careless or
>>>erroneous applications) assumes only the validity of logic and
>>>mathematics (essentially that both x and non-x cannot be true at
>>>the same time). Somewhat over-simplified, but I think you will
>>>get the point.

>>>You believe God to be real (if typically totally undefined;
>>>which God from all the variant religions?) Science does not
>>>require or endorse acceptance of the God hypothesis. A scientist
>>>may be a Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, Atheist, Agnostic, etc.,
>>>but if he/she sticks to strict scientific method he/she will not
>>>use belief or non-belief in God (or a god) as a starting point
>>>or as a touchstone for ascertaining truth.

>>May Heaven forbid I barge in to your conversation with
>>meddlesome quibblings of my own, but even a scientific premise
>>comes from a human (thank God!) belief like x and non-x can't
>>both be true. I suppose even that basic belief was also

>>disproven by the assumptions of Werner Karl Heisenberg!

>Rick,

>I'm not sure what you are saying or implying here. If it is that
>humans are fallible and make errors, well of course that's true.
>That's why scientific method is set up the way it is to require
>logical analysis and double checking of everything to avoid
>self-deception (which is exceedingly common in human affairs).

>Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle applies to physics, not to
>logic. There are mathematical proofs of the validity of logic
>(Principia Mathematica). Would you argue that both x and non-x
>can be true at the same time? Either there is a table in front
>of you (x) or there is not a table in front of you (non-x). The
>only way around that is to engage in dodgy semantics.

>- Dick

Thanks for the response Dick! It looks like my lame attempt at levity fell flat. I apologize for that. So seriously, yes humans err. I thank God when we admit it! (And let me further apologize ahead of time for this next quibble.) But the scientific method, logic, and even math, borrowing your philosopher=92s hat if I may, were only meant to be tools. However, for some they have become a sort of social sophistry belief system=97dehumanizing in all aspects.

Please don=92t get me wrong. I=92m not encouraging a "new age" comingling of pop-sci concepts with East and West philosophies and belief systems into some eclectic "toolbox" form of interpretation. On the other hand, many good ideas have come from those outside a chosen field of study. Much good has also come to humanity from using those tools as tools alone, meaning the scientific method, logic and math. From your writings I "believe" you see this as well. And yes I still take seriously the conclusions of those in this field who know better than I.

Relating "x and non-x" arguments to the uncertainty principle, my understanding is admittedly limited. But what I believe is that physics seeks to find a unifying and documentable order to all processes, basic and sublime, quantum and cosmological, very tiny and very huge, both beyond our finite imagining, with everything in between.

Heisenberg, along with Schr=F6dinger=92s well-known thought experiment, found that nothing is certain at a fundamental level. This has been hypothesized to be relevant with all things observable.

And now I take a deep breath: Whether, by a "majority rule" of a statistically significant number of observed events with just an infinitesimal chance of "non-x", or merely a "sound" hypothesis, (by the way itself based on a belief or "premise"), the scientific method, logic, and even math are, at best, still only tools. Yet to some, these become the basis for their belief system, or a replacement for one, reinforced by a majority of observables, dependent on sample size to be sure. Conclusions often become beliefs, and vice versa; an ultimately self-fulfilling, and sometimes self-serving prophecy, if you will. But please note here, there is nothing inherently wrong with this, unless the motive is to dam the discourse with dogma. Everything observable is just not doctrinaire. This is just as those religionists who have their beliefs reinforced by the witnesses of others of their own faith. I truly and sincerely mean no disrespect to anyone on or off this list. I ask those offended to please consider the source; just one babbling on, based on his own fallible beliefs.

Humankind has a need to believe, and to find order and meaning in life. Admittedly biased toward humanity, I enjoy my own hourly observations of those human virtues!

Opening one=92s own mind to possibilities doesn=92t always equal letting his brains fall out! (And yes, I=92m willing to accept responsibility for that latest partial attempt at humor!)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 17:24:36 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:19:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson

>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:46:03 -0300
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <eugene.frison.nul>
>>>To: UFO Updates List <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 27 May 2006 19:13:48 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>For someone who speaks so strongly in favor of "evidence" and
>"sound reasoning" you seem to be either unaware of a lot of the
>evidence, or simply ignoring it.

It's true that I'm not aware of any evidence for non-'nuts and bolts' technology being responsible for the preponderance of substantive UFO cases. Virtually all the substantive cases I know of - and there are quite a large number of them - seem to involve straightforwardly "nuts and bolts" higher technology.

I'm certainly open to the possibility of UFO cases that seem to involve something other than ostensibly advanced technology, but I would hope that such cases involve something more than lucid dreams or sundry mystical revelations. I would hope - nay, demand - that anyone claiming that UFOs are something other than nuts/bolts technology would be able to offer strong evidence for that - evidence equivalent to photography, radar returns, material emissions, credible eyewitness testimony and other material effects. If you have evidence for non-bolts/nuts UFOs that is at least roughly equivalent to these well-known nuts/bolts evidence, then I would be very interested to see it.

My intent wasn't to defend Stan Friedman per se - he's obviously more than capable of doing that himself - but rather to point out that here's a very bright guy who's worked his fingers to the bone doing deep, detailed excavations into the substrata of truth on this subject, and that I see no reason to take seriously any critiques of his work which don't demonstrate equally deep excavation.

It seems eminently reasonable for anyone who has performed such Augean labors to demand the same from his or her critics.

Best,

Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 18:03:23 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:22:03 -0400
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Olson

>From: Christopher Allan <cda.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 20:47:29 +0100
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Jeff Olson <jlolson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

<snip>

>It is possible to refute each and every one of Stan Friedman's
>arguments for both Roswell and MJ-12 reality. By this I mean it
>is possible to advance a perfectly sound, alternative, scenario
>that does not involve either ET visitors or a Top Secret Majic
>committee under Pres. Truman. Others can, and have, done this
>but it takes time & effort, and (most important) is probably of
>little interest to the majority on this list. It is hard to
>believe anyone has, or will want to, delve into official
>archives & libraries to the extent that Stan has. However,
>despite this, we do not have to accept his conclusions as
>gospel.

It's equally logically true that it is possible to refute each
and every (attempted) refutation of Stan Friedman's arguments.
Which is to say that claims about the possibility of refuting
X arguments have no relevance to the truth or falsity of
anyone's claims. It is in fact a logical possibility that Stan's
or anyone else's arguments are not refutable. The only way to
know if an argument is refutable is to actually refute it.
Assertions of possible refutations are either (or both) utterly
vacuous or logically fallacious.

>It is much more likely that people are bored with the whole
>Roswell/MJ-12 saga and want to get on with other matters. Thus
>nobody is sufficiently motivated to research and rebut in
detail >Stan's arguments in a public forum.

That may be psychologically understandable, but it says
absolutely nothing about the truth regarding Roswell or anything
else. I hear from friends and family all the time that they
have no interest in UFOs, and because they aren't motivated to
think about them, they tend to believe the whole subject is
"silly." I see no difference between their assertions and the
above. If one isn't motivated to dig into Roswell, etc., to the
extent that Stan has, fine. But I see no more reason to find
their assertions regarding either Stan or Roswell any more
deserving of attention than my friends' or relatives' ignorant
assertions about the silliness of UFOs.

Best,

Jeff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 22:17:27 -0300
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:24:46 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 23:38:17 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>You are correct that power (and telephone) poles are not all
>of one standard size. Only my recent trip to Ottawa and back
>by train I noticed power poles along the side of the tracks
>that were so low, a tall person could easily reach and touch
>the glass insulators that the high voltage lines rested on.

They are data transmission poles the Rail Road uses for their
switching system, Nick. They can carry power for the RR's switch
actuators as well..

>Thank God you did not use a 50 foot steel tape when you went
>across the road to measure that 35 foot tall power pole in
>your neighbourhood!

As I've said, I was a lineman once. You work in the lousiest
weather. Spurs and belts pretty much back when I was doing it.
Blue corona around the tops of your rubber gloves, no hair on
your arms there. Some of the UK MOD's plazma phenomenon:)

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 > [2006](#) > [May](#) > [May 31](#)

Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 21:32:59 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 21:26:59 -0400
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <bob.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 10:03:19 -0400
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 22:37:04 EDT
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Here you go. It's a good read for everyone.

>><http://www.dspguide.com/ch25/3.htm> . . .

>Thanks, Victor. The pertinent quote is:

>"...humans can distinguish about 20 to 200 shades of gray
>between the blackest black and the whitest white. The exact
>number depends on a variety of factors..."

>The key word being "about".

The max is 200 and the exact number is uncertain between 20
and 200. As you can see I was being generous:)

Best,

Viktor Golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com