

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpDatesList.Com](http://UFOUpDatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > Jun

## UFO UpDates Mailing List Jun 2006

### Jun 1:

[Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [86]  
[UFOs 'Seem Keen' On KZN](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [37]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Martin Shough [4]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Viktor Golubik [62]  
[Re: The Park Hypothesis - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [66]  
[Secrecy News -- 05/31/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [161]  
[UFO Petitions And Wheel Reinvention](#) - Isaac Koi [274]  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [41]  
[What Are Those Words That Trigger Echelon?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [238]  
['Drops Of Alien In My Hair'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [41]  
[What If Life On Earth Did Not Begin On Earth?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [224]  
[MSNBC's Rita Cosby Show](#) - Bruce Maccabee [37]  
[UFO History Takes A Beating](#) - Richard Hall [37]  
[Is SETI A Religion?](#) - Don Ledger [123]  
[Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [3]

### Jun 2:

[British Researcher Pete Smith Passes](#) - Dave Sadler [17]  
[Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [130]  
[Re: UFO Photo 'Proof' - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [8]  
[Sighting Of A Tiny 'UFO'?](#) - Michael Bourne [6]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Christopher Allan [30]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [6]  
[Secrecy News -- 06/02/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [122]  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [46]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Viktor Golubik [79]  
[Mexican FLIR Footage Update \[was: MSNBC's Cosby\]](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [41]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [27]  
[Project Condign Daily Express Article](#) - Nick Pope [22]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Martin Shough [94]  
[Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints?](#) - Tim Shell [16]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - - Martin Shough [23]  
[Re: Supreme Court Stomps Whistleblowers - White](#) - Eleanor White [3]

### Jun 3:

[Re: Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know - Larry Hatch \[29\]](#)  
[Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment - Martin Shough \[19\]](#)  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough - Martin Shough \[26\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Bruce Maccabee \[7\]](#)  
[Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial - Larry Hatch \[6\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Robert Gates \[34\]](#)  
[Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial - Ed Gehrman \[47\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Stanton Friedman \[16\]](#)  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall - Richard Hall \[6\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman - Stanton Friedman \[7\]](#)  
[UK UFO & Fortean/Paranormal Conference - Robert Whitehead \[48\]](#)  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall - Richard Hall \[20\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Viktor Golubik \[58\]](#)  
[Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial - Larry Hatch \[11\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Viktor Golubik \[10\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison - Eugene Frison \[25\]](#)  
[Stupid TV Making Earth Safe From Aliens - UFO UpDates - Toronto \[72\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Viktor Golubik \[101\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Don Ledger \[7\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison - Eugene Frison \[43\]](#)  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall - Richard Hall \[7\]](#)  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee - Bruce Maccabee \[63\]](#)

#### **Jun 4:**

[Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial - Don Ledger \[5\]](#)  
[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 - Martin Shough \[72\]](#)  
[Re: UFOs In Journal of American Folklore - Hall - Richard Hall \[18\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison - Eugene Frison \[30\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Bruce Maccabee \[13\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Stanton Friedman \[8\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - John Harney \[21\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison - Eugene Frison \[72\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison - Eugene Frison \[7\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison - Eugene Frison \[5\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison - Eugene Frison \[5\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Martin Shough \[37\]](#)  
[Re: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints? - Maccabee - Bruce Maccabee \[21\]](#)  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer - John Rimmer \[14\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - John Rimmer \[3\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Gehrman - Ed Gehrman \[15\]](#)  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman - Stanton Friedman \[23\]](#)  
[Re: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints? - Olmos - Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos \[9\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Richard Hall \[13\]](#)  
[Corrales Heights Woman Swears She Saw UFO Here - UFO UpDates - Toronto \[37\]](#)  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark - Jerome Clark \[30\]](#)  
[Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial - Bill Chalker \[56\]](#)  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Bob Shell \[13\]](#)

#### **Jun 5:**

[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith - James Smith \[40\]](#)

[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [3]  
[Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [57]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Uzi Baron [10]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [14]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Richard Hall [11]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [109]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [18]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Viktor Golubik [60]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [30]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [9]  
[Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial](#) - Larry Hatch [6]  
[Saskatchewan Sightings Being Investigated](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [47]  
[UFOs Over Sacred Sites](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [222]  
[Object Lessons](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [29]  
[Altrinham UFO Conference This Saturday](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [127]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [8]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Richard Hall [14]  
[Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers \[was: Jesse Marcel\]](#) - Stanton Friedman [27]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [17]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers \[was: Jesse\]](#) - Rick Nielsen [17]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [85]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [11]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Tim Shell [4]  
[UFOs In The House of Commons](#) - Joe McGonagle [21]

## Jun 6:

[Karl Pflock Passes Away](#) - Herb Taylor [21]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [5]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [15]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - John Rimmer [100]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - David Rudiak [323]  
[Secrecy News -- 06/05/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [122]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Robert Gates [23]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [20]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [58]  
[UFO Review Issue #16](#) - Stuart Miller [51]  
[Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [7]  
[Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Kimball](#) - Paul Kimball [20]  
[Re: Karl Pflock Passes - Connors](#) - Wendy Connors [9]  
[UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge Dies](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [61]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [6]  
[Ancient Rock Art Depicts Exploding Star](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [58]  
[Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Burns](#) - Chris Burns [4]  
[Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Paijmans](#) - Theo Paijmans <th.paijmans@wxs.nl> [4]  
[The Burmarsh Incident](#) - Geoff Richardson [16]  
[Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [12]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Tim Shell [11]  
[Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos](#) - Tim Shell [14]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [10]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [30]  
[Karl Pflock](#) - Kevin Randle [39]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [45]

[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Richard Hall [4]  
[The Black, Hartmann & Heflin Video](#) - Richard Hall [50]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [49]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [59]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White](#) - Eleanor White [eleanor@shoestringradio.net](mailto:eleanor@shoestringradio.net)> [72]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White](#) - Eleanor White [eleanor@shoestringradio.net](mailto:eleanor@shoestringradio.net)> [72]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - White](#) - Eleanor White [5]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - John Rimmer [5]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [40]  
[Another Tactical Blunder For Bush?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [69]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [77]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [8]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [14]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Pope](#) - Nick Pope [11]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Stuart](#) - Chaz Stuart [2]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [14]

## Jun 7:

[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White](#) - Eleanor White [eleanor@shoestringradio.net](mailto:eleanor@shoestringradio.net)> [72]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [6]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [55]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [88]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [4]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Burns](#) - Max Burns [39]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [3]  
[Karl Pflock Tributes](#) - Fred Whiting [14]  
[Object In Manitoba Sky Nets 100 Calls](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [35]  
['UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [46]  
[The Return Of The 4400](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [134]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [20]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [30]  
[Engraved In Stone](#) - Richard Hall [44]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [17]

## Jun 8:

[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [175]  
[Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [19]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [22]  
[Dr. Willy Smith III](#) - Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo [9]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith](#) - James Smith [8]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [42]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [98]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Watson](#) - Nigel Watson [12]  
[Secrecy News -- 06/07/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [110]  
[Reason's Reasoning](#) - Richard Hall [67]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [11]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [34]  
[Re: Object In Manitoba Sky Nets 100 Calls - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [12]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [76]

**Jun 9:**

[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [8]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [32]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - White](#) - Eleanor White [9]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [24]  
[Re: Engraved In Stone - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [20]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [19]  
[Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial](#) - Nick Balaskas [66]  
[Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Russo](#) - Edoardo Russo [27]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [26]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Morton](#) - Dave Morton [21]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Bob Shell [9]  
[Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [6]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [10]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [7]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [2]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Viktor Golubik [73]  
[NUFORC 1974 - 1977](#) - Wendy Connors [18]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [27]  
[An Operation By Strange Entities In Argentina?](#) - Scott Corrales [83]  
[Strange Experience Of Argentina's Julio Oscar](#) - Scott Corrales [67]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Viktor Golubik [41]  
[Jesse Marcel & Interview By Tom Horn](#) - Tom Horn [16]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [90]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [26]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Scheldroup](#) - John Scheldroup [17]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [27]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [24]  
[UFO Abducted Town's Residents In 1965 Says Author](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [56]

**Jun 10:**

[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [270]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [19]  
[Mars & Saturn Converge](#) - Don Ledger [15]  
[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 -](#) - Viktor Golubik [4]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [54]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith](#) - James Smith [53]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [39]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [57]  
[Re: Jesse Marcel & Interview By Tom Horn - White](#) - Eleanor White [8]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [104]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [40]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [77]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [5]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Olson](#) - Jeff Olson [12]  
[Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [31]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Martin Shough [8]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Bob Shell [27]  
[Secrecy News -- 06/09/06](#) - Aftergood Steven [92]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [93]

[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [11]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith](#) - James Smith [74]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [4]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [40]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [30]

## **Jun 11:**

[Dan Aykroyd On CNN](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [186]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [25]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [12]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [235]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Viktor Golubik [15]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [3]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [17]  
[Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Anderson](#) - Paul Anderson [73]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - David Rudiak [74]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [46]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney](#) - John Harney [13]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [40]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [54]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [9]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Viktor Golubik [8]  
[Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [9]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On](#) - William Sawers [12]

## **Jun 12:**

[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [68]  
[Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [5]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Cameron](#) - Cory Cameron [22]  
[Will Mothman Deaths Return?](#) - Loren Coleman [2]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [175]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith](#) - James Smith [49]  
['Seeing Is Believing' Video](#) - Ray Dickenson [41]  
[The X-Files Deep Throat](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [41]  
[Re: UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge Dies - Burns](#) - Chris Burns [45]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Bueche](#) - Will Bueche [18]  
[Re: Dan Aykroyd On CNN - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [5]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -](#) - Bob Shell [21]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Bob Shell [4]

## **Jun 13:**

[Fire In Sky Is Probably Not Man-Made](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [73]  
[Yahoo Mail Security Problem](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [33]  
[Maybe They Were Too Busy To Look](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [88]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Anonymus](#) - modernherbal@[address known] [16]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [16]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [33]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [129]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [9]

[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [96]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Bruce Maccabee [14]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith](#) - James Smith [66]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [8]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [18]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [14]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [147]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Nick Balaskas [39]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [73]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - David Rudiak [7]  
[Re: The passing of Karl Pflock - Graeber](#) - Matt Graeber [15]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [31]  
[Civilized Life In The Universe](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [95]  
[Aerial Reconnaissance](#) - Ray Dickenson [33]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [7]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [10]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [18]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith](#) - James Smith [9]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Tim Shell [3]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith](#) - James Smith [52]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith](#) - James Smith [9]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Tim Shell [11]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [5]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Tim Shell [10]

## **Jun 14:**

[Secrecy News -- 06/12/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [138]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [4]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney](#) - John Harney [22]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [13]  
[Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith](#) - James Smith [52]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [13]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [28]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - David Rudiak [71]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [44]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [17]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Bruce Maccabee [5]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Olmos](#) - Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos [14]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Anonymous](#) - Anonymous [19]  
[Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO](#) - Martin Shough [58]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [6]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Martin Shough [14]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Miller](#) - Stuart Miller [11]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [20]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [49]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [3]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [26]  
[Hawking Says Space Colonies Needed](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [37]

## **Jun 15:**

[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [106]

[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [11]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [113]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [29]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [115]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [158]  
[BBC Newsnight Special On-Line Tonight](#) - Joe McGonagle [11]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [1]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [54]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [19]  
[Re: State Of The Art - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [80]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [81]  
[Paintsville UFO/Train Collision Case](#) - Frank Warren [50]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [123]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [12]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [5]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Tim Shell [11]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Gates](#) - Robert Gates RGates8254@aol.com> [35]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [6]  
[Condign Fuels Spy Plane Theories](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [91]

## Jun 16:

[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [68]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Scheldroup](#) - John Scheldroup [11]  
[Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background](#) - Richard Hall [273]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [20]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Brad Sparks [5]  
[The U.S. Army's \\$213.30 "Mistake"](#) - Larry W. Bryant [49]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [35]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [12]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [42]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [116]  
[Secrecy News -- 06/15/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [145]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [12]  
[Matt's Pollen Out](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [17]  
[So Where Are All The Crop Circles?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [72]  
[Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Burns](#) - Max Burns [21]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [24]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [7]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [10]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Anonymous](#) - Anonymous [24]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [49]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [5]  
[Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Anderson](#) - Paul Anderson [16]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On](#) - Martin Shough [27]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [28]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [9]  
[Re: Paintsville UFO/Train Collision Case - Smith](#) - James Smith [15]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Tim Shell [11]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [31]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Tim Shell [9]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [25]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [111]



**Jun 17:**

[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [19]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [49]  
[Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Burns](#) - Max Burns [5]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On](#) - Martin Shough [12]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [10]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [119]  
[Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville](#) - Don Ledger [24]  
[Visitors From Another World?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [48]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [23]  
[Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [12]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [22]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [21]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell](#) - Tim Shell tshell@vcmails.com [9]  
[Asteroid-Watchers Worry About Cosmic Katrina](#) - Ray Dickenson@virgin.net [29]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [40]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [54]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [39]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]  
[Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Belzil](#) - Fern Belzil [11]  
[Karl Pflock's Official Obituary](#) - Loren Coleman [46]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [40]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [28]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [2]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [22]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [18]  
[Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [12]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [117]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [2]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Scheldroup](#) - John Scheldroup [14]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [6]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [15]  
[Re: Heflin UFO Photos - King](#) - Kyle King [36]  
[Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [11]  
[Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [5]

**Jun 18:**

[Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [7]  
[Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [12]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [48]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [20]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [10]  
[Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [14]  
[Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [5]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [41]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [88]  
[Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [58]  
[Researcher Has Photo Of 1976 UFO Over Clovis](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [103]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [58]  
[Houston Bat Man Flashback](#) - Loren Coleman [6]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [37]

[Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [310]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [2]  
[Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution](#) - Jason Gammon [14]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [14]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney](#) - John Harney [35]

## **Jun 19:**

[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [18]  
[Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters?](#) - Greg Taylor [11]  
[Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [10]  
[Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [90]  
[Aliens In California](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [23]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [15]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [50]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [4]  
[Roswell UFO Festival](#) - Nigel Watson [5]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [26]

## **Jun 18:**

[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [10]

## **Jun 19:**

[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [8]  
[Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe](#) - Cory Cameron [8]  
[Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond](#) - Cory Cameron [3]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [28]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [51]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [25]  
[Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Pope](#) - Nick Pope [8]  
[Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [7]  
[Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [10]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Gammon](#) - Jason Gammon [14]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [42]  
[Secrecy News -- 06/19/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [183]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [6]  
[Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - White](#) - Eleanor White [3]

## **Jun 20:**

[UFO-Related Video Clips On-Line](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [27]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [25]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [20]  
[Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Beasley](#) - Craig Beasley [7]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [6]  
[UFO Pictured In UK Carnival Flypast](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [18]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [41]  
[US Patent Application For Black Budget](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [384]  
[John Paul II Told Stephen Hawking](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [71]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [6]  
[Re: UFO Pictured In UK Carnival Flypast - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [3]

[Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [9]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith](#) - James Smith [43]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [73]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [11]  
[Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond](#) - Ed Gehrman [16]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]  
[Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [8]  
[Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - White](#) - Eleanor White [35]

## **Jun 21:**

[Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe](#) - Tim Shell [4]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [26]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [23]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [2]  
[Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [7]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [67]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Druffel](#) - Ann Druffel [20]  
[Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [11]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik Diverge247@aol.com> [45]  
[Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [24]  
[Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond](#) - Cory Cameron [48]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [112]  
[Karl Pflock Revisted](#) - Don Ecker [24]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [7]

## **Jun 22:**

[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [80]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [9]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [34]  
[We're Just Following Orders](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [27]  
[Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [88]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [10]  
[UFO Research: Findings Vs. Facts](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [151]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [10]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [28]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [30]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [48]  
[Hypersonic Craft Seen In UK](#) - Chris Parr [7]  
[Pensioner's UFO Plans Scuppered](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [49]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [20]

## **Jun 23:**

[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Don Ledger [10]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Tim Shell [39]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison](#) - Eugene Frison [15]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Martin Shough [49]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [14]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Nick Balaskas [47]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Martin Shough [22]  
[UFO Hacker Gary McKinnon Interview](#) - Nigel Watson [12]

[The Other Side Of... Stuart Miller](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [8]  
[Have We Offended Them?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [93]  
[Conversations With Extraterrestrials](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [394]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Martin Shough [12]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [60]  
[Another UFO Photographed Over Peruvian Volcano](#) - Scott Corrales [28]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Martin Shough [16]  
[Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [18]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [34]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Viktor Golubik [18]  
[Re: Robo-Sapiens The New \(R\)Evolution - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [7]

## **Jun 24:**

[We've Got This Wrong](#) - Stuart Miller [62]  
[Space.com Article Response](#) - Bruce Maccabee [164]  
[Re: UFO Hacker Gary McKinnon Interview - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [5]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Scheldroup](#) - John Scheldroup [17]  
[Re: Have We Offended Them? - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [21]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Tim Shell [7]  
[Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe](#) - Viktor Golubik [10]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [40]  
[Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [41]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Bruce Maccabee [32]  
[Re: Another UFO Photographed Over Peruvian Volcano](#) - Greg Boone [9]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [112]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Tim Shell [22]  
[Re: Analysing UFO Footage - Parr](#) - Chris Parr [11]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [68]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [131]  
[Re: Have We Offended Them? - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [7]  
[St. John's Day UFOs Birthday & Researchers' Death](#) - Loren Coleman [48]  
[Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [92]  
[Tunneling Through Space And Time](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [264]  
[Re: We've Got This Wrong - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [30]  
[Re: Space.com Article Response - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [44]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [47]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason](#) - Cathy Reason [82]  
[Re: Have We Offended Them? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [6]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik Diverge247@aol.com> [19]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [44]  
[Re: The Truth About Heflin - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [24]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [178]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake - Vander](#) - Dirk Vander Ploeg [74]

## **Jun 25:**

[Re: We've Got This Wrong - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [6]  
[Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Nielsen](#) - Rick Nielsen [23]  
[Conceptualizing UFOs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [137]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [29]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [25]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [16]

[No US Official Has The Right To Lie](#) - Larry W. Bryant [69]  
[The Economic Alien](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [75]  
[Re: Space.com Article Response - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [10]  
[Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Boone](#) - Greg Boone [67]  
[Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!](#) - Bruce Maccabee [25]  
[Bad UFO Photos & Video](#) - Greg Boone [42]  
[Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [17]  
[Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Gammon](#) - Jason Gammon [14]  
[Re: Conceptualizing UFOs - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [10]

## **Jun 26:**

[Are We Missing Something?](#) - Ray Dickenson [38]  
[Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]  
[Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake](#) - Larry Hatch [18]  
[Fate's David F. Godwin Has Heart Attack](#) - Loren Coleman [4]  
[Re: US Patent Application For Black Budget](#) - Willian Sawers [18]  
[Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [82]  
[UFOs Brought Down To Earth](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [55]  
[This Column Is Out Of This World](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [57]  
[Breaking The Light Speed Barrier](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [538]

## **Jun 27:**

[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [19]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [16]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [22]  
[Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Shell](#) - Bob Shell [23]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [17]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [23]  
[Frank Edwards' Publisher Lyle Stuart Dies June](#) - Loren Coleman [6]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [64]  
[Donna T. Hare & NASA UFOs Revisited](#) - Don Ecker [27]  
[SETI & CSICOP](#) - Greg Taylor [107]  
[X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06](#) - Stephen G. Bassett [85]  
[Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [11]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [12]  
[ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference](#) - Michael Salla [34]  
[Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [4]  
[Re: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06 - Allan](#) - Christopher Allan [14]  
[Re: SETI & CSICOP - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [59]  
[Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [24]  
[Re: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06 - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [14]  
[Feel smart? Thank Your Lucky Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [70]  
[The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [39]

## **Jun 28:**

[Clash Of Events Has UFO Festival Upset](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [80]  
[Sleuthing Out Truth On UFOs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [107]  
[UFOs And A Half-Naked Man](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [192]  
[Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference](#) - Christopher Allan [11]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [23]

[Re: SETI & CSICOP - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [12]  
[Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [5]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - Tim](#) - Tim Shell [9]  
[Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo](#) - Dirk Vander Ploeg [25]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [65]  
[Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [15]  
[Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS - Sawyer](#) - Steve Sawyer [20]  
[Looking For Signs Of Alien Life In NZ](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [42]  
[Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference](#) - - Rick Nielsen [13]  
[UK Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [131]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [18]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [61]  
[Re: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [6]

## Jun 29:

[Blinded By The Lights?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [97]  
[How Many Computers To Make Contact With ETs?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [94]  
[The Ultimate Lifeboat](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [230]  
[Re: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [6]  
[Re: SETI & CSICOP - Friedman](#) - Stanton Friedman [19]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos](#) - Kelly Freeman [15]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [23]  
[Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [11]  
[Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference](#) - - Michael Salla [44]  
[Rediscovery Of Heflin Photos](#) - Martin Shough [97]  
[Loving The Alien - A News Film By Ronan Gallagher](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [17]  
[Metallic Object Near Aircraft Over Mexico 2006](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [43]  
[Re: UK Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive'](#) - - Kathy Kasten [12]  
[Re: UFOs And A Half-Naked Man - Kasten](#) - Kathy Kasten [4]  
[Old US Satellite Passes ISS Without Incident](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [38]  
[Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS](#) - - Nick Balaskas [44]  
[Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [79]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [24]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [37]

## Jun 30:

[Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference](#) - - Rick Nielsen [18]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - Dickenson](#) - Ray Dickenson [11]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [42]  
[Re: SETI & CSICOP - Shell](#) - Tim Shell [32]  
[Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [13]  
[Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial](#) - - Stanton Friedman [28]  
[Re: Old US Satellite Passes ISS Without Incident](#) - - Tim Shell [7]  
[Re: Rediscovery Of Heflin Photos - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [24]  
[UFO Caught On Camera In Banbury](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [46]  
[Soo Michigan Police Investigate UFO Report](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [18]  
[Secrecy News -- 06/29/06](#) - Steven Aftergood [170]  
[Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial](#) - - Eleanor White [6]  
[Re: Are We Missing Something? - White](#) - Eleanor White [4]  
[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [166]  
[Check Your Site Statistics For Hong Kong](#) - Larry Hatch [18]

[Re: SETI & CSICOP - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [9]

[Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik](#) - Viktor Golubik [12]

[Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Shough](#) - Martin Shough [15]

[Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial](#) - Greg Boone [38]

[Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Burns](#) - Max Burns [9]

*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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [ufoupdateslist.com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:03:13 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:03:13 -0400  
Subject: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

Source: Darren Ethier's Blog

<http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=3D22>

Tuesday, May 30, 2006

Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary Bates last night. The summary and title of the book intrigued me because from childhood I have always been interested in stories involving 'ETs' (extraterrestrials) and UFOs. I remember doing a presentation on UFOs as a project for one of my classes in high school. The reason why this book interested me is because I discovered a website for it advertised in the Creation Ministries International flyer that I recieved in the mail and after checking it out I thought the book would be worth a read (because of my already piqued interest in ETs). Here's the description found on the back of the book:

---

UFOs have been seen throughout the centuries. But in our enlightened technological age, are we any closer to solving the mystery? This book revisits the most famous events that have defined UFO culture, such as Roswell and alien autopsies; astronaut Gordon Cooper's sightings; Major Donald Keyhoe's allegations of official silence; and the claims of famous contactees Billy Meier and George Adamski.

Also discover evidence about alien abductions and other UFO phenomena that is widely ignored by the UFO community. The author's research and conclusions will surprise you and challenge your thinking =97 not just about UFOs, but about the nature of life itself.

This landmark volume that brings together the most important evidences, and comes to conclusions far more sinister =97 yet profound =97 than most could imagine.

---

I don't want to write too much about Gary Bates conclusions about UFOs here because of the profound amount of evidence he amasses and the well-thought out progression he takes through the book to reach them. For me to just list the conclusion might prevent some from reading the book because of bias' they may already have. However, I will say this - my eyes were opened - WIDE OPENED - to the reality of the UFO phenomenom and how far off from the truth most people are when reading about it and explaining it.

Bates does an excellent job of presenting a logical and reasonable explanation for the numerous reports and evidences that have been collected in the past century (and referencing



supposed ancient sightings as well). I can't help but wonder if any honest, sincere, and open-minded investigator would not reach the same conclusions he did. Certainly when I finished the book I agreed with his conclusions.

For the Christian - this book helps us to understand the UFO phenomenon and grasp the significance of its influence in our culture. It also gives good reason for our faith to be strengthened and encouraged about what the Bible has to say about the 'conspiracy' behind UFOs and Aliens. I believe Bates correctly identifies the religious (or spiritual) nature of the UFO phenomenon and how it requires a belief system that is inherently antagonistic to the Christian faith. In his conclusions, he expertly gives opinions why this is so (the conclusions are shocking to say the least!). After reading his book I definitely feel it's a worthwhile read for Christians - let me put it this way=85like I said earlier, I have always been fascinated by stories of UFOs and aliens (and a bit of a sci-fi buff to boot) and the idea that there may be life on other planets in our universe. Yet, after reading this book I've realized that such interests cannot be taken lightly or even seen as a harmless indulgence=85

For the non-Christian I would invite you to read this book and not be put off by what I stated in the paragraph above. For certainly, in my opinion, Bates is not writing this book as an apologetic of the Christian faith and doesn't even mention the Christian connection until the last chapters. Instead, it very much read as an honest attempt to have an objective look at the UFO phenomena, it's origins, it's ideals, it's evidences, and it's stories. Bates draws from an incredible amount of resources (from a multitude of differing viewpoints) that demonstrate the diligence in his research and investigation into the subject. The way he presents this information is in the method of an open-minded researcher. It is clear that Bates was honestly trying to get to the bottom of this mystery from a scholarly perspective. By the end of the book I think you'll appreciate the high plausibility that his conclusions are true - and at the very least give you something to really think about.

Bates presents numerous stories, evidences, and research that no doubt many people have seen presented in documentaries, or read before (a testimony to how widespread talk of UFOs has become=85almost an accepted expectation in our society). Overall this book was a very interesting read and one I will be recommending to many people!

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## UFOs 'Seem Keen' On KZN

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:17:07 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:17:07 -0400  
Subject: UFOs 'Seem Keen' On KZN

Source: News24.Com - Cape Town, Western Cape, South Africa

<http://tinyurl.com/fvpgn>

30/05/2006

UFOs 'Seem Keen' On KZN  
Craig Bishop

Pietermaritzburg - (SA) KwaZulu-Natal skies have played host to three UFO sightings in the past nine days.

In the latest encounter, tipplers at the Firkin pub in Westville saw an oval-shaped, dimly-lit object moving in the night sky at around 19:00 on Friday.

One of the crowd, Deon Joubert, said he'd seen people pointing up at the sky, looked up and saw something moving in the night sky.

"It moved at about the speed of an airplane, but the shape was totally wrong and the lights were wrong. It then came to a dead stop and then it started weaving in the sky and getting smaller. I realised that it was speeding off in an upward direction, into the sky. It took about half a minute to disappear completely from view.

"The weaving motion seemed to have been a result of its path not being perfectly straight as it sped upwards. There was no apparent increase in the intensity of the lights as it changed direction," he explained.

'We had very little to drink'

Although Firkin staff suggested that alcohol could've fuddled patrons' vision, and that some of the clientele could well have been upside down staring at car headlights, the incident brings to three the total of weird, aerial phenomena. "We had very little to drink. I have actually seen a UFO before," insisted Joubert.

The Witness can reveal that the silver, spinning disc in the sky above Nottingham Road last Friday afternoon was the work of a local prankster who is currently guiding hot-air balloon safaris over the Masai Mara game reserve in Kenya.

However, rough seas have hampered divers' efforts to investigate the Port Shepstone object two Saturdays ago, which footage suggests was a water-spout.

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 09:42:59 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:19:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>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.

Unfortunately I said

>>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.

Whoops, sorry, dropped some zeros in there somewhere or pressed  
a wrong button! Way off.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 08:39:57 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:35:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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 (mozaic-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	Pix wide	Visible (comments)
>	(microns)	(5MegPix)	
>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.

Hi David, All,

The broad issue here is... why go through all this? Well, after 30 seconds of viewing the 3D, I confirmed (as Tim Shell originally did), that the climb to proving that this wasn't a fake, was a steep one. This doesn't require 40 pages of analysis... the math is beautifully self-contained and the film/camera/lighting/setting is all that remains of the physical evidence reconstruction that I know of. Therefore, any 40 page report will have to contain evidence to offset this 'coincidental' 3D stereo by conducting actual experiments and higher resolution/bit depth scans of the prints. I'm back to using my teeter-totter again - that's all.

Size of the UFO from frame to frame may also reveal consistence or inconsistency of the object getting closer and farther from the viewer (object) in relation to movement direction (but the UFO could be moving erratically so this isn't conclusive either). As I pointed out earlier, directional information is in the 3D at the Horizon point in the 3D overlap (either his movement or the UFO).

The scope of your experiment, while very useful, has a limited scope when considering other points I've already introduced.

The FOCUS SPACE is an important factor which isn't explored in your experiment and leads to single solutions without cofactors.

A polarization film could also attenuate the light and shadow from thread in certain orientations, thus lesson their impact on film.

My point was that an actual experiment with that camera has to be entertained not a digital one). And, if you read my earlier post, slightly out of focus conditions may dramatically effect the outcome you've examined when using inferior film (Bob Shell).

More importantly, my proposal would also include threads at different ANGLES (towards and away from the camera lens... like a UFO hanging on a clothesline-like thread arrangement, moving into the "out of focus" region toward the camera. Therefore, it may not just be hanging by a single thread where the entire thread is within the same focal plane. The opposite end could be at a very low angles with respect to the lens too.

Questions:

What was the infinity setting on the camera he used under the specific physical conditions? What camera did he use? What was the model and make? What are the lens characteristics? Was the window rolled up?

I can think of one another way to suspend a small object without thread. If the object was suspended in between two panes of thin glass. Perhaps the car window is one of them? I guess it would have lead me to become very observant at the evidence and witnesses houses during that time.

Yours is all good, but in the final analysis, still too week to climb out of the Heflin Hole. That he would have had to compensate for the movement of the object, such that it maintains the same exact relative position within the window frame. I've included the other points I've raised both here

(earlier) and with Tim Shell off site.

Just trying to find the Physics Loop Holes and playing both sides of the Chess board to win. Obviously, I'm sure we both are.

This is fun and a good learning tool for all of us... the case has much intrinsic value either way... right... no need for despair.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## Re: The Park Hypothesis - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 12:27:51 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:36:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Park Hypothesis - Balaskas

>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 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.

Bob Park only speaks for himself and not for me or the rest of mankind, both present and future, and certainly not for the ET civilizations which we have good reasons to believe exist (UFO sightings in space, parnormal events related to multidimensional physics, accounts of gods or beings from other worlds found in ancient writings and holy scriptures, etc.) in the immediate neighbourhood of our vast universe which we have only begun to comprehend and appreciate.

Unlike Bob Park, Jill Tarter is a SETI scientist and her views carry more weight than the latest "junk" comments by her science colleagues and self-proclaimed experts on this subject. In a short but honest article by Tarter that appears in the May/June 2006 issue of 'Skeptical Inquirer' she begins by reminding us that what we describe today is based on what we know about physics and technology in the twenty-first century and is limited by our terrestrial and inescapably anthropocentric vantage point.

If our popular space age idea that "flesh and blood" type ET civilizations like our own must exist on rocky planets orbiting Sun-like stars is expanded to include evidence from a vast body of historical and religious knowledge that has been dismissed as fictitious legends or myths, then we may discover that ETs are already here in our midst. Although our science describes and explains with authority what it can observe and measure in the universe we can see, as prisoners of our 4 dimensional reality (the 3 dimensions of space and 1 of time) science is not better suited than religion when dealing with higher dimensional realities and spiritual matters.

There is no Fermi Paradox regarding ETs and no need for Bob Park's or any other debunker's new hypothesis. The reason we have not found ETs is because we search for them only through the opaque glasses of twenty-first century science.

That said, I wish our SETI colleagues success with the new tools they now have available (the Allen Telescope Array, Harvard University's optical SETI program, etc.) in the search for ET civilizations like us.

Nick Balaskas

P.S. In the same issue of 'Skeptical Inquirer' there is an article by my astronomy colleague Stanley Jeffers at York U. on Princeton University's Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research (PEAR) group and their amazing findings in support that humans can effect electronic and mechanical devices with their minds. Since this article was published in a skeptical magazine, you will be correct to assume that my colleague's paper found evidence in the contrary based on Princeton's poor methodology and analysis. Although I helped by testing the actual random event generators (REGs) that was used by Princeton researchers and found them stable to changes in temperatures and other physical variables, there were several findings by Jeffer's researcher and I in his lab that seemed to confirm that mind does affect matter. Since Jeffer's was not present during our findings and it did not involved PEAR's actual instruments, it was dismissed as "anecdotal evidence" and was not included in this paper.

Ironically, in the same lab in the basement of Petrie that was used by Stanley Jeffers for this paper, I was allowed to see and participate in proof of concept testing that will make a space elevator a reality. Although Jeffer's skeptic colleague Bob Park is a critic of human spaceflight, if this team of space researchers at York U. gets funding for their space elevator, one day we may be able to invite our friends for lunch at a restaurant in space at the other end of this proposed space elevator for York U. and keep Toronto as the city with the world's tallest free standing structure currently held by the CN Tower.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Secrecy News -- 05/31/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 12:30:38 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:39:05 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 05/31/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 64  
May 31, 2006

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

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* ISOO URGED TO COMPEL VICE PRESIDENT TO REPORT ON SECRECY  
\*\* "DEEMED EXPORTS": COMMERCE DEPARTMENT RETREATS  
\*\* HOUSE MOVES TO LIMIT "SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION"  
\*\* SOME NOTABLE DECLASSIFICATIONS

ISOO URGED TO COMPEL VICE PRESIDENT TO REPORT ON SECRECY

The Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) should exercise its authority to compel the Office of the Vice President to disclose how frequently it classifies and declassifies information, the Federation of American Scientists urged in a letter to ISOO Director J. William Leonard.

For the third year in a row, the Office of the Vice President (OVP) has failed to disclose such data, as all executive branch entities that handle classified information are required to do for publication in the ISOO annual report to the President (Secrecy News, 05/26/06).

But the OVP did not simply neglect to report the data, it declared that it had no obligation to do so.

OVP spokeswoman Lea Ann McBride told the Chicago Tribune last week: "This has been thoroughly reviewed and it's been determined that the reporting requirement does not apply to [the office of the vice president], which has both legislative and executive functions." ("Cheney Keeps Classification Activity Secret" by Mark Silva, Chicago Tribune, May 27.)

There is no basis for this claim that the OVP is exempt from reporting.

"Nothing in the executive order excuses the OVP from reporting on classification activity in the performance of its executive duties merely because it also has separate legislative functions," I wrote in a May 30 FAS letter to ISOO.

"Since the OVP has publicly staked out a position that openly defies the plain language of the executive order, I believe ISOO now has a responsibility to clarify the matter. Otherwise, every agency will feel free to re-interpret the order in idiosyncratic and self-serving ways."

FAS asked ISOO either to directly compel the OVP to comply with the executive order under threat of sanction, or else to formally request a determination from the Attorney General on the applicability of the executive order to the OVP.

"I recognize that the OVP's classification activity is quantitatively small, by comparison with other executive branch elements, and that it could easily be overlooked without much detriment to the aggregate statistical reporting by ISOO," our letter stated.

"But by casting its non-compliance as a matter of principle, the OVP has mounted a challenge to the integrity of classification oversight and to the authority of the executive order. In my opinion, it is a challenge that should not go unanswered," I wrote. See:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/05/isoo-ovp.pdf>

"You raise some valid points," wrote ISOO Director Leonard in an initial email response on May 30. "I will pursue."

#### "DEEMED EXPORTS": COMMERCE DEPARTMENT RETREATS

In a victory for academic researchers, the Department of Commerce announced the withdrawal of a controversial rulemaking notice on so-called "deemed exports" that would have imposed new restrictions on access to information and technology by foreign-born scientists.

A "deemed export" has taken place when a foreign national who is working in the United States gains access to technology or information that is export controlled.

The 2005 Commerce rulemaking notice had triggered an outpouring of anxiety in academia and among scientists who said the Commerce proposal would complicate or render impossible many common interactions with foreign-born students as well as foreign collaborators. (See "Controls on 'Deemed Exports' May Threaten Research," Secrecy News, 05/02/2005).

In response to hundreds of comments received, the Commerce Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) abandoned key features of its proposal, including a surprising provision that access restrictions should be based on an individual's country of birth rather than on his current citizenship.

Along with withdrawal of the pending proposal, "BIS is establishing a Deemed Export Advisory Committee [that] will serve as forum to address complex questions related to an evolving deemed export control policy."

The policy shift was described in a Federal Register notice published today.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/05/fr053106.html>

"While the deemed export rule plays a crucial role in preventing foreign nationals from countries of concern from obtaining controlled U.S. technology, BIS also recognizes that export controls must take into account the integral and critical contribution of foreign nationals to U.S. fundamental research," the Federal Register notice stated.

"U.S. research institutions play a vital role in advancing science and technology for future generations. Part of the vitality of the research enterprise is the contribution made by foreign national students, faculty, and visiting scientists."

#### HOUSE MOVES TO LIMIT "SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION"

The scope of the "sensitive security information" (SSI) control category that prevents disclosure of certain kinds of transportation security-related information would be significantly curtailed by the House version of the 2007 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

The House bill would mandate automatic disclosure of SSI when it becomes three years old if it is not part of an active security plan and unless a written determination is made by the Secretary that it must be withheld.

It would also require DHS to revise its written policy on SSI to

provide common representative examples of what constitutes SSI, and it would make it easier for parties in litigation to gain access to SSI. See the SSI provision in the 2007 Homeland Security Appropriations bill, which awaits final action on the House floor, here:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/congress/2006/hr5441.html>

The White House denounced the House measure.

"The Administration strongly opposes Section 525 [the SSI provision], which would jeopardize an important program that protects Sensitive Security Information (SSI) from public release by deeming it automatically releasable in three years..." according to a May 25 Statement of Administration Policy.

"This provision would require the Secretary to undertake an ongoing, burdensome review process to protect this secure sensitive information that would otherwise remain appropriately protected by regulation," the White House said. See (at page 4):

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/2006/05/whsap-dhs.pdf>

And see, relatedly, "Homeland Security Department: FY2007 Appropriations," Congressional Research Service, May 10, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/homsec/RL33428.pdf>

#### SOME NOTABLE DECLASSIFICATIONS

The National Security Archive announced the publication of a large collection of Henry Kissinger's Memoranda of Conversation (memcons), a detailed and candid record of his diplomatic contacts with world leaders from 1969 to 1977, edited by the Archive's William Burr. See:

<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB193/press.htm>

An FBI account of "Bacteriological Warfare in the United States" was published by TheMemoryHole.org. It contains a description of a "previously unknown simulated BW attack on the Pentagon" [circa 1950], notes Michael Ravnitzky, who obtained the document. See:

<http://www.thememoryhole.org/fbi/biowar.htm>

The second and final installment of declassified National Security Agency records on Vietnam and the Tonkin Gulf Incident was published yesterday on the NSA web site. See:

<http://www.nsa.gov/vietnam/>

---

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/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

SUPPORT Secrecy News with a donation here:

[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](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](http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## UFO Petitions And Wheel Reinvention

From: Isaac Koi <[isaackoi2.nul](mailto:isaackoi2.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 20:40:29 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:42:35 -0400  
Subject: UFO Petitions And Wheel Reinvention

Wheel Reinvention Within Ufology : A Case Study Relating To  
Petitions

By Isaac Koi.  
Copyright 2006. [11]

As some of you are aware, two of my regular gripes about the  
current state of ufology are:

(a) that a huge amount of time and effort wasted within ufology  
in reinventing the wheel on a regular basis, and

(b) that there is a lack of coordination between researchers  
and/or awareness of existing projects.

One new instance of such reinvention of the wheel came to my  
attention today when I happened to be thinking about this topic,  
so I'll discuss this particular example (without wishing to  
imply that it is any worse than quite a few other examples I  
could have taken).

The Disclosure UK website at the link below has just added a  
petition. This afternoon (i.e. Monday 29 May 2006), there are 35  
signatures on the petition. A list of "current signatures" can  
be  
seen at:

[http://www.petitiononline.com/mod\\_perl/signed.cgi?skyshock&1](http://www.petitiononline.com/mod_perl/signed.cgi?skyshock&1)

The website states that: "By signing the petition you will not  
only be showing our Government that there are many people in the  
UK who want full disclosure on the subject, you will also be  
helping lead the world into a free energy existence and greater  
understanding of the world we live in and the universe that  
surrounds us."

As is typical with petitions organised by ufologists, this  
petition is more than a little vague. Furthermore, there is no  
discussion on the relevant website of existing or previous  
petitions.

The failure to refer to existing or previous petitions is not  
limited to the Disclosure UK website.

As far as I can see, none of the websites for the petitions  
listed below appear to refer to any of the other on-going  
petitions. Nor is there any explanation of why it was considered  
necessary to launch a new petition rather than seek to encourage  
people to support one or more of the on-going petitions.

It probably also goes without saying that none of the websites  
below appears to contain any reference to any prior petition.  
Nor do they seek to explain why the new petition would be more  
effective than, or different from, any prior petition.

It seems that a great deal of time and effort is put into  
publicising such petitions after they have been formulated,  
but less effort is apparent in relation to planning how the

objectives of the organiser could be met or the lessons that could be learnt from previous petition attempts.

Many of the newer petitions do not appear to be refinements of previous attempts. Indeed, the contrary appears to be true. Several of the newer petitions are considerably less elegant than some previous attempts.

Some of the newer petitions also introduce new problems avoided by several previous attempts, e.g. by introducing controversial collateral elements (e.g. free energy) to the already controversial nature of the basic points being made in the petitions.

As Brad Sparks has commented in a slightly different context, it is "as if we never learn anything from the past".

Given that I have come across several new petitions within ufology in the last few months, I thought it would be useful to outline some of the previous and on-going petitions.

I think it is particularly useful to consider the example of the International Roswell Declaration petition submitted by Kent Jeffrey to the White House in July 1997. Jeffrey wanted to get the President of the USA to issue an Executive Order declassifying any information regarding the existence of UFOs or extraterrestrial intelligence.

The declaration itself was a single sheet that asked for a signature, which was to be sent to CUFOs or MUFON. The Declaration contained a summary of the Roswell incident and stated "there is a logical and straightforward way to ensure that the truth about Roswell will emerge : an Executive Order declassifying any information regarding the existence of UFOs or extraterrestrial intelligence" [1]. The Declaration stated:

---

"If, as if officially claimed, no information on Roswell, UFOs, or extraterrestrial intelligence is being withheld, an Executive Order declassifying it would be a mere formality, as there would be nothing to disclose. The Order would, however, have the positive effect of setting the record straight once and for all. Years of controversy and suspicion would be ended, both in the eyes of the United States' own citizens and in the eyes of the world.

If, on the other hand, the Roswell witnesses are telling the truth and information on extraterrestrial intelligence does exist, it is not something to which a privileged few in the United States Government should have exclusive rights. It is knowledge of profound importance to which all people throughout the world should have an inalienable right. Its release would unquestionably be universally acknowledged as an historic act of honesty and goodwill". [1]

---

By late 1995, more than 20,000 people had signed the Roswell Declaration. [1], [2]

However, prior to submitting the petition, Jeffrey's views had changed. He wrote in MUFON UFO Journal (in June 1997) that he had become "absolutely certain that the debris recovered from Roswell was not that from an extraterrestrial craft.". [2]. When Jeffrey submitted the petition in July 1997, he enclosed a covering letter which, according to Kevin Randle, suggested that there was nothing to the Roswell crash other than the recovery of a Mogul balloon, but that an executive order ending UFO secrecy was a good idea. [1]

None of the websites associated with the petitions below refer to the Roswell Declaration or discuss the response of the US Government to the Roswell Declaration. Basically, that response was that since a declassification process for government records was already underway, an executive order for specific categories was unnecessary.

The full text of that response was published in [1], and was also made available online by Joachim Koch at the link below:



<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1998/dec/m01-034.shtml>

Nor do any of the websites below address comments made by skeptics about such petitions.

None of them address, for example, assertions by Phil Klass in relation to the Roswell Declaration that "If any President were to issue such an Executive Order, when no one came forward with credible evidence that any UFOs are ET craft, paranoid UFOlogists would claim that the President covertly issued a 'Top Secret' Executive Order warning military personnel not to come forward and speak out".

The failure to refer to other petitions is not limited to historical examples. The Disclosure UK website does not, for example, contain any reference to the international petition to the United Nations organised by John Velez on the Virtually Strange website at the link below:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/petition/>

This petition is still on-going and will be familiar to many subscribers to the UFO Updates email List since each message emailed by that List ends by urging readers to "Sign the International Petition for UFO Information Disclosure". During June 2005, John Velez claimed the petition had 5835 signatures. That petition is addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations and requests that he take action to encourage Member Nations to

(1) declassify and release all UFO files or records in their possession;

(2) cooperate with and support serious scientific efforts to study this phenomenon;

(3) promulgate regulations or laws requiring military personnel, professional pilots, police officers, and maritime personnel to generate reports on any UFOs sighted in the course of their professional duties and to make those reports freely available to the public after any legitimately classified portions are deleted. We recognize the need for protecting legitimate secrets in the short term, but in the longer term it is important that vital information not be withheld from the public.

Nor does the Disclosure UK website refer to the separate petition (also directed to the United Nations) organised by Alfred Webre at the link below.

<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/529287855>

That petition includes the following:

---

1. The United Nations General assembly establishes a DECADE OF CONTACT with the following four Objectives:

DISCLOSURE - Open, transparent, official governmental disclosure and declassification of all past and present programs related to Extraterrestrial Presence.

DECADE OF CONTACT - Public funding by U.N. Member Nations and by the UNITED NATIONS of a 10 year process of formal public education, scientific research, educational curricula development, strategic planning, community activity, and public outreach about the Extraterrestrial Presence and our future in a populated Universe.

DISARMAMENT - A permanent ban on all space-based weapons and warfare in space through a Space Preservation Treaty Conference.

DIPLOMACY Public Interest UNITED NATIONS Diplomacy with ethical Off-Planet Cultures now visiting Earth.

---

Furthermore, none of the websites for the petitions mentioned above or below refer to a petition seeking Congressional hearings which appears to have been organised by Stargate International out of Tucson, Arizona. By 1998, it was claimed that over 20,000 signatures had been accumulated for that petition. The petition stated that: "I, the undersigned, petition my Congress to hold in 2001 an open hearing in which government, military, civilian contract and agency employees (active and retired) are permitted to give testimony regarding their personal knowledge of any UFO related evidence, this testimony to be given under immunity by waiver of any applicable security oath or agreement of non-disclosure."

That petition appears to still be on-going and can be found on various websites, including on the website of Stephen Bassett and the Paradigm Research Group at the link below:  
<http://www.paradigmclock.com/therighttopetition.html>

However, no one appears to have updated any of the several copies of that petition on the Internet that individuals are still being urged to sign. The copies of that petition ask Congress to hold hearings in 2001 or 2002, thus requiring Congress to invent a time machine to meet the demands of the petitioners.

Perhaps the new Disclosure UK petition is intended to be directed towards citizens of the UK, rather (unlike the examples given above) than a global audience. However, there is no mention of the petition organised by Steve Watkins on the Alien Existence website (commonly referred to as "the UK UFO Petition"). See: <http://www.alienexistence.com/petition/>

That petition:

1. seeks that the UK Government "engage in a public held forum debate, on National Television, in regard to the subject of Unidentified Flying Objects and Extra Terrestrial Intelligence"
2. "request that full disclosure of all known UFO sightings & cases, including abduction cases across the United Kingdom are made available under the good spirit of the Freedom Of Information Act and partnership working."
3. "seek clarification as to what the 'unknowns' are, secret projects by Government/Military or genuine unknowns".

That petition appears to have over 500 signatures [10]. (I say "appears to have" since, as with all the other petitions - particularly those on the Internet - it is difficult to be confident in the genuine nature of each and every purported signature).

Less surprisingly, there is no reference on the Disclosure UK website (or the websites associated with the other petitions listed above) to the myriad of other petitions on the Internet with a small number of signatures. Summaries are given below of a small sample of such petitions.

(1) 403 Signatures: Addressed to "President of U.S., U.S. Congress, United Nations": "In the Declaration of Cosmic Cooperation, we are stating to the Universe that "we the people" now want space to be a place of peace, that we humans want to be peaceful participants with members of Off Planet Cultures, and that we want to reap the benefits of such relations with them."  
[3]

(2) 29 Signatures: Addressed to "United Nations and Off Planet Intelligence": "... We hereby call upon all intelligences, races, civilizations, governments and every body in power to make way for the universal community of beings and accelerate the interaction and cooperation of intergalactic intelligence by all possible means..." [4]

(3) 45 Signatures: Addressed to the United States Government : "The United States Government is hiding information about UFOs and Aliens. They are unwilling to share this info. This is because they are afraid it will cause chaos among the nation."

Due to the last statement, the Government MUST have valuable information on these topics. We are petitioning the United States Government to release ALL information about UFOs and aliens. This includes all reports, pictures, movies, and ALL actual proof." [5]

(4) 4 Signatures: Addressed to the United States Government : "We, the signed below, are petitioning the United States Government to Release all info about UFOs and alien research. This includes all reports, pictures, movies, and ALL actual proof." [6]

(5) 125 Signatures: "Lets all welcome our ET friends to come down and do first contact!" [7]

(6) 101 Signatures: Addressed to the president of the USA: "The ludicrous cover-ups and deception must end. We have a right to expect some measure of honesty from our elected officials. The events of the times are moving much too rapidly for further delay. If we wish to continue calling ourselves a democracy, we must act now. We, the undersigned, implore you to use all your substancial power and influence to ensure full disclosure of all UFO phenomena." [8]

(7) 8 Signatures: "Aliens DO exist. I have been doing research and found that there have been sightings of glowing orbs that people think are aLIENS." [9]

Footnotes:

[1] Randle, Kevin D in his "The Roswell Encyclopedia" (2000) at pages 146-151 (in an entry entitled "International Roswell Declaration") of the Quill softcover edition.

[2] Klass, Philip J in his "The Real Roswell Crashed-Saucer Coverup" (1997) at 212-214, 216-219 (in Chapter 27) of the Prometheus Books hardback edition.

[3] <http://www.petitiononline.com/tj41776/petition.html>

[4] <http://www.petitiononline.com/cyber1/>

[5] <http://www.petitiononline.com/42187/petition.html>

[6] <http://www.gopetition.com/online/2667.html>

[7] <http://www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/238216295>

[8] [http://www.thepetitionsite.com/archived\\_petitions/629189976.html](http://www.thepetitionsite.com/archived_petitions/629189976.html)

[9] <http://www.petitionspot.com/petitions/aliensarereal>

[10] <http://www.aliensexistence.com/Petition.pdf>

[11] Isaac Koi is a pseudonym, used because the author has no desire for clients or colleagues to know that he has any interest in this subject.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 17:12:59 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 07:47:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Golubik

>From: Steven Kaeser <[steve.nul](mailto:steve.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 08:27:57 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<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.

Agreed, but is there somewhere to take this... a better way?

To me, Roswell has always been about probabilities and not certainties. This case, all cases, simply need to be addressed as a series of pros and cons but with a weight factor assigned to each level of fact and witness. No need to get so wrapped up.

I always look at a case as a way to improve technique and explore theory. If that is available as an offshoot, then it really isn't a waste of time after all. But, by going down the end results pathway as a true or false only, one is left wanting if the emphasis is exclusively over-placed there. There are other more interesting pathways that deserve equal say: Like the method used. If we believe there is something to UFO's, then let's create a workable, yet believable, structure to all investigative courses of action.

All cases need to have:

- 1) Several working hypotheses (stated not assumed)
- 2) A flow chart filter that classifies the event, we should all be able to agree on this...
- 3) An audio/video recording of the interview process
- 4) Present all the pros and cons
- 5) Graph a result based on all factors
- 5) State where you fall on the evidence, but let others have equal access to all the facts as well.

This isn't so hard. Make a universal check sheet, record interviews, present the evidence, classify the event as to it's exoticness as compared to other understood phenomena: airplane-like, meteor-like, plasma-like, etc. Graph the result on a chart: the x-axis can represent the mundane, the y-axis the extraordinary. Depending on where it came out of the filter, graph it there: The farther up and out on the graph, the more extraordinary! However, this doesn't necessarily mean that they're all not of an actual UFO, they could all be! But, we just didn't catch it right on that day... it wasn't showing off enough for us... Oh well? But through time we should see a very strong signal from the application of a consistent approach. Now the whole endeavor isn't wasted at all... each added a dot to the emerging profile... we can all smile at a job well done. Spread the news... use this technique, through that review

board, and everyone can get involved.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## What Are Those Words That Trigger Echelon?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:06:02 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:06:02 -0400  
Subject: What Are Those Words That Trigger Echelon?

Source: The Register - Southport, Lancashire, UK

[http://www.theregister.co.uk/2001/05/31/what\\_are\\_those\\_words/](http://www.theregister.co.uk/2001/05/31/what_are_those_words/)

Thursday 31st May 2001

What Are Those Words That Trigger Echelon?  
We'll tell you

By Kieren McCarthy

Updated According to various UK media sources today, the buzzwords said to trigger the US, UK, Canada, New Zealand spying mechanism Echelon have been "posted on the Internet". We haven't found the file and it hasn't popped up on the authoritative site for these sorts of things, Cryptome.org, so we'd not put too much weight behind it.

However, just for your interest, we give you a quick run-through on what some of the words are.

There are the obvious phrases like "Kill the President" which caused two schoolboys from the UK to be quizzed by special branch, "anarchy", "echelon" :-), "nuclear", "assassinate". Then there are ones that are dodgy (cause they fit in with X-file type paranoia) like "Roswell", "Waco", "World Trade Center", "Soros" - after George Soros, "Whitewater".

Then there are a suspiciously large number of hacker names: Furby, Bugs Bunny, Bubba the Love etc. But just when we thought it was obviously some script-kiddie hoax, a few interesting words crop up:

- \* FRU - the cover name for the SAS in Northern Ireland
- \* Lebed - an ex-Russian general, now a politician
- \* HALO - a type of parachute jump
- \* Spetznaz - the Russian SAS
- \* Al Amn al-Askari - a member of the Iraqi cabinet
- \* Glock 26 - a ceramic handgun that can't be detected by airport scanners (a reader informs us that the Glock 26 is only partly ceramic, the bullets are metal and is can be detected at airports - so we should really shift this one into the X-file list)
- \* Steak Knife - the codename for an IRA double agent

And so on and so forth.

Go through them carefully to satisfy your paranoid fantasies (you'll be safe under the bed, trust us). =AE Update

## What Are Those Words That Trigger Echelon?

We've been sent this list which may or may not be the same as the one that Block Echelon Day used and which has hit papers today. Who knows? (They do). Enjoy

Rewson, SAFE, Waihopai, INFOSEC, ASPIC, MI6, Information Security, SAI, Information Warfare, IW, IS, Privacy, Information Terrorism, Terrorism Defensive Information, Defense Information Warfare, Offensive Information, Offensive Information Warfare, The Artful Dodger, NAIA, SAPM, ASU, ASTS, National Information Infrastructure, InfoSec, SAO, Reno, Compsec, JICS, Computer Terrorism, Firewalls, Secure Internet Connections, RSP, ISS, JDF, Ermes, Passwords, NAAP, DefCon V, RSO, Hackers, Encryption, ASWS, CUN, CISU, CUSI, M.A.R.E., MARE, UFO, IFO, Pacini, Angela, Espionage, USDOJ, NSA, CIA, S/Key, SSL, FBI, Secert Service, USSS, Defcon, Military, White House, Undercover, NCCS, Mayfly, PGP, SALDV, PEM, resta, RSA, Perl-RSA, MSNBC, bet, AOL, AOL TOS, CIS, CBOT, AIMSX, STARLAN, 3B2, BITNET, SAMU, COSMOS, DATTA, Furbys, E911, FCIC, VTCIA, IACIS, UT/RUS, JANET, ram, JICC, ReMOB, LEETAC, UTU, VNET, BRLO, SADCC, NSLEP, SACLANTCEN, FALN, 877, NAVELEXSYSSECENGECEN, BZ, CANSLO, CBNRC, CIDA, JAVA, rsta, Active X, Compsec 97, RENS, LLC, DERA, JIC, rip, rb, Wu, RDI, Mavricks, BIOL, Meta-hackers, ^?, SADT, Steve Case, Tools, RECCEX, Telex, Aldergrove, OTAN, monarchist, NMIC, NIOG, IDB, MID/KL, NADIS, NMI, SEIDM, BNC, CNCIS, STEEPLEBUSH, RG, BSS, DDIS, mixmaster, BCCI, BRGE, Europol, SARL, Military Intelligence, JICA, Scully, recondo, Flame, Infowar, FRU, Bubba, Freeh, Archives, ISADC, CISSP, Sundevil, jack, Investigation, JOTS, ISACA, NCSA, ASVC, spook words, RRF, 1071, Bugs Bunny, Verisign, Secure, ASIO, Lebed, ICE, NRO, Lexis-Nexis, NSCT, SCIF, FLiR, JIC, bce, Lacrosse, Flashbangs, HRT, IRA, EODG, DIA, USCOI, CID, BOP, FINCEN, FLETC, NIJ, ACC, AFSPC, BMDO, site, SASSTIXS, NAVWAN, NRL, RL, NAVWCWPNS, NSWC, USAFA, AHPCRC, ARPA, SARD, LABLINK, USACIL, SAPT, USCG, NRC, ~, O, NSA/CSS, CDC, DOE, SAAM, FMS, HPCC, NTIS, SEL, USCODE, CISE, SIRC, CIM, ISN, DJC, LLNL, bemd, SGC, UNCP CJ, CFC, SABENA, DREO, CDA, SADR, DRA, SHAPE, bird dog, SACLANT, BECCA, DCJFTF, HALO, SC, TA SAS, Lander, GSM, T Branch, AST, SAMCOMM, HAHO, FKS, 868, GCHQ, DITSA, SORT, AMEMB, NSG, HIC, EDI, benelux, SAS, SBS, SAW, UDT, EODC, GOE, DOE, SAMF, GEO, JRB, 3P-HV, Masuda, Forte, AT, GIGN, Exon Shell, radint, MB, CQB, TECS, CONUS, CTU, RCMP, GRU, SASR, GSG-9, 22nd SAS, GEOS, EADA, SART, BBE, STEP, Echelon, Dictionary, MD2, MD4, MDA, diwn, 747, ASIC, 777, RDI, 767, MI5, 737, MI6, 757, Kh-11, EODN, SHS, ^X, Shayet-13, SADMS, Spetznaz, Recce, 707, CIO, NOCS, Halcon, NSS, Duress, RAID, Uziel, wojo, Psyops, SASCOM, grom, NSIRL, D-11, DF, ZARK, SERT, VIP, ARC, S.E.T. Team, NSWG, MP5k, SATKA, DREC, DEVGRP, DSD, FDM, GRU, LRTS, SIGDEV, NACSI, MEU/SOC, PSAC, PTT, RFI, ZL31, SIGDASYS, TDM, SUKLO, Schengen, SUSLO, TELINT, fake, TEXTA, ELF, LF, MF, Mafia, JASSM, CALCM, TLAM, Wipeout, GII, SIW, MEII, C2W, Burns, Tomlinson, Ufologico Nazionale, Centro, CICAP, MIR, Belknap, Tac, rebels, BLU-97 A/B, 007, nowhere.ch, bronze, Rubin, Arnett, BLU, SIGS, VHF, Recon, peapod, PA598D28, Spall, dort, 50MZ, 11Emc Choe, SATCOMA, UHF, The Hague, SHF, ASIO, SASP, WANK, Colonel, domestic disruption, 5ESS, smuggle, Z-200, 15kg, DUVDEVAN, RFX, nitrate, OIR, Pretoria, M-14, enigma, Bletchley Park, Clandestine, NSO, nkvd, argus, afsatcom, CQB, NVD, Counter Terrorism Security, Enemy of the State, SARA, Rapid Reaction, JSOFC3IP, Corporate Security, 192.47.242.7, Baldwin, Wilma, ie.org, cospo.osis.gov, Police, Dateline, Tyrell, KMI, lee, Pod, 9705 Samford Road, 20755-6000, sniper, PPS, ASIS, ASLET, TSCM, Security Consulting, M-x spook, Z-150T, Steak Knife, High Security, Security Evaluation, Electronic Surveillance, MI-17, ISR, NSAS, Counterterrorism, real, spies, IWO, eavesdropping, debugging, CCSS, interception, COCOT, NACSI, rhost, rhosts, ASO, SETA, Amherst, Broadside, Capricorn, NAVCM, Gamma, Gorizont, Guppy, NSS, rita, ISSO, submiss, ASDIC, .tc, 2EME REP, FID, 7NL SBS, tekka, captain, 226, .45, nonac, .li, Tony Poe, MJ-12, JASON, Society, Hmong, Majic, evil, zipgun, tax, bootleg, warez, TRV, ERV, rednoise, mindwar, nailbomb, VLF, ULF, Paperclip, Chatter, MKULTRA, MKDELTA, Bluebird, MKNAOMI, White Yankee, MKSEARCH, 355 ML, Adriatic, Goldman, Ionosphere, Mole, Keyhole, NABS, Kilderkin, Artichoke, Badger, Emerson, Tzvrif, SDIS, T2S2, STTC, DNR, NADDIS, NFLIS, CFD, BLU-114/B, quarter, Cornflower, Daisy, Egret, Iris, JSOTF, Hollyhock, Jasmine, Juile, Vinnell, B.D.M., Sphinx, Stephanie, Reflection, Spoke, Talent, Trump, FX, FXR, IMF, POCSAG, rusers, Covert Video, Intiso, r00t, lock picking, Beyond Hope, LASINT, csystems, .tm, passwd, 2600 Magazine, JUWTF, Competitor, EO, Chan, Pathfinders, SEAL Team 3, JTF, Nash, ISSAA, B61-11, Alouette, executive, Event Security, Mace, Cap-Stun, stakeout, ninja, ASIS, ISA, EOD, Oscor, Tarawa,

## What Are Those Words That Trigger Echelon?

COSMOS-2224, COSTIND, hit word, hitword, Hitwords, Regli, VBS, Leuken-Baden, number key, Zimmerwald, DDPS, GRS, AGT. AMME, ANDVT, Type I, Type II, VFCT, VGPL, WHCA, WSA, WSP, WWABNCP, ZNI1, FSK, FTS2000, GOSIP, GOTS, SACS STU-III, PRF, PMSF, PCMT, I&A, JRSC, ITSDN, Keyer, KG-84C, KWT-46, KWR-46, KY-75, KYV-5, LHR, PARKHILL, LDMX, LEASAT, SNS, SVN, TACSAT, TRANSEC, DONCAF, EAM, DSCS, DSNET1, DSNET2, DSNET3, ECCM, EIP, EKMS, EKMC, DDN, DDP, Merlin, NTT, SL-1, R olm, TIE, Tie-fighter, PBX, SLI, NTT, MSCJ, MIT, 69, RIT, Time, MSEE, Cable & Wireless, CSE, SUW, J2, Embassy, ETA, Porno, Fax, finks, Fax encryption, white noise, Fernspah, MYK, GAFF, forcast, import, rain, tiger, buzzer, N9, pink noise, CRA, M.P.R.I., top secret, Mossberg, 50BMG, Macintosh Security, Macintosh Internet Security, OC3, Macintosh Firewalls, Unix Security, VIP Protection, SIG, sweep, Medco, TRD, TDR, Z, sweeping, SURSAT, 5926, TELINT, Audiotel, Harvard, 1080H, SWS, Asset, Satellite imagery, force, NAIAG, Cypherpunks, NARF, 127, Coderpunks, TRW, remailers, replay, redheads, RX-7, explicit, FLAME, J-6, Pornstars, AVN, Playboy, ISSSP, Anonymous, W, Sex, chaining, codes, Nuclear, 20, subversives, SLIP, toad, fish, data havens, unix, c, a, b, d, SUBACS, the, Elvis, quiche, DES, 1\*, N-ISDN, NLSP, OTAR, OTAT, OTCIXS, MISSI, MOSAIC, NAVCOMPARS, NCTS, NESP, MILSATCOM, AUTODIN, BLACKER, C3I, C4I, CMS, CMW, CP, SBU, SCCN, SITOR, SHF/DOD, Finksburg MD, Link 16, LATA, NATIA, NATOA, sneakers, UXO, (), OC-12, counterintelligence, Shaldag, sport, NASA, TWA, DT, gtegs, nowhere, .ch, hope, emc, industrial espionage, SUPIR, PI, TSCI, spookwords, industrial intelligence, H.N.P., SUAEWICS, Juliett Class Submarine, Locks, qrss, loch, 64 Vauxhall Cross, Ingram Mac-10, wwics, sigvoice, ssa, E.O.D., SEMTEX, penrep, racal, OTP, OSS, Siemens, RPC, Met, CIA-DST, INI, watchers, keebler, contacts, Blowpipe, BTM, CCS, GSA, Kilo Class, squib, primacord, RSP, Z7, Becker, Nerd, fangs, Austin, no|d, Comirex, GPMG, Speakeasy, humint, GEODSS, SORO, M5, BROMURE, ANC, zone, SBI, DSS, S.A.I.C., Minox, Keyhole, SAR, Rand Corporation, Starr, Wackenhutt, EO, burhop, Wackendude, mol, Shelton, 2E781, F-22, 2010, JCET, cocaine, Vale, IG, Kosovo, Dake, 36,800, Hillal, Pesec, Hindawi, GGL, NAICC, CTU, botux, Virii, CCC, ISPE, CCSC, Scud, SecDef, Magdeyev, VOA, Kosiura, Small Pox, Tajik, +=3D, Blacklisted 411, TRDL, Internet Underground, BX, XS4ALL, wetsu, muezzin, Retinal Fetish, WIR, Fetish, FCA, Yobie, forschung, emm, ANZUS, Reprieve, NZC-332, edition, cards, mania, 701, CTP, CATO, Phon-e, Chicago Posse, NSDM, l0ck, beanpole, spook, keywords, QRR, PLA, TDYC, W3, CUD, CdC, Weekly World News, Zen, World Domination, Dead, GRU, M72750, Salsa, 7, Blowfish, Gorelick, Glock, Ft. Meade, NSWT, press- release, WISDIM, burned, Indigo, wire transfer, e-cash, Bubba the Love Sponge, Enforcers, Digicash, zip, SWAT, Ortega, PPP, NACSE, crypto-anarchy, AT&T, SGI, SUN, MCI, Blacknet, ISM, JCE, Middleman, KLM, Blackbird, NSV, GQ360, X400, Texas, jihad, SDI, BRIGAND, Uzi, Fort Meade, \*&, gchq.gov.uk, supercomputer, bullion, 3, NTT, Blackmednet, :, Propaganda, ABC, Satellite phones, IWIS, Planet-1, ISTA, rs9512c, Jiang Zemin, South Africa, Sergeev, Montenegro, Toeffler, Rebollo, sorot, Yucca Mountain, FARC, Toth, Xu Yongyue, Bach, Razor, AC, cryptanalysis, nuclear, 52 52 N - 03 03 W, Morgan, Canine, GEBA, INSCOM, MEMEX, Stanley, FBI, Panama, fissionable, Sears Tower, NORAD, Delta Force, SEAL, virtual, WASS, WID, Dolch, secure shell, screws, Black-Ops, O/S, Area51, SABC, basement, ISWG, \$@, data-haven, NSDD, black-bag, rack, TEMPEST, Goodwin, rebels, ID, MD5, IDEA, garbage, market, beef, Stego, ISAF, unclassified, Sayeret Tzanhanim, PARASAR, Gripan, pigr, curly, Taiwan, guest, utopia, NSG, orthodox, CCSQ, Alica, SHA, Global, gorilla, Bob, UNSCOM, Fukuyama, Manfurov, Kvashnin, Marx, Abdurahmon, nullen, Pseudonyms, MITM, NARF, Gray Data, VLSI, mega, Leitrim, Yakima, NSES, Sugar Grove, WAS, Cowboy, Gist, 8182, Gatt, Platform, 1911, Geraldton, UKUSA, veggie, XM, Parvus, NAVSVS, 3848, Morwenstow, Consul, Oratory, Pine Gap, Menwith, Mantis, DSD, BVD, 1984, blow out, BUDS, WQC, Flintlock, PABX, Electron, Chicago Crust, e95, DDR&E, 3M, KEDO, iButton, Rl, erco, Toffler, FAS, RHL, K3, Visa/BCC, SNT, Ceridian, STE, condor, CipherTAC-2000, Etacs, Shipiro, ssor, piz, fritz, KY, 32, Edens, Kiwis, Kamumaruha, DODIG, Firefly, HRM, Albright, Bellcore, rail, csim, NMS, 2c, FIPS140-1, CAVE, E-Bomb, CDMA, Fortezza, 355ml, ISSC, cybercash, NAWAS, government, NSY, hate, speedbump, joe, illuminati, BOSS, Kourou, Misawa, Morse, HF, P415, ladylove, filofax, Gulf, lamma, Unit 5707, Sayeret Mat Kal, Unit 669, Sayeret Golani, Lanceros, Summercon, NSADS, president, ISFR, freedom, ISSO, walburn, Defcon VI, DC6, Larson, P99, HERF pipe-bomb, 2.3 Oz., cocaine, \$, imapct, Roswell, ESN, COS, E.T., credit card, b9, fraud, ST1, assassinate, virus, ISCS, ISPR, anarchy, rogue, mailbomb, 888, Chelsea, 1997, Whitewater, MOD, York, plutonium, William Gates,



clone, BATF, SGDN, Nike, WWSV, Atlas, IWWSVCS, Delta, TWA, Kiwi, PGP 2.6.2., PGP 5.0i, PGP 5.1, siliconpimp, SASSTIXS, IWG, Lynch, 414, Face, Pixar, IRIDF, NSRB, eternity server, Skytel, Yukon, Templeton, Johohonbu, LUK, Cohiba, Soros, Standford, niche, ISEP, ISEC, 51, H&K, USP, ^, sardine, bank, EUB, USP, PCS, NRO, Red Cell, NSOF, DC7, Glock 26, snuffle, Patel, package, ISI, INR, INS, GRU, RUOP, GSS, NSP, SRI, Ronco, Armani, BOSS, Chobetsu, FBIS, BND, SISDE, FSB, BfV, IB, froglegs, JITEM, SADF, advise, TUSA, LITE, PKK, HoHoCon, SISMI, ISG, FIS, MSW, Spyderco, UOP, SSCI, NIMA, HAMASMOIS, SVR, SIN, advisors, SAP, Monica, OAU, PFS, Aladdin, AG, chameleon man, Hutsul, CESID, Bess, rail gun, .375, Peering, CSC, Tangimoana Beach, Commecen, Vanuatu, Kwajalein, LHI, DRM, GSGI, DST, MITI, JERTO, SDF, Koancho, Blenheim, Rivera, Kyudanki, varon, 310, 17, 312, NB, CBM, CTP, Sardine, SBIRS, jaws, SGDN, ADIU, DEADBEEF, IDP, IDF, Halibut, SONANGOL, Flu, &, Loin, PGP 5.53, meta, Faber, SFPD, EG&G, ISEP, blackjack, Fox, Aum, AIEWS, AMW, RHL, Baranyi, WORM, MP5K-SD, 1071, WINGS, cdi, VIA, DynCorp, UXO, Ti, WWSP, WID, osco, Mary, honor, Templar, THAAD, package, CISD, ISG, BIOLWPN, JRA, ISB, ISDS, chosen, LBSD, van, schloss, secops, DCSS, DPSD, LIF, J-Star, PRIME, SURVIAC, telex, Analyzer, embassy, Golf, B61-7, Maple, Tokyo, ERR, SBU, Threat, JPL, Tess, SE, Alex, EPL, SPINTCOM, FOUO, ISS-ADP, Merv, Mexico, SUR, blocks, SO13, Rojdykarna, RSOC, USS Banner, S511, 20755, airframe, jya.com, Furby, PECSENC, football, Agfa, 3210, Crowell, moore, 510, OADR, Smith, toffee, FIS, N5P6, EuroFed, SP4, shelter, Crypto AG Croatian nuclear FBI colonel plutonium Ortega Waco, Texas Panama CIA DES jihad fissionable quiche terrorist World Trade Center assassination DES NORAD Delta Force Waco, Texas SDI explosion Serbian Panama Uzi Ft. Meade SEAL Team 6 Honduras PLO NSA terrorist Ft. Meade strategic supercomputer \$400 million in gold bullion quiche Honduras BATF colonel Treasury domestic disruption SEAL Team 6 class struggle smuggle M55 M51 Physical Security Division Room 2A0120, OPS 2A building 688-6911(b), 963-3371(s). Security Awareness Division (M56) Field Security Division (M52) Al Amn al-Askari Supreme Assembly of the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SAIRI) Binnenlandse Veiligheidsdienst Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti Federalnaia sluzhba besopasnosti GCHQ MI5 Kill the president

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena

'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:11:40 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:11:40 -0400  
Subject: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

Source: Sploid.Com - Budapest, Hungary

[http://www.sploid.com/news/2006/05/drops\\_of\\_alien\\_1.php](http://www.sploid.com/news/2006/05/drops_of_alien_1.php)

May 31, 2006

'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

[They call them fingers, but I've never seen them fing!]

In the summer of 2001, a blood-colored rain fell across India. If that wasn't spooky enough, now some scientists think that the red ooze may in fact be alien life.

The astounding claim was made in the April issue of the prestigious peer-reviewed journal *Astrophysics and Space Science*, in a paper authored by solid-state physicist Godfrey Louis, of Mahatma Gandhi University. Louis analyzed some samples of the red rain, and was amazed to find strange, thick-walled, red-tinted cell-like structures mixed with the water.

But what makes Louis think that these structures could be alien? In his analysis, he found that the particles lack DNA, but still seem to reproduce plentifully - even when heated to 600=CB=9AF. The known upper limit for life in water is about 250=CB=9AF, and life on Earth is generally thought to require DNA to reproduce.

Louis thinks the particles could be extraterrestrial bacteria that hitched a ride on a comet or meteorite, breaking apart in the upper atmosphere and mixing with rain clouds above India.

Skeptics suggest other origins for the blood rain. An Indian government investigation has said that algae is most likely to blame, while other theories suggest red dust from the Arabian peninsula, or even actual blood produced by a meteor striking a high-flying flock of bats. It may sound far-fetched, but something similar has happened before.

But Louis says his analysis already excludes these theories. He is consulting with noted astronomer Chandra Wickramasinghe, who co-authored the modern theory of panspermia - which suggests that life on Earth was originally seeded via bacteria-carrying space rocks - some twenty-five years ago. "If it's true that life was introduced by comets four billion years ago," says Wickramasinghe, "one would expect that microorganisms are still injected into our environment from time to time. This could be one of those events."

Louis says he isn't out to create headline news with his results. "I would be most happy to accept a simpler explanation," he says. "But," he adds, "I cannot find any."

[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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## What If Life On Earth Did Not Begin On Earth?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:15:13 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:15:13 -0400  
Subject: What If Life On Earth Did Not Begin On Earth?

Source: Science & Theology - Quincy, Massachusetts, USA

<http://www.stnews.org/News-2846.htm>

June 1, 2006

What If Life On Earth Did Not Begin On Earth?

The hypothesis that life on Earth began elsewhere received support from an unlikely source: the Columbia tragedy

By William Orem

Judeo-Christian tradition has long maintained that the dizzying variety of life forms found on our planet are the result of a special moment of Genesis. From this initial premise, theologians, philosophers and now modern scientists have branched out, arguing for a single act of creation on a young Earth, an ongoing process of molecular evolution begun some four billion years ago with replicating nucleic acids and a multitude of intermediate positions.

What has not been at contention in the majority of these debates has been the premise itself: that life on Earth began on Earth.

This is precisely a point that needs to be considered, say contemporary advocates of a hypothesis known as "panspermia." In its broadest iteration, panspermia is the proposal that life exists throughout the cosmos. As simple speculation, it has a pedigree dating as far back as 500 B.C. with the Greek philosopher Anaxagoras and makes connections with such luminaries as Giordano Bruno, the ex-Dominican astronomer put to death by the Inquisition partly for suggesting that the sky may be full of populated worlds.

One need not posit highly evolved forms, however, to subscribe to the panspermia hypothesis. Indeed, scientists who take panspermia seriously today are more concerned with a humbler expression of life: bacteria.

"As a group, microorganisms are probably the hardiest of any life forms on Earth," said Robert McLean, a biologist at Texas State University-San Marcos, who has collaborated with NASA to have microbiology experiments performed on the space shuttle. He said his sense of the fledgling science of astrobiology is that "the vast majority of it is going toward microorganisms."

McLean is interested in biofilm formation. In particular he wanted to know how planktonic and surface-adhering bacterial populations would interact in microgravity conditions. This information has implications for the future of space travel, in which the filtration of water will be critical. In a paper published in the January edition of *Icarus*, the International Journal of Solar System Studies, McLean describes how he selected three strains =97 *C. violaceum*, *P. aeruginosa* and *E.coli* =97

to ride on the space shuttle Columbia in 2003.

"I think there were 70 to 80 experiments total on the flight," McLean said. "The Columbia was slanted more toward scientific work. That was its primary responsibility."

On the morning of Feb. 1, 2003, McLean received the news that broke the nation's heart. Columbia had disintegrated on re-entry, its left wing seal damaged by the now-infamous dislodged foam. All hands, with their complement of scientific data, were lost.

#### Exogenesis hypothesis

Under the general rubric of panspermia lies exogenesis, a more modest, and perhaps more testable, hypothesis. In its simplest form, exogenesis is the proposition that life did not begin on Earth but elsewhere in the stellar region.

One likely candidate would be neighboring Mars, where oceans are now believed to have existed as recently as several million years ago. At some point, basic, self-replicating organisms were then transferred to this planet, explaining the surprisingly small window between when the geological record dates Earth's formation and when the Precambrian fossil record dates the first appearance of life.

The mechanism by which that transfer of microbes could take place is meteorites. A collision of a large enough meteorite impactor with a planetary surface sends up clouds of debris. Retained by the gravitational field, the ejecta may rain back down or stay aloft to form rings or moons. At escape velocity, however, nonvaporized chunks sail away, bound for empty space. In rare instances, they may eventually come within the gravitational fields of other planets or moons. Perhaps, as exogenesis suggests, such newly born asteroids could be bearing travelers.

A couple of days after the Columbia disaster, McLean got a call.

"One of the people who had an experiment [on Columbia] happened to get on The New York Times Web site and saw a picture of some shuttle debris that looked like our payload," he said. A long-shot idea struck him. Why not test the apparatus for bacteria?

"There was some liquid that survived in the payload. I pulled that out and tried to culture stuff from that and also flushed various sample cells with sterile medium," McLean said. All three of the bacterial strains he had sent aloft had been wiped out by Columbia's re-entry, during which temperatures peaked at more than 1750 C. But after a week or so he noticed something peculiar in the incubator.

"In one of the cells that I flushed I eventually found a very slow-growing organism," he said.

The unexpected survivor was a new bacterial strain known as *Microbispora*. While not common, it is by no means extraterrestrial. *Microbispora* is found in the Earth's soil.

"The scientific weakness of this is we don't absolutely know where it came from," McLean said. "But I did do controls when I collected the samples to make sure I wasn't introducing anything on the site. Those were totally clean. None of the solutions I took down to Florida were contaminated at all, so I was not introducing anything."

The remaining option, which McLean calls his "best guess," is that the *Microbispora* infiltration occurred before liftoff. If so, the Columbia crash inadvertently demonstrated the feasibility of a claim that exogenesis critics and panspermia detractors in general have found implausible. It showed that some bacteria can survive the extreme stresses that would be involved in meteorite entry and impact.

#### Macroscopic survival

McLean was not the only researcher to be surprised. NASA astrobiologist Catharine Conley works at NASA's Ames Research Center in Moffett Field, Calif. She had sent up a live population of nematodes with Columbia. Nematodes are a species

of worm, each roughly the size of the period at the end of this sentence. Conley was using them to conduct a study on bone density disturbances that occur in microgravity, again with a view toward reducing the risk associated with long-term space assignments.

When Columbia broke apart, Conley=92s six canisters of worms were scattered in midair and subjected individually to the re-entry burn and impact force. Five canisters were eventually recovered. All five still had live populations inside.

"Certainly the recovery of vital organisms has completely changed my opinion of what we might expect to find in the solar system," Conley said. She said her thinking about panspermia has been affected by her finding, and the thesis now seems more compelling.

"There has been life on Earth for three or three-and-a-half billion years," Conley said. "There have certainly been a large number of big things that have hit the Earth and blasted rocks off the Earth in that three-plus billion years."

"The more I think about it now, it seems the more likely that there have been so many rocks with live organisms [in them] when they left the Earth floating around the solar system that it would be surprising to me if there weren=92t living organisms in places that were hospitable to life," she said.

Indeed, a massive computer modeling study just completed at the University of British Columbia and presented in March at the Lunar and Planetary Science Conference in Texas has made it apparent just how far-ranging these travels may be. In it, a research team simulated a massive Earth strike on the order of the impactor that is believed to have formed the Chicxulub crater 65 million years ago. Their model tracked the debris paths of millions of ejected fragments and found that potentially life-sustaining sites as far a way as Europa and Titan (moons of Jupiter and Saturn, respectively) were eventually hit.

Even some organisms as large as nematodes would be able to survive such an abrupt ejection into space, Conley said.

"The acceleration forces to get to escape velocity for a meteorite turn out to be not that high," Conley said. "If it=92s a big impactor, it will take a long time to penetrate. It=92s more the mass transfer that=92s actually going to be forcing the smaller rocks off the planet." And nematodes routinely survive experimental force conditions of 2,000 Gs or higher. The hard part, she said, is surviving space =97 the university model predicted a transit time of millions of years for the Jovian moons, well beyond the conceivable survival range of even frozen nematodes =97 and surviving the new environment when it arrives. In that respect, she said microorganisms are more plausible candidates.

"What you really want is something that can make its own food," Conley said. "In that case, you=92re looking for something like a cyanobacteria that make food from light, or one of these hydrogen sulfide metabolizers that=92s able to get food from rocks. Or you want something like a lichen, that can both make food from light and also fix nitrogen."

Such an organism might be able to survive the long haul between worlds and set up shop in a variety of locations. "If I were looking for life on another planet, I would go looking for a lichen," Conley said.

#### Natural carriers

Max Wallis, Honorary Research Fellow at the Cardiff Centre for Astrobiology in Wales, has a different mechanism for long-distance transport in mind. That mechanism is a comet.

"Asteroids are pretty dead," he said. He added, however, that microorganisms are already known to survive in the extreme conditions of the poles. "Comets have the water and carbon, and it=92s very accessible. Certainly as an environment for living organisms they=92re very much like the Antarctic."

In an article published in Nature in 1980, Wallis showed that,

despite the popular image of comets as dirty snowballs, some may house liquid cores. Six years later, as a member of the European team that sent the Giotto probe to study Halley=92s comet, Wallis recognized that the structured surface and gas jets revealed a more complex comet structure than had previously been assumed. He said he suspects some versions of that complexity could operate like natural traveling containers. And because of the gravitational perturbations of Jupiter, comets in the Kuiper belt are, on occasion, swung out of the solar system entirely.

"I think comets can form an environment in their interior in which elementary life can replicate, survive and travel in a sheltered environment to another stellar system," Wallis said.

The "bombardment periods" of planetary formation would still play a critical role. In this model, a good-sized impactor of the type that were 100 times more frequent in the young solar system would send a population of microorganisms into space, where some would eventually be collected by passing comets. The collection process would be simply mechanical, akin to the way your hair collects airborne particles as you walk through a room full of smokers.

"It=92s basically only the elementary life form =97 the DNA =97 but that=92s the difficulty in starting life," Wallis said. "Once you=92re seeded with life going by in a comet, it would proceed just the way life has evolved on the Earth."

Wallis said that the natural tendency of comets to begin outgassing in the proximity of stars may serve to litter the orbital path with organic material that then can rain down on whatever environments are nearby. This type of seeding =97 not just from planet to planet but from star to star =97 would be true panspermia.

"There is a growing body of evidence to support the idea that life did not originate on the Earth," said Chandra Wickramasinghe, director of the Cardiff Centre and a major proponent of the panspermia hypothesis.

"The Earth just happened to be one of innumerable planets that came to be drenched with these cosmic genes, and evolution proceeded to piece the genes together as time progressed, subject, of course, to the criterion that the fittest assemblages are always the most likely to survive," he said.

At his earthbound lab in Texas, however, McLean urges caution.

"I=92d like to believe that it=92s true," he said when considering the possibility of extraterrestrial life of any sort. "But I=92m mindful of a saying by Carl Sagan that extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. What we=92re reporting is just a really small piece of the puzzle."

William Orem is science editor at Science & Theology News.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

### MSNBC's Rita Cosby Show

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 1 Jun 2006 09:03:53 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 21:16:43 -0400  
Subject: MSNBC's Rita Cosby Show

Some of you may have caught the Rita Cosby Show last night on MSNBC between 10 and 11 PM EST.

I was on along with Peter Davenport and Mike Luckman as panel of commentators.

The apparent reason for the show was to promote Aykroyd's new "Unplugged" video produced by David Sereda. I was called late yesterday morning by the MSNBC producer and asked to appear as the panel commenting on the UFO subject in general.

The show began with several minutes of conversation between Cosby and Aykroyd. At first Aykroyd seemed, to me, to act somewhat nervous or as if pressed for time or perhaps as if he didn't really want to be doing this show. But gradually he warmed to it. He got some good statements in while they showed clips of "real" UFOs mixed with clips his Ghost Busters and Coneheads, etc. shows and other movies such as ET.

He ended by saying that his video was entertaining, and that seemed to be the point of the video, entertainment. Would have been nice if he had added "educational" as well.

(I haven't seen the video so I don't know how educational it is.)

Then Rita turned to the panel of commentators for 6 minutes of banter while the videos and photos they showed in the background were 'all over the map'. I saw portions of the FLIR video from Mexico over and over (this section of the Mexican DOD sighting is probably ground lights, at least the Mexican AF hasn't reported on any experiments or data that would prove otherwise) and a Meier photo and other videos, etc., that are questionable.

These were all presented with no direct commentary on the videos/photos, so I suppose the general public was given the impression that these all were True UFOs, with the term UFO clearly identified with ET craft.

Davenport and Luckman provided some interesting information and Rita was particularly interested in the sightings by famous entertainers (Elvis, Lennon, etc.)

I didn't get to say much, but I did mention the FBI documents and I did answer that now age-old question "who ya gonna call?" when I gave out the MUFON web page address ([mufon.com](http://mufon.com)).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)



## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## UFO History Takes A Beating

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 22:06:19 +0000  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 21:23:26 -0400  
Subject: UFO History Takes A Beating

Quite a few recent posts have raised questions about important or classic UFO cases of the past from an extremely naive and uninformed viewpoint. Like re-inventing the wheel, or being doomed to repeat the mistakes of history because of not studying the historical record.

I began publishing the Journal of UFO History 2-plus years ago, but not all that many people seem to be interested compared to those who dote on Area 51, animal mutilations, the Bermuda Triangle, Roswell, and all those other sensational, folkloric, and highly speculative aspects often having no real-world connection with the UFO mystery at all.

Subscribe and learn, folks!

See:

[www.hallrichard.com](http://www.hallrichard.com)

Hallmart page.

There is a world of information out there that you need to bone up on. Check out Larry W. Bryant's review of the Journal of UFO History in the June 2006 issue of UFO Magazine. He is a charter subscriber. He and I disagree on 'Exopolitics' so I particularly appreciate his praise of the Journal.

Above all, I like his comment that due to my previous published columns for MUFON and UFO Magazine, "we all know and appreciate Dick's persona as a walking Swiss army knife, able to cut through mountains of ufological BS within a millisecond."

That - i.e., my long experience and extensive knowledge of the UFO field - is what informed my quick dismissal of the Condign report, not some sort of arrogance or superiority complex as some relatively new people seem to think.

Despite our desires and wishful thinking, there is no simple, glib, 100% accurate interpretation of what is going on and what it all means. One needs to gather and study data carefully, consider the views of knowledgeable and experienced people, and always be willing to reconsider on the basis of new evidence.

But, if you ignore the investigations by skilled and competent people that have gone before, you are being arrogant and dismissive.

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## Is SETI A Religion?

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 20:36:19 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 21:27:10 -0400  
Subject: Is SETI A Religion?

Thought this might be of interest.

Don

-----

Source: Space.Com - New York, New York, USA

[http://www.space.com/searchforlife/seti\\_religion\\_060601.html](http://www.space.com/searchforlife/seti_religion_060601.html)

01 June 2006

Of Faith And Facts: Is SETI A Religion?

By David Darling  
SETI Institute

Is SETI=97the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence=97a religion?  
This is one of the topics that Jill Tarter, Director of the Center for SETI Research at the SETI Institute, and I discussed on "Are We Alone?", the SETI Institute's weekly radio program on Wednesday May 17.

The discussion by Jill and I was in response to a claim made by George Basalla (professor emeritus of history at the University of Delaware) in his book *Civilized Life in the Universe* (Oxford University Press: 2006) that SETI is more of a faith-based enterprise than a genuine science. He points to SETI's failure to make "contact" after more than forty years of trying and its continuing efforts in the absence of any positive evidence as a sign that it relies more on a kind of religious zeal than anything else. (Incidentally, Basalla was invited to appear on the show but declined.)

Needless to say, Jill Tarter is less than impressed by this argument, as indeed am I. Firstly we know that there's intelligence in the universe. As I pointed out on the show there are dolphins and great apes. And you might even throw *Homo sapiens* into that mix on the rare occasions when we live up to our self-proclaimed species name. It isn't an unreasonable hypothesis that if intelligence has come about on one planet that it may also have arisen elsewhere, especially given the vast number of stars in this and other galaxies. SETI serves as a test of that hypothesis. But beyond that it's one of our noblest and most exciting scientific quests: to discover if we are alone and represent the high-water mark of intelligence and technology in the cosmos or, alternatively, if we're simply one member of a community of minded races, many of them perhaps vastly more ancient and advanced than ourselves.

Religions are characterized by two factors: worship=97in other words, some system of devotion directed toward one or more omniscient and supranatural beings=97and faith in the absence of material evidence. SETI qualifies as a religion on neither of these counts. Unless I'm very much mistaken no SETI researcher

offers prayers to the subject of his or her quest (although it would be fascinating to know what spiritual traditions might have grown up among the civilizations of other stars). And any faith that's involved in SETI is only the kind of non-religious "faith" that any scientist adheres to—faith in the scientific method, the equipment she uses, the all-important peer review process, and so on. As I've mentioned, we already have material evidence for intelligence in the universe: it consists of the brains you're using right now to assimilate these thoughts. Unlike a religion which relies on pure faith that a god exists, we don't need faith that intelligence and technology exist.

To address Basalla's argument, that it's time for SETI advocates to lower their expectations and even admit they may be on a wild goose chase, I'd like to point to a parallel with the search for extrasolar planets - worlds that are in orbit around other stars. Until quite recently we had no evidence for planets beyond our own solar system; it was simply a hypothesis, like the hypothesis that there may be ETI. The practical search for extrasolar worlds kicked off back in the 1930s with the pioneering work of the Dutch-American astronomer Peter Van der Kamp. Although he collected data that seemed to suggest there were worlds in orbit around Barnard's Star and a few other nearby stars, this evidence proved to be unfounded (some of it due to tiny systematic wobbles in the telescope he was using). Only in the 1990s, sixty years after Van der Kamp began his investigations, did scientists find conclusive proof that there are other planets out there. Over the past decade or so, more than 180 extrasolar planets have been found.

If we were to follow Basalla's line of reasoning, the search for extrasolar planets also qualifies as a kind of religion. Shouldn't we simply have given up after four decades of looking? Surely that's enough time to have found something if it really existed? Isn't continuing beyond that a sign of misplaced faith and over-optimism? Fortunately the quest did go on and we're now reaping the rewards—new planets by the bucket-load.

Historically, the question of whether extrasolar planets existed and, if they did, how common they were and what they might be like, finds an interesting parallel with the central issues in SETI. There used to be two big theories about the origin of the planets in the solar system. One of these was called the catastrophic hypothesis.

It suggested that the planets had formed in the aftermath of a near collision between the Sun and another star from a swathe of gas ripped out of the Sun by the stellar intruder. If this were the case then planetary systems could be expected to be very rare because such close encounters between stars almost never happen. The rival theory of planet formation was the nebular hypothesis which argued that the planets of the solar system coalesced from a cloud of gas and dust left over from when the Sun was formed. The nebular hypothesis suggested that the birth of planets might be a routine business throughout the universe. Of course, this is the theory, in updated form, that astronomers believe in today and the discovery of numerous other planets is good confirmation of it.

The parallel debate going on in SETI and astrobiology concerns how often primitive life, such as bacteria, serves as the precursor of complex, multicellular life, and, ultimately, advanced intelligence. Supporters of the "Rare Earth" hypothesis think that it happens only very, very rarely. Others, including myself, think that intelligence offers a big survival advantage and that it will come about whenever it's given a reasonable chance. SETI is a first step towards resolving this issue. But it still has a very long way to go. Forecasting how intelligence will evolve is a hazardous business. We don't have much to go on. What we do know is that as soon as high technology takes hold, evolution is fantastically rapid and virtually unpredictable. Does anyone have a clue how the Internet or genetic engineering are going to develop over the next 10, 20, or 50 years? How about the next million years?

SETI researchers know their limitations. They're restricted at present to searching for radio and optical signals—our own best, fastest means of getting messages across interstellar distance. Who knows what our galactic elders, if they exist, may be using to communicate with? We have no idea what is out there or what forms alien intelligence may take. We are, as Seth Shostak

pointed out during the radio interview, like Columbus sailing into uncharted waters. We don't know what we'll find. But the quest is extraordinary, exciting, abundantly worthwhile, and true to the methodology and spirit of science.

[http://www.space.com/searchforlife/seti\\_religion\\_060601.html](http://www.space.com/searchforlife/seti_religion_060601.html)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

## Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 1 Jun 2006 20:18:44 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 21:28:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore - Clark

>From: Nigel Watson <[nigelwatson1.nul](mailto:nigelwatson1.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 18:46:52 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>From: Nigel Watson <[nigelwatson1.nul](mailto:nigelwatson1.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tues. 30 May 2006  
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>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?

I believe I've addressed this question more than once now,  
Nigel. Think two words: "disbelief tradition."

Jerry Clark

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## British Researcher Pete Smith Passes

From: Dave Sadler <[sadler\\_dave.nul](mailto:sadler_dave.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 09:47:44 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 09:33:01 -0400  
Subject: British Researcher Pete Smith Passes

It is with deep regret that I must announce the death of a great friend and colleague from within our Ufological community in the UK.

Pete Smith, formally of the Bolton UFO group, and his own skywatch group Aurora, passed away last night after many months of illness from Leukaemia.

Pete was a keen supporter of local ufology, always an attendee at conferences, and a participant in Aurora's own, and other Skywatches countrywide.

Pete had a wealth of Ufological knowledge, and it was always pleasant to talk UFOs with him.

I was my honour to share time with Pete and a pleasure to have his friendship.

Anybody who knew Pete or would like to attend his funeral can contact me direct for more details.

Dave Sadler  
<http://www.upia.co.uk>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 10:09:14 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 10:09:14 -0400  
Subject: Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know

Source: Las Vegas Weekly - Nevada, USA

<http://www.lasvegasweekly.com/2006/06/01/feature2.html>

June 1st 2006

Whatever They're Hiding, I'd Like to Know What It Is

Memorial Day at Area 51

By Skytaire Alfvegren

"Insanity runs rampant here," Sharon tells me with a sassy smirk, the kind small-town waitresses develop after years of pouring coffee for bikers, truckers and other highway bandits making a pit stop off the interstate.

But Sharon's greasy spoon=97the infamous Little A 'Le' Inn of Rachel, Nevada=97plays host to characters more colorful than your standard highway travellers. Scrubby and beyond desolate, Rachel sits about 150 miles north of Las Vegas off Interstate 375. Rechristened the "Extraterrestrial Highway" in 1996 in an effort to lure tourists to this real-life twilight zone, the permanent population, inhabiting helter-skelter trailer encampments and a half-dozen homes, has yet to exceed 100. And residents like it that way.

The population roughly doubled this past weekend, when "truth seekers" from as far afield as New York, Florida and Iowa gathered for the annual Memorial Day UFO/Friendship Campout, which Boise, Idaho, resident Ike Bishop has been organizing since 2002.

In 1955, Groom Dry Lake was chosen as a test site for Lockheed's super-secret U-2 spy plane. First dubbed "The Ranch," and then Watertown (named after former CIA director Allen Dulles' New York hometown), the Atomic Energy Commission later renamed the secret aircraft testing facility Area 51.

An entire mythology has grown up around Area 51 (also known as Dreamland, the airspace code name for the site), a 6-by-10 mile "operating location" adjacent to the Nellis Test Range and overseen by the U.S. Air Force. Its runway, the longest on Earth, has been the testing ground for spy planes like the U-2, SR71 and B-2 Stealth Bomber.

Rumors that the "secret" base was used as a storage space for crashed UFOs, and where alien technology has been "back-engineered" and applied to military aircraft circulated for years before Las Vegas Bob Lazar made the claim on local television that he tinkered with alien spacecraft at Papoose Lake, a dry lake bed located south of the Groom Lake facility. Lazar referred to the location as S4. Area 51, hidden behind a range of impenetrable mountains, lies some 25 miles south of Rachel.

Bishop lived in Las Vegas for 29 years, where he worked as a private investigator. He left in 1989, the same year Lazar's claims began luring the curious out to the Little A 'Le' Inn. "A lot of interesting things are going on out here," Bishop says. "I'm using my background as a private investigator to see if I can help uncover some of the facts, some of the truth, about what's going on."

Some 70 attendees filed into the Rachel Senior Center to take in lectures with titles like "The ABCs of ETs" and "Scrutinizing Roswell, Area 51, Underground Bases and Pyramids." But the highlight of Bishop's conference is the nightly "skywatch." After dusk, those gathered bundle up against the chilly desert wind and point their binoculars in the direction of the mysterious base.

"I have spent a lot of time in the past in the desert, watching what goes on, and I do know that if you want to see anything, you can't go out during these events expecting to see the latest and greatest," remarked Rachel resident Bill Whiffen. "You need to spend a lot of nights in a row, waiting them out, with binoculars and cameras and a lot of patience. And you've got to stay up all night, because I've had sightings ranging from dusk to 4 a.m."

"It's crazy here from the end of April until the end of November," says my waitress. Rachel plays host to a number of non-Area 51-related events every year. It's a pit stop for The Great Race (featuring vintage cars motoring from Philadelphia to San Rafael, California) and well as the TSCO "Vegas to Reno," the longest off-road race in the United States.

But Rachel's biggest bang, sky-wise, occurs during Red Flag training exercises, when pilots from all over the world come to participate in mock combat training within the Nellis complex. Held over a period of weeks, aviation buffs and UFO enthusiasts alike converge on Rachel to watch the show. "If you have a scanner with the proper channels, you can often hear a voice saying 'That over there=97doesn't exist' in reference to Area 51," Whiffen says. (The next Red Flag events are scheduled for August 5th to September 2nd).

"My interest piqued down here when I came for a Red Flag exercise two years ago and got a glimpse of the black triangle," Bishop tells me. (Impossibly gigantic, black triangle-shaped craft were first reported over European skies, and gradually made their way west=97they have been reported over the skies of Southern Nevada since the 1990s.) "It was a HUGE craft. We saw it three nights in a row and got it on video. It had no sound, and the craft itself was about a half-mile across. I used the mountain peaks that it came through as reference points.

"I don't believe=97knowing what I know about black projects=97that we have that kind of technology," Bishop continues. "Our technology has expanded so greatly and so rapidly over the past 20, 30 years, but I don't think its expanded fast enough to encompass the technology that the black triangle has. But I've seen it; I've seen it operate, I've seen it turn sideways, and I watched it float for over 45 minutes, which is a long time for a sighting."

"American military technology is 50 years ahead at any given time," says Whiffen. "I've been telling people for 10 years that what I've seen out here is going to be common aircraft a few decades from now."

There are two opposing camps who make Rachel a destination: they intersected on Memorial Day weekend, as Area 51 celebrated its Golden Anniversary. Dozens of campers came out for the one-time Dreamland Resort event, celebrating terrestrial technology and good old-fashioned American know-how.

German-born Joerg Arnu, a clean-cut computer programmer based in Las Vegas, runs Dreamlandresort.com, the premier website for those interested in the militaristic side of Area 51. "Our group is not interested in UFO stories. We feel that we have more than enough real evidence that whatever goes on at Area 51 has nothing to do with ETs, but is in fact R&D for new defense systems, mostly aircraft and anti-aircraft related," Arnu says. "Due to the nature of tests out there, it is only natural that occasionally some tourists or locals catch a glimpse of a test

flight or a new top-secret jet, and begin to talk about it. What better way to hide the real deal than to muddy the waters with stories about UFOs and alien autopsies at Area 51."

"My main interest is to bring like minds together," Bishop says, as he stacks folding chairs into the Rachel Senior Center. "I don't really hang my hat on any particular thing unless I'm able to prove it. I'm from Missouri=97I've got to see it to believe it. And my scientific background makes me want to prove these things. My position is that I'm merely looking for the truth. I just returned from the boundary line [of the base], and the security is so strong, and so aggressive, they're protecting something. And what ever it is, they're protecting it very aggressively. I'd like to know what that is."

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: UFO Photo 'Proof'

From: **Stuart Miller** <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 11:13:42 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 10:54:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Photo 'Proof' - Miller

>From: Will Bueche <[willbueche.nul](mailto:willbueche.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:05:22 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: UFO Photo 'Proof'

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto: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](http://images.amazon.com/images/P/B000083DVU.16._SCLZZZZZZZ_SS260_.jpg)

Hi Will,

You should get some. We bought some for some friends a while  
back and they're really cool. Spooky when the light dips and  
they slowly come on. But, be wary of having non-ufological  
friends round otherwise comments like "Oh Will, your UFO has  
landed" will surely follow when the blue light glows.

Aren't folk a riot?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Sighting Of A Tiny 'UFO'?

From: Michael Bourne <[thebookofthoth.nul](mailto:thebookofthoth.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 12:54:45 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 11:37:15 -0400  
Subject: Sighting Of A Tiny 'UFO'?

Hi..

Wonder if anyone could help with analysis of some photographs submitted to my site, I think they're probably hoaxed, but am not technical enough to be able to analyse them.

<http://www.book-of-thoth.com/ftopict-7683.html>

Can anyone help?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 11:40:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Joe Faccenda <[Uforth.nul](mailto:Uforth.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:32:43 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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>

>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.

If I might add to my note of some days ago. Richard Hall took me up on the matter of Heflin being a skilled model maker, and insisted this was a total falsehood. NICAP apparently did a thorough check of Heflin's background and found zilch to support the idea.

I referred to a British TV program in which this claim appeared, saying it was surprising that no confirmation of this allegation had surfaced, even from skeptics.

I now discover that the said 75-minute program was on May 9, 1968 and was presented by a Dr Stephen Black (a psychiatrist). I have now come across two reviews of this program, written soon after the broadcast. One review does not mention the Heflin photos; the other review does mention them, and it confirms what I wrote on this List. The reviewer said: "Rex Heflin revealed that he was a keen model maker and Dr Black commented that it was possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it."

This confirms that I had recalled the TV show correctly, but raises another point. Black had been around quite a bit visiting UFO witnesses. It appears that Heflin himself revealed his propensity for making models to Dr Black. Why, then, did he not reveal such things to NICAP and other investigators? Was it because most of the people who interviewed Heflin were 'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic? Otherwise, what else took place during that interview? We shall likely never know. But even this one admission (the only one I have come

across) is sufficient to cast considerable doubts over the photos.

By the way, I find it very hard to accept that someone could 'forget' he had faked a photo less than 3 years afterwards.

CDA

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 07:04:23 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 11:42:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Nielsen

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 22:06:19 +0000  
>Subject: UFO History Takes A Beating

<snip>

>I began publishing the Journal of UFO History 2-plus years ago,  
>but not all that many people seem to be interested compared to  
>those who dote on Area 51, animal mutilations, the Bermuda  
>Triangle, Roswell, and all those other sensational, folkloric,  
>and highly speculative aspects often having no real-world  
>connection with the UFO mystery at all.

>Subscribe and learn, folks!

>See:

>[www.hallrichard.com](http://www.hallrichard.com)

>Hallmart page.

Just one point Dick. I believe I'm speaking for many others when I say that it's awfully hard to pay for any mag these days, no matter the quality, when so much good stuff is available online.

Your well-done content is competing with the brute force of the unwashed masses on the internet.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/02/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 10:59:30 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 11:44:32 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/02/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 65  
June 2, 2006

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

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* THE CASE OF THOMAS BUTLER: THE LAST CHAPTER  
\*\* SELECTED AGENCY DECLASSIFICATION PLANS  
\*\* JAG HANDBOOK ON NATIONAL SECURITY LITIGATION

THE CASE OF THOMAS BUTLER: THE LAST CHAPTER

The prosecution of Thomas C. Butler, the distinguished scientist who was convicted in 2004 of exporting plague bacteria to Tanzania without proper authorization and of various contract violations, came to a final conclusion last month when the U.S. Supreme Court denied his petition to review the matter.

Yet the Butler case may endure as a parable of our times, since Dr. Butler, a specialist in plague and other infectious diseases, is such an unlikely criminal and the government's pursuit of him seems so heavy-handed.

By all accounts, Butler is a person of extraordinary stature and achievement.

"The defendant's research and discoveries have led to the salvage of millions (!) of lives throughout the world," Judge Sam R. Cummings of the Northern District of Texas admitted in March 2004, before sentencing him to two years in jail.

A terrorist is one who destroys life indiscriminately. We lack a word for someone who *saves* millions of lives indiscriminately. If there were such a word, it could be applied without exaggeration to Thomas Butler.

But incredibly, his expertise in infectious diseases was invoked against him by the post-9/11 prosecution.

"From the outset of the trial, the government openly sought to use the specter of plague to convince the jury that Dr. Butler was a 'bad person'," wrote Butler's defense attorney, George Washington University professor Jonathan Turley.

"The government analogized the actions of Dr. Butler to the practice in the Middle Ages of catapulting plague-infested human cadavers into walled cities to cause panic and death, bringing widespread panic to the quiet town of Lubbock," Turley recalled.

See the Butler's petition for certiorari, filed at the U.S. Supreme Court on April 11, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/butler/cert.pdf>

The petition was denied without comment by the Court in a May 15, 2006 order.

Science Magazine (26 May 2006, p. 1120) reported that "His supporters, including chemistry Nobelist Peter Agre... are hoping against hope for a presidential pardon, if not from George W. Bush then possibly from his successor."

Selected case files, statements of support and other background materials on the Butler case are available from the Federation of American Scientists here:

<http://www.fas.org/butler/index.html>

Dr. Butler completed his prison term and returned home in December 2005.

#### SELECTED AGENCY DECLASSIFICATION PLANS

In his 1995 executive order 12958, President Clinton directed that most historically valuable classified records be automatically declassified as they become 25 years old. The onset of this automatic declassification process was deferred repeatedly, but it was affirmed in principle by President Bush in his 2003 executive order 13292, and the initial phase of the process is now scheduled to begin at the end of December 2006.

"It is one thing to conceive such a concept and quite another to implement it," wrote William Leonard, director of the Information Security Oversight Office, in the latest ISOO annual report to the President.

"As of September 21, 2005, ISOO estimate[d] that 155 million pages of classified national security information must be declassified, exempted, or referred to other agencies by December 31, 2006."

"ISOO believes, for the most part, that the Executive branch is progressing toward fulfilling its responsibilities for these records by the deadline," Mr. Leonard wrote.

A selection of agency declassification plans presented to ISOO detailing plans for compliance with the automatic declassification deadline, obtained under the FOIA by Michael Ravnitzky, is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/isoo/declass/index.html>

For related background, see "Progress Toward the Automatic Declassification Deadline of December 31, 2006" in the 2005 ISOO Annual Report to the President (at page 19):

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/isoo/2005rpt.pdf>

#### JAG HANDBOOK ON NATIONAL SECURITY LITIGATION

The legal issues and security procedures involved in litigating national security cases are introduced in a handbook published by the Navy Judge Advocate General.

"National Security Cases and cases involving classified information are inherently complex because they impose strict security, reporting, coordination, and approval requirements on top of the necessities of investigating, trying, defending, or adjudicating charges."

"Some offenses are capital and often are 'high visibility' cases overseen by the media, senior government officials, and Congress."

The JAG handbook "contains information and guidance on the preparation, prosecution, defense, and adjudication of such cases."

See "The Judge Advocate's Handbook For Litigating National Security Cases," Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, n.d. (2002):

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/library/jag.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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul) with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](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](http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 12:48:05 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 19:50:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:32:39 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>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.

Very true!

>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.

Oh, but in each of my posts I've been very specific about why I assert that even your claims that at least some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature (this is not quite the same thing as saying "that for me [you] all there is to UFOs is high tech hardware" but a nice try in trying to make it look like I'm saying this). I just didn't get get specific in why I agree with others regarding Roswell/MJ-12 and disagree with you - a debate I have no interest in - and this, too, is a good try to make it look like I'm someone who avoids specifics.

Stick to the point I'm making (that even your claims that at least some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature) based on plenty of specifics (like the Webster/Bedford case that you've conveniently avoiding being specific about) instead of meandering away down other avenues which you know I'm not referring to.

I'm merely refusing to get into a debate about Roswell/MJ-12 - not avoiding being specific about why I view your conclusions that at least some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature. You're taking my refusal to debate one subject with you and using it to make it look like I'm not being specific about why I disagree with you regarding another subject. Nice sleight of hand but my eye is still on the card that you're trying to make disappear.

>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.

Yes, indeed, I understand exactly what you're trying to say  
\_but\_ ...

>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.

... this is a premature conclusion (that some UFOs are ET

spacecraft) because the data shows that the category you are referring to - your gold ore - is not a separate category from the other components of the UFO phenomenon but instead blends into the more bizarre. You can't just pick and choose nice neat little perfect nuts and bolts cases - cut it off there - when some perfect nuts and bolts cases blur (through bizarre characteristics) into the other components of the UFO phenomenon. You're drawing arbitrary lines and roping off a category (in effect, creating a category) that may not exist in the sense you're defining it.

You may be correct that some UFOs are ET spacecraft but you can't conclude this yet until you adequately explain the 'blur zone' between the well-behaved nuts and bolts cases and the nuts and bolts cases that possess characteristics of the 'other components' aspect of the total UFO phenomenon.

>So I am very happy to end this discussion.

Works for me too, Stan, especially if you're going to keep trying to make it look like my refusal to get drawn into a debate over Roswell/MJ-12 with you is the same thing as me refusing to be specific about why I think your conclusions that some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:29:30 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 19:54:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:28:23 +0100  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:57:25 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>snip

>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?)

Yes, very good point Martin, the camera and film are available  
and currently on order. (I ordered them a few days ago)  
Observation:

Surprisingly, no mention is made (that I've read) in Photo 1 on  
the asymmetry of the object. The left side is pinched off, where  
as the right side is somewhat flared out. Assuming this to be a  
representation of the craft in motion and depending upon the  
speed of the shutter and movement pattern of the UFO, this could  
confirm rotational (harmonic/wobble and the like) movement as  
reported with a rough measurement of (angular projected)  
velocity in the event distance is established. Certainly, safe  
limits could be established amongst the two competing theories  
(see below). I would find it a major fault if researchers, at  
the time, had not handed Heflin a clay model and then asked him  
to replicate the movement pattern, as this is an important piece  
of information lost. This asymmetry, it not detected in the  
other photos, is also proof of movement, movement that may not  
be possible with a small suspended model, etc... this is strong  
evidence in favor of it not being a hoax (see below)! If the

model was made of inferior quality, this could quite easily be just one bad side of the handy work. In any event, staying positive...

A estimated calculation of instantaneous velocity given two remarkably different distances to objects as proposed:

Assuming two scenarios, one a fake model at 4 feet distance and a larger Real one of 25 feet at 1/8 mile (near Rex's estimate)

1) 1/8 mile scenario: craft 25 feet in diameter: (photo 1)

Assuming a craft at ~25 (reasonable given the lens) feet in diameter, the right hand blur rotation in feet observed is approximately ~2.0 feet (5 degrees and very left side as the rotation point). With a shutter speed at ~1/1000 second, that gives a momentary velocity of ~2000 feet/sec or ~1,400 miles/hr. I would consider this as nobservable. Perhaps a higher harmonic of the reported wobble and blur factor historically mentioned. (or, just a flaw in the UFO model/other possibilities?)

2) A model at 4 feet distance: (Photo 1)

Assuming a diameter of about two (consistent) inches the equivalent blur movement as compared with above would be ~0.17 inches in ~1/1000 sec or ~170 inches/sec, which comes to about 9.6 miles an hour. Since I think it unlikely to purposely include or accidentally move a model at that speed/orientaion, this lends great credibility to it being of a genuine craft. But, it may turn out that this is reasonable for an object vibrating on the end of a thread while being moved... need to test that likelihood (I'm working on that scenario). If not, it may just be a reasonable way of sorting out the two competing scenarios. You may also cut my estimates in half to account for error... an we still get somewhat high numbers?

I offer the above as a pro despite the fact that 3D stereoscopic examination lends credibility to a model of small stature at close range given the coincidence of Heflin exactly compensating for the movement in order to place it at the same x/y coordinates within the same window frame (as seen in 3D and as I've previously mentioned)

I also found it doubtful that true 16 bit B&W was available as written in your article. Please have that reaffirmed. Often, a scanner advertises this ability of the optical reading head, but the file is saved (A/D converted) and transferred internally as 8 bit only. With true 16 Bit, you may be able to capture much more detail. If you need, I can suggest a source where this could be accomplished in reality.

The wire depicted stretching off into the distance in photo one could be used as a great reference (agree with Martin) with strings of various thickness as compared to their counterpart if a mock setup at closer distance is entertained. By the way, it has not been established in your article that a wire was used, only that it was not detected as of yet. You need to replicate the shots with strings of various thickness and make to establish thickness detection limits of the film at the given conditions. You also need to include enhancements of various kinds, not just those that support a single premise. If you should need assistance in your endeavor, I will help as much as time permits.

Sincerely,

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Mexican FLIR Footage Update [was: MSNBC's Cosby]

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 18:13:57 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:12:55 -0400  
Subject: Mexican FLIR Footage Update [was: MSNBC's Cosby]

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 1 Jun 2006 09:03:53 -0400  
>Subject: MSNBC's Cosby Show

>Some of you may have caught the Rita Cosby Show last  
>night on MSNBC between 10 and 11 PM EST.

>I was on along with Peter Davenport and Mike Luckman  
>as panel of commentators.

>The apparent reason for the show was to promote  
>Aykroyd's new "Unplugged" video produced by David  
>Sereda.

>I saw portions of the FLIR video from Mexico over  
>and over (this section of the Mexican DOD sighting  
>is probably ground lights, at least the Mexican AF  
>hasn't reported on any experiments or data that would  
>prove otherwise)

The Mexican Airt Force doesn't have to prove anything, Sir.  
You've only done your own personal study and analysis of the  
footage, not the whole case. In the end your results reflect  
only your own personal conclusions which don't establish, in any  
way, the true facts of what happened that day in the Campeche  
air space.

Your conclusion is just an assumption and not shared by many  
other sources - as important and vauable as yours might be.  
You may be convinced by your own study but that will not change  
anything in this case as your opinion is not fact, just a theory  
like the others.

Here in Mexico we conducted a complete investigation along with  
the original source that is the Mexican Air Force and they  
provided much co-operation on this research including subsequent  
flights over the zone in very similar conditions and never found  
anything unusual - the phenomena never repeated and the FLIR  
cameras didn't register those mysterious lights. Do I need to  
say more?

To ask for a "test flight" of the Mexican Air Force is naive and  
nonsense as they have national priorities like their anti- drug  
operations and can't deviate from their programs and budgets to  
please a foreign request in order to prove something not  
included in their agenda. This is easy to understand.

However the Mexican Air Force and the Mexican DoD have been kind  
enough to provide us results on their subsequent flights over  
that area, including more FLIR footage confirming the phenomena  
has not repeated or replicated since March 5, 2004.

This response from the Air Force was according to the mutual  
agreement of co-operation in this investigation and they  
respected their comittment according to the rules established.

We, as the civilian researchers are satisfied with their  
information, results and evidence. We have kept this research to

ourselves here in Mexico with a huge database on this case. We don't have any doubts and don't need any outsider to come and question facts that have been established and proven.

It's useless to argue, over and over, the same issue without being directly involved with the original source. We respect other opinions but don't accept them as 'fact' as they will always suffer from insufficient data to support their claims.

So far the Mexican Air Force UFO case continues being a milestone in Ufology, that's a fact.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:16:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shell

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 22:06:19 +0000  
>Subject: UFO History Takes A Beating

>Despite our desires and wishful thinking, there is no simple,  
>glib, 100% accurate interpretation of what is going on and what  
>it all means. One needs to gather and study data carefully,  
>consider the views of knowledgable and experienced people, and  
>always be willing to reconsider on the basis of new evidence.

>But, if you ignore the investigations by skilled and competent  
>people that have gone before, you are being arrogant and  
>dismissive.

I personally don't think it hurts to go back into the dusty files every once in a while and dig out a 'cold case'. After all, the reason they're cold is that they're still essentially unsolved. And while I'm sure some - not necessarily all - of the previous research done was as good as possible at the time, there's no saying that a new analysis, or a different way of approaching the case might not yield new data. Perhaps not definitive data, one way or the other, but some small, new puzzle piece might at least be added to the box.

We all have our favorite cases, those we can point to and say, "That is one of the cases that has shaped my beliefs, and why I think the subject is worth studying in the first place." We almost wish those cases were left alone, possibly in fear that something overlooked all these years might be revealed and the house of cards we've built might tumble.

But those are the preceisely cases we need to keep looking at. The ones we've grown most comfortable with. Even if a new scan reveals the fishing line and the case blows up in our faces. Because that's what science is about. Chipping away at belief until all that remains is fact. Debunking in the purest sense of the word, since it's foolish to tolerate bunk.

Yes, for every 'new rehash' of an unsolved case, the opportunity exists not only to blow it out of the water, but also to re-verify and confirm the facts that point toward authenticity. UFO history needs to take a beating once in a while, if for nothing else to knock the dust and rust off to make sure we still have what we though we did in the first place.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Project Condign Daily Express Article

From: Nick Pope <[nick.nul](mailto:nick.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 20:11:25 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:22:14 -0400  
Subject: Project Condign Daily Express Article

The text of the article the Daily Express commissioned me to write about the MOD's release of 'The Condign Report' is now available online, on my website:

[http://www.nickpope.net/project\\_condign.htm](http://www.nickpope.net/project_condign.htm)

The article appeared in the Daily Express (one of the UK's national newspapers) on May 15, to coincide with the publication of the report on the MOD website.

The article may be freely used for non-commercial purposes.

The version that the Daily Express printed was about 300 words shorter and the opening paragraphs were recast, but aside from that it appeared almost exactly as drafted. At around 2000 words it was the largest newspaper feature on the subject. Key points include:

The cases that led to our wanting to carry out the study.

The photograph that intrigued the Defence Intelligence Staff.

How we got the study commissioned by banning the word 'UFO'.

Reiteration of the fact that I'm not the report's author.

Problems with the study's methodology and conclusions.

How pilots were advised not to try to out-maneuvre UFOs.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 20:24:07 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:23:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 08:39:57 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>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.

>Hi David, All,

>The broad issue here is... why go through all this?

For "completeness" Viktor. :-)

>Well, after  
>30 seconds of viewing the 3D, I confirmed (as Tim Shell  
>originally did), that the climb to proving that this wasn't a  
>fake, was a steep one.

You can't possibly "prove it isn't a fake". If you began with  
this as an aim you were always going to end up throwing your  
hands in the air. But you can effectively refute the theory that  
it is genuine. The realistic aim is to test possible  
inconsistencies with that theory in as many ways as you can  
think of. The more you fail, the less confidently you can assert  
that it might still be a fake.

<snip>

>Size of the UFO from frame to frame may also reveal consistence  
>or inconsistency of the object getting closer and farther from  
>the viewer (object) in relation to movement direction (but the  
>UFO could be moving erratically so this isn't conclusive  
>either). As I pointed out earlier, directional information is in  
>the 3D at the Horizon point in the 3D overlap (either his  
>movement or the UFO).

I suggested some time ago that if you rescale the distant  
landscapes, which means reducing #3 by about 6% in relation to  
#2, the UFO in #3 (flange diameter estimated by reference to  
proportionality of #1) still appears to be about 7% larger  
than in #2. On the face of it this seems inconsistent with the  
sequence as reported. It could be consistent with the camera  
moving closer to a small model just beyond the window, since the  
window width has enlarged at the same time by almost 5% between

#2 and #3. This should be taken as a minimum value for the difference in range between lens and window since, as I pointed out, there is a very small perspective foreshortening of the window width in #3. Allowing for this, it isn't ruled out that the proportion change in angular width of the UFO and of the window frame have not only the same sign but the same exact value.

This needs to be investigated with more care on high-resolution images, which we (or I at any rate) do not possess. Possibly this issue, and a number of other issues that have been raised recently, by several people, on this List and in off-List exchanges with Ann Druffel and Bob Wood, will be addressed in their and Ed Kelson's forthcoming JSE paper this summer. Or if not then hopefully the images can then be made available for wider study. Meanwhile, all one can say is that the above result - considered alone - would be consistent with a model just beyond the window. As I also pointed out the direction of displacement of the images against the landscape is also consistent with a stationary model just beyond the window, close to the range of the mirror, but not a stationary model beyond the mirror. This is in turn consistent with Tim Shell's original idea about the stereo coincidence. But . . .

<snip>

>My point was that an actual experiment with that camera has to  
>be entertained not a digital one).

I agree. That doesn't mean David's experiment has no value though, especially if the hypothetical model needs to have been within only a few tens of inches of the lens, which is what I said the evidence suggests (and I think David now agrees?).

It's also possible that Heflin got the order wrong. Remember the film pack was not numbered and he marked them 1 to 4 at some time later. So he could have transposed #3 and #4 quite easily I imagine. It wouldn't seem particularly important to him at the time. In fact if you reverse them you end up with a coherent sequence of reducing angular size. Of course the cost of doing that is to make the #3 "smoke trail" less intelligible, since this becomes #2 and presumably heading in the opposite direction.

Alternatively the similarity of relative position is a coincidence. This is also possible. Consider that however you look at the testimony, this approximate point in the sky is the point at which the object, quite slow moving, was reported performing a tight course reversal. It stands to reason that only a small angular translation is to be expected between #2 and #3 at this point; it stands to reason that it will be right to left; the photographer cannot physically move far and so could only possibly introduce a small angular displacement; and it also stands to reason (psychologically and physically) that any movement of the photographer will be in the direction he did demonstrably move, so that any compensation will be in the direction of reducing the relative angular displacement. That two small quantities which are naturally of opposite sign will cancel to a much smaller residual is inherently quite likely.

<snip>

>Questions:

>What was the infinity setting on the camera he used under the  
>specific physical conditions?

The only camera controls were a colour/black & white selector and the shutter release.

>What camera did he use? What was the model and make?

Polaroid 101. David already answered these questions from you in a previous post.

>What are the lens characteristics?

FL 114 mm, f8 - ~f42. Ditto.

>Was the window rolled up?

Yes the window was rolled up. This is published info. You should go and read some of the case literature Viktor!

>I can think of one another way to suspend a small object without  
>thread. If the object was suspended in between two panes of thin  
>glass. Perhaps the car window is one of them? I guess it would  
>have lead me to become very observant at the evidence and  
>witnesses houses during that time.

Think about this. If you look at the opened triangular side vent in #2 and #3 you can see what the darkening due to the overlapped edge of a second sheet of glass looks like. Now visualise the internal obstructions due to the shape of the cab, side window divider, windscreen post etc. Then visualise the obstruction caused outside the window by the mirror support structure. I don't see any anomalous lines that look like the edge of a second sheet of glass. A second sheet of glass would have to be cut and positioned so that its edge did not overlap the window glass anywhere.

Maybe close examination of enhanced high-res scans of the originals will show the edge of a glass sheet, but I doubt it. This is not a very simple job, never mind the odd problem of how to trap a moving model between two such sheets of glass such that it apparently tips and rotates without moving around, then arranging a support mechanism for the whole contraption.

>Yours is all good, but in the final analysis, still too week to  
>climb out of the Heflin Hole. That he would have had to  
>compensate for the movement of the object, such that it  
>maintains the same exact relative position within the window  
>frame.

See above.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints?

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 14:25:03 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:25:28 -0400  
Subject: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints?

Just a quick question. Who currently has the Trent/McMinnville negatives and prints? I've been fiddling with the excellent high-res scans at Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos's page:

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

I'm running into a bit of trouble with them. There are problems with the horizontal scaling, making me think they weren't processed at the same time and place. Also, the one showing the underside of the saucer, "mcminnville1.jpg" I think might be a contact print of some kind, which also shows some evidence of dodging around the saucer. I guess it was done to enhance the saucer, but it messes up the size and diffusion comparisons. I can make some adjustments myself, but I don't like to do that.

Anyone know where there are some nice, alternate high-res prints available somewhere? Particularly of the photo showing the saucer underside?

Thanks!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 21:01:55 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:31:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 08:39:57 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

Victor, David, anyone interested:

In relation to the point that the #3 UFO image may be anomalously large in relation to the #2 image I said in a post just minutes ago:

"It's also possible that Heflin got the order wrong. Remember the film pack was not numbered and he marked them 1 to 4 at some time later. So he could have transposed #3 and #4 quite easily I imagine. It wouldn't seem particularly important to him at the time. In fact if you reverse them you end up with a coherent sequence of reducing angular size. Of course the cost of doing that is to make the #3 "smoke trail" less intelligible, since this becomes #2 and presumably heading in the opposite direction."

Obviously I meant "#2 and #3" in the 2nd sentence but that isn't the point. I just noticed that Heflin's very first account to NICAP (report form and narrative Sept 22 1965) states:

"The object moved slowly off to the northeast. I \_then\_ snapped the second picture... "

In other words this is consistent with a possible confusion of #2 and #3, because whatever the order both photos would show a UFO travelling right to left.

Just a possibility.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

## Re: Supreme Court Stomps Whistleblowers - White

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 16:44:53 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:39:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Supreme Court Stomps Whistleblowers - White

>From: Greg Boone <[Evolbaby.nul](mailto:Evolbaby.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:16:43 EDT  
>Subject: Supreme Court Stomps Whistleblowers

<snip>

>But wait, don't we have a right to freedom from fear of  
>government?

>I'm done. Fed up. I've had it.

"FED" up with government. I like that!

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know -

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 14:29:00 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 09:23:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know -

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Friday, June 02, 2006 7:09 AM  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know

>Source: Las Vegas Weekly - Nevada, USA

><http://www.lasvegasweekly.com/2006/06/01/feature2.html>  
>June 1st 2006

>Whatever They're Hiding, I'd Like to Know What It Is

>Memorial Day at Area 51

>By Skylaire Alfvegren

>"Insanity runs rampant here," Sharon tells me with a sassy  
>smirk, the kind small-town waitresses develop after years of  
>pouring coffee for bikers, truckers and other highway bandits  
>making a pit stop off the interstate.

>But Sharon's greasy spoon-the infamous Little A 'Le' Inn of  
>Rachel, Nevada-plays host to characters more colorful than your  
>standard highway travellers. Scrubby and beyond desolate, Rachel  
>sits about 150 miles north of Las Vegas off Interstate 375.

Interstate 375? I drove it myself, one lane in each direction.  
No dividers, no overpasses. The signs all indicated state route  
375 with the state shield, not the blue and red Interstate  
highway shield which would indicate full freeway status.

Either Skylaire Alfvegren never went there, or he/she doesn't  
know one of the loneliest stretches of desert road from a  
freeway. "A pit stop off the Interstate"? Sounds like the  
former. Rachel, NV is just a wide spot on a long, long undivided  
road two-lane road. Its paved at least, no need to negotiate an  
off-ramp.

The nearest Interstate is I-15, many miles to the South, itself  
running from San Diego, CA through Las Vegas, NV and Salt Lake  
City, Utah to the Canadian Border.

One look at a Nevada state map will instantly clarify this,  
assuming the journalist can read it. I gotta ask how the other  
details were gotten.

To achieve Interstate Status, (Motorway in Britain) a highway  
must have multiple lanes in each direction; "limited access"  
meaning entry/exit ramps, overpasses, never a signal light or a  
stop sign; minimum lane widths and overhead clearances; runs  
between states etc. etc.

Anything less than Nevada State Route 375 would be unpaved. If  
there *were* an I-375, it would be a spur or bypass off of I-75,  
which runs South from Michigan to Florida. Again, cow-paths need  
not apply. That is the nature of puff pieces.

Maybe the writer is simply one of that growing number of  
illiterati for whom any ribbon of asphalt becomes an

Re: Whatever They're Hiding I'd Like to Know -

"interstate".

- Larry

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 23:29:39 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 09:37:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment -

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 12:13:55 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 10:42:31 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Encounters Lead To Spiritual Enlightenment

<snip>

>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.

Interestingly there was an attempt to reconstruct logic so as to properly "understand" quantum phenomena. This was by Reichenbach early in the last century, who wrote influentially on the philosophical foundations of quantum mechanics.

Maybe you've come across this Dick?

He suggested a three-valued logic which would dump the law of the excluded middle and effectively allow x and non-x. It wasn't successful, even though much of popular quantum philosophy reads as though this was the standard position. In fact as you imply the problem doesn't apply to observables, only to theoretical entities between observables.

The UP is only one way of characterising things.

If you think in terms of Feynmann's spacetime representation with path integrals then there is no UP.

The coherent superposition of states isn't a single, fuzzy mystical thing, but a way of codfying all the different very exact ways in which nature generates one physical thing.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 23:31:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 09:39:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 22:06:19 +0000  
>Subject: UFO History Takes A Beating

>Quite a few recent posts have raised questions about important  
>or classic UFO cases of the past from an extremely naive and  
>uninformed viewpoint. Like re-inventing the wheel, or being  
>doomed to repeat the mistakes of history because of not studying  
>the historical record.

<snip>

>There is a world of information out there that you need to  
>bone up on.

<snip>

>"we all know and appreciate  
>Dick's persona as a walking Swiss army knife, able to cut  
>through mountains of ufological BS within a millisecond."

>That - i.e., my long experience and extensive knowledge of the  
>UFO field - is what informed my quick dismissal of the Condign  
>report, not some sort of arrogance or superiority complex as  
>some relatively new people seem to think.

>Despite our desires and wishful thinking, there is no simple,  
>glib, 100% accurate interpretation of what is going on and what  
>it all means. One needs to gather and study data carefully,  
>consider the views of knowledgable and experienced people, and  
>always be willing to reconsider on the basis of new evidence.

>But, if you ignore the investigations by skilled and competent  
>people that have gone before, you are being arrogant and  
>dismissive.

Dick

Since it is plain as a pikestaff to anybody that I am one of the  
targets of your criticism here I would like you to be specific  
about:

- 1) which classic case(s) I have reinvented the wheel about in recent posts;
- 2) exactly where I am naive, uninformed and refusing to study the historical record;
- 3) where I am claiming or expecting glib 100% accurate interpretation of what is going on and what it all means;
- 4) where I am showing unwillingness to reconsider on the basis of new evidence; and
- 5) where I am being arrogant and dismissive by ignoring others' investigations.

The "classic cases" on which I think I have commented in recent posts are Trindade and the Heflin photos. Going back a while I can recall discussing Boianai and the Washington National radar affair. If you can justify a single one of those accusations by specific examples (and I don't mean just finding some place where I said something inaccurate - anybody makes occasional bloomers if they ever try to say anything concrete - but by demonstrating a systematic tendency) then fair play. But if not...

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 22:26:21 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 09:42:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Joe Faccenda <[Uforth.nul](mailto:Uforth.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:32:43 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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.

You can see the drawing(s) and read about the sighting of A.C.  
Urie in the Snake River Canyon. This is one of the case in the  
FBI's file "Security Matter - X", the REAL X files - see  
The UFO-FBI Connection by Bruce Maccabee; available from  
Amazon, etc.

<http://www.brumac.8k.com/prosaic3.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 01:25:28 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 09:49:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Thursday, June 01, 2006 4:03 AM  
>Subject: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>Source: Darren Ethier's Blog

><http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=22>

>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

>I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary Bates  
>last night. The summary and title of the book intrigued me  
>because from childhood I have always been interested in stories  
>involving 'ETs' (extraterrestrials) and UFOs. I remember doing a  
>presentation on UFOs as a project for one of my classes in high  
>school. The reason why this book interested me is because I  
>discovered a website for it advertised in the Creation  
>Ministries International flyer that I recieved in the mail and  
>after checking it out I thought the book would be worth a read  
>(because of my already piqued interest in ETs). Here's the  
>description found on the back of the book:

>---

>UFOs have been seen throughout the centuries. But in our  
>enlightened technological age, are we any closer to solving the  
>mystery? This book revisits the most famous events that have  
>defined UFO culture, such as Roswell and alien autopsies;  
>astronaut Gordon Cooper's sightings; Major Donald Keyhoe's  
>allegations of official silence; and the claims of famous  
>contactees Billy Meier and George Adamski.

<snip>

I'm completely blind-sided by this.

Does anyone on the list know much about the book, or its writer  
Gary Bates? I had never heard of either.

Best

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

**Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -**

From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 05:01:29 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 09:52:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

As I have watched the exchange of information we find out some interesting things.

The entire Heflin model theory's launching pad was a 1968 UK TV special done by alleged skeptic Christopher Allen. Apparently some nameless, faceless individual makes the claim that Heflin made models and Allen apparently breathlessly repeated it.

Now, since some people just love information repeated by nameless, faceless sources, lets take a look at such things as government insiders telling a noted researcher that ET was going to land on a Arizona Mountain top, or the nameless/faceless person who dumped the bogus documents on the dude in Texas, who unloaded them on CBS Producer Mary Mapes, which led to Dan Rather vomiting the story all over. Lets take a look at the nameless, faceless source who blathered all over ABC investigative reporter Brian Ross that House Speaker Hastert was being investigated, when he wasn't.

We have loads and loads of nameless, faceless people telling all sorts of tales and stories and leaking them to the media, who passes them to us but it doesn't make them correct. Bottom line is I wouldn't hang my hat on Allens broadcast.

We also live in a world where we have scientists (not amateurs or hobbyist's) who allegedly study issues and information very carefully. Allegedly use all the correct scientific procedures, telling us on one hand in the 70s that the earth was going to turn into a frozen ball, blah blah, now its global warming, then based upon ice cores (which I suspect is more reliable then some of the pronouncements we have been hearing) we hear that this is really part of a larger natural cycle. Probably in another 10 years or so, we will be back to the Ice Age theories.

Point being is I suspect that if we had 3 "professional people" who actually do 3 D work for a living doing an analysis of the Heflin photos, we would likely end up with different answers.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

From: Ed Gehrman <[egehrman.nul](mailto:egehrman.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:16:10 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 09:57:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Thursday, June 01, 2006 4:03 AM  
>Subject: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>Source: Darren Ethier's Blog

><http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=22>

>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

>I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary Bates  
>last night.

<snip>

>I don't want to write too much about Gary Bates conclusions  
>about UFOs here because of the profound amount of evidence he  
>amasses and the well-thought out progression he takes through  
>the book to reach them. For me to just list the conclusion  
>might prevent some from reading the book because of bias' they  
>may already have. However, I will say this - my eyes were  
>opened - WIDE OPENED - to the reality of the UFO phenomom and  
>how far off from the truth most people are when reading about it  
>and explaining it.

I thought the List enjoy the following review from Amazon:

<http://tinyurl.com/q6gkw>

-----

26 of 33 people found the following review helpful:

GREAT Book! Blows the LID Off of the TRUTH  
About Aliens!, July 18, 2005  
Reviewer: Ed Leed "Jesus says, 'Go and Sin No More!'"  
(Dayton, OH USA) -

The first 75% of this book is a very good overview of the entire modern topic of UFOs and Aliens. It is a good overview, from a skeptical point of view. It debunks all of the major UFO/Alien stories.

It also shows us that, unfortunately, some UFO followers treat their belief in UFOs as a substitute religion, (while they accuse the Bible of promoting a false religion which UFOs debunk, "Hail Bopp").

What makes this book unique is the last 25% of the book, where we finally get to the author's point: the phenomena known as UFOs and Alien Abductions can be explained from a Biblical point of view, and exposed as tricks of the devil. To this end, the author makes many convincing Biblical references to support this premise. This is the first time I have ever heard of this concept in a book.

Most UFO books, if they mention the Bible, they make the Bible fit into their belief in UFOs - a spiritual dead end. This book looks at UFOs, as explained by the Bible. The result is a successful spiritual outcome for the true believing Christian.

The book explains for the first time, the covered up testimony of alien abduction victims who testify that they have actually STOPPED abductions by uttering the name of JESUS.

I believe this to be true for similar reasons in my own experience. I grew up haunted by and infatuated with the whole UFO/occult scene, urged on by an influential relative who believed in UFOs, and I really feel like it wasted decades of my life, trying to get to the "truth" about UFOs, while my life was stuck in a perpetual dead end.

After getting saved and becoming a Christian in 1998, my whole life has changed for the better, and the creepy, haunting UFO experiences have stopped. As if "UFOs" and "Aliens" are as influenced and fear Jesus as much as the demons in the Bible flee from His presence. This Bible aspect of demons masquerading as UFO Aliens is definitely on the right track.

The author explains that though these UFO/Aliens are NOT from another planet, they ARE from another DIMENSION, which the Bible calls the Spiritual Realm. From the Spiritual Realm is where these trouble making demons are acting like space aliens, to trick our "modern" minds.

-----

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:29:15 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:08:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Joe Faccenda <[Uforth.nul](mailto:Uforth.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:32:43 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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>

>>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.

>If I might add to my note of some days ago. Richard Hall took me  
>up on the matter of Heflin being a skilled model maker, and  
>insisted this was a total falsehood. NICAP apparently did a  
>thorough check of Heflin's background and found zilch to support  
>the idea.

>I referred to a British TV program in which this claim appeared,  
>saying it was surprising that no confirmation of this allegation  
>had surfaced, even from skeptics.

>I now discover that the said 75-minute program was on May 9,  
>1968 and was presented by a Dr Stephen Black (a psychiatrist). I  
>have now come across two reviews of this program, written soon  
>after the broadcast. One review does not mention the Heflin  
>photos; the other review does mention them, and it confirms what  
>I wrote on this List. The reviewer said: "Rex Heflin revealed  
>that he was a keen model maker and Dr Black commented that it  
>was possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it."

>This confirms that I had recalled the TV show correctly, but  
>raises another point. Black had been around quite a bit visiting  
>UFO witnesses. It appears that Heflin himself revealed his  
>propensity for making models to Dr Black. Why, then, did he not

>reveal such things to NICAP and other investigators? Was it  
>because most of the people who interviewed Heflin were  
>'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic? Otherwise, what  
>else took place during that interview? We shall likely never  
>know. But even this one admission (the only one I have come  
>across) is sufficient to cast considerable doubts over the  
>photos.

>By the way, I find it very hard to accept that someone could  
>'forget' he had faked a photo less than 3 years afterwards.

CDA you are correct, but we all know that all witnesses lie and  
only debunkers tell the truth.

Did it ever occur to you that Dr. Black might have asked whether  
Rex had liked making models as a child? The answer might have  
been "sure, when I was a kid. I was pretty good at it, too."

Most models were made from kits.

Never saw a kit like the one in the photo.

Did Black make a tape or take notes? Had he ever expressed other  
opinions about UFOs? Was he a Freudian? Does Black have a full  
name? Is there a clip available?

I do recall your once claiming that Don Menzel's post WW II  
intelligence connections were well known. You gave a reference  
which I checked. It only noted, as everybody knew, that Menzel was  
in the Navy during WW II... not the same thing as his close  
connections with the CIA, NSA, etc., in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:25:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 07:04:23 -0700 (PDT)  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 22:06:19 +0000  
>>Subject: UFO History Takes A Beating

><snip>

>>I began publishing the Journal of UFO History 2-plus years ago,  
>>but not all that many people seem to be interested compared to  
>>those who dote on Area 51, animal mutilations, the Bermuda  
>>Triangle, Roswell, and all those other sensational, folkloric,  
>>and highly speculative aspects often having no real-world  
>>connection with the UFO mystery at all.

>>Subscribe and learn, folks!

>>See:

>>[www.hallrichard.com](http://www.hallrichard.com)

>>Hallmart page.

>Just one point Dick. I believe I'm speaking for many others when  
>I say that it's awfully hard to pay for any mag these days, no  
>matter the quality, when so much good stuff is available online.

I would dispute the "good stuff"; very little on line.

>Your well-done content is competing with the brute force of the  
>unwashed masses on the internet.

Yes, which of course also goes a long way toward explaining the  
ongoing ignorance about (and/or misinformation on) UFO history  
that tends to prevail. My Journal is intended for the more  
discriminating.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:44:24 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:28:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 12:48:05 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:32:39 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>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.

>Very true!

>>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.

>Oh, but in each of my posts I've been very specific about why  
>I assert that even your claims that at least some UFOs are ET  
>spacecraft are premature (this is not quite the same thing as  
>saying "that for me [you] all there is to UFOs is high tech  
>hardware" but a nice try in trying to make it look like I'm  
>saying this). I just didn't get get specific in why I agree with  
>others regarding Roswell/MJ-12 and disagree with you - a debate  
>I have no interest in - and this, too, is a good try to make it  
>look like I'm someone who avoids specifics.

>Stick to the point I'm making (that even your claims that at  
>least some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature) based on plenty  
>of specifics (like the Webster/Bedford case that you've  
>conveniently avoiding being specific about) instead of  
>meandering away down other avenues which you know I'm not  
>referring to.

>I'm merely refusing to get into a debate about Roswell/MJ-12 -  
>not avoiding being specific about why I view your conclusions  
>that at least some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature. You're  
>taking my refusal to debate one subject with you and using it to  
>make it look like I'm not being specific about why I disagree  
>with you regarding another subject. Nice sleight of hand but my  
>eye is still on the card that you're trying to make disappear.

>>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.

>Yes, indeed, I understand exactly what you're trying to say  
>\_but\_ ...

>>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.

>... this is a premature conclusion (that some UFOs are ET  
>spacecraft) because the data shows that the category you are  
>referring to - your gold ore - is not a separate category from  
>the other components of the UFO phenomenon but instead blends  
>into the more bizarre. You can't just pick and choose nice neat  
>little perfect nuts and bolts cases - cut it off there - when  
>some perfect nuts and bolts cases blur (through bizarre  
>characteristics) into the other components of the UFO  
>phenomenon. You're drawing arbitrary lines and roping off a  
>category (in effect, creating a category) that may not exist in  
>the sense you're defining it.

This is pretty silly. Please note the results of the chi-square  
analysis in Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14. The  
probability that the UNKNOWNS are just missed KNOWNS is less  
than 1%. I really don't care about the blur-zone nor about ore  
whose gold content is too low for profitable mining.

>You may be correct that some UFOs are ET spacecraft but you  
>can't conclude this yet until you adequately explain the 'blur  
>zone' between the well-behaved nuts and bolts cases and the nuts  
>and bolts cases that possess characteristics of the 'other  
>components' aspect of the total UFO phenomenon.

>>So I am very happy to end this discussion.

>Works for me too, Stan, especially if you're going to keep  
>trying to make it look like my refusal to get drawn into a  
>debate over Roswell/MJ-12 with you is the same thing as me  
>refusing to be specific about why I think your conclusions that  
>some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature.

Keep your blur-zones. I think they are irrelevant

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## UK UFO & Fortean/Paranormal Conference

From: Robert Whitehead <[robwhiteheaduk.nul](mailto:robwhiteheaduk.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:48:56 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:34:51 -0400  
Subject: UK UFO & Fortean/Paranormal Conference

Just to let UK members know about the forthcoming conference being organised by LAPIS (Lancashire Aerial Phenomena Investigation Society) in July.

Event: 'Strange Days: The 2006 LAPIS UFO & Fortean/Paranormal Conference'

Date & Time: Saturday, 17 June 2006. Doors open 9:15, First speaker 10:00am

Venue: YMCA, St Annes, Lancashire, England

Price: =A312 in advance, =A315 on the door

Tickets & Details: Telephone 'Janet' on 01253 890601 or visit:

<http://www.lapis.org.uk>

Speakers & Topics:

PHILIP MANTLE: 'The Alien Fraudtopsy'

With all the recent publicity surrounding the Ant and Dec Alien Autopsy film, we felt it was time to give Phillip Mantle, who has followed all the developments regarding the Santilli film, a chance to speak out. Whatever your opinion of a subject which has probably provided us with more insight into the nature of ufologists than aliens, this is a lecture not to be missed by one of Britain's foremost researchers.

John Rimmer: 'The Warminster Thing Revisited'

John has been editor of Magonia, the UK's oldest established UFO magazine, for over 30 years. He will discuss the Warminster Mystery dating from the mid 1960's when the quiet Wiltshire town of Warminster was caught up in an extraordinary UFO flap. Several thousand UFO sightings were reported and the town became a Mecca for ufologists. The incidents are now largely forgotten and John will bring the story of the "Thing" to a whole new generation.

Mike Hallowell: 'Imaginary Childhood Friends'

Mike will present some startling ideas about the phenomena of imaginary childhood friends. A fascinating look at a subject that is acknowledged and yet dismissed by mainstream society. This is a concept so common as to need no explanation, but also one which is never taken seriously, which is strange considering that children, like adults, are well aware of the difference between fact and fiction, between play and reality.

Richard Freeman: 'Monster Hunter'

Richard is one of Britain's few professional cryptozoologists. His interest with unknown animals stretches back to his

childhood. Initially, he worked for a zoo breeding rare and endangered species before joining the Centre for Fortean Zoology, the UK's only cryptozoological organisation. He has travelled the world in search of strange beasts and will discuss his experiences during the lecture.

See you all there!

Rob Whitehead  
on behalf of LAPIS

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:37:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 22:06:19 +0000  
>>Subject: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>Despite our desires and wishful thinking, there is no simple,  
>>glib, 100% accurate interpretation of what is going on and what  
>>it all means. One needs to gather and study data carefully,  
>>consider the views of knowledgeable and experienced people, and  
>>always be willing to reconsider on the basis of new evidence.

>>But, if you ignore the investigations by skilled and competent  
>>people that have gone before, you are being arrogant and  
>>dismissive.

>I personally don't think it hurts to go back into the dusty  
>files every once in a while and dig out a 'cold case'. After  
>all, the reason they're cold is that they're still essentially  
>unsolved. And while I'm sure some - not necessarily all - of the  
>previous research done was as good as possible at the time,  
>there's no saying that a new analysis, or a different way of  
>approaching the case might not yield new data. Perhaps not  
>definitive data, one way or the other, but some small, new  
>puzzle piece might at least be added to the box.

<snip>

>But those are the preceisely cases we need to keep looking at.  
>The ones we've grown most comfortable with. Even if a new scan  
>reveals the fishing line and the case blows up in our faces.  
>Because that's what science is about. Chipping away at belief  
>until all that remains is fact. Debunking in the purest sense of  
>the word, since it's foolish to tolerate bunk.

>Yes, for every 'new rehash' of an unsolved case, the opportunity  
>exists not only to blow it out of the water, but also to  
>re-verify and confirm the facts that point toward authenticity.  
>UFO history needs to take a beating once in a while, if for  
>nothing else to knock the dust and rust off to make sure we  
>still have what we though we did in the first place.

Tim,

I certainly agree with you on this. As new analytical techniques  
are developed or new bits of data uncovered, it can help to shed  
light on a particular case. Some of those old, dusty, 'cold'  
cases are among the best ever reported and deserve continued or  
renewed attention.

My point is that I was there for many of them, personally  
involved in the investigations, and know a great deal about  
them.

I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network, which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very thorough and always sought first to find a conventional explanation for each case.

On this List I see people assuming and presuming all sorts of things about Rex Heflin and his photos without apparently having bothered to examine the carefully developed record from that time. This is not right.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:13:14 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:50:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 20:24:07 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 08:39:57 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>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.

>>Hi David, All,

>>The broad issue here is... why go through all this?

>For "completeness" Viktor. :-)

This was a rhetorical comment, please Martin!

>>Well, after  
>>30 seconds of viewing the 3D, I confirmed (as Tim Shell  
>>originally did), that the climb to proving that this wasn't a  
>>fake, was a steep one.

>You can't possibly "prove it isn't a fake". If you began with  
>this as an aim you were always going to end up throwing your  
>hands in the air. But you can effectively refute the theory that  
>it is genuine. The realistic aim is to test possible  
>inconsistencies with that theory in as many ways as you can  
>think of. The more you fail, the less confidently you can assert  
>that it might still be a fake.

All we can do is weigh possibilities, yes... anything new here  
that is just as obvious as my earlier post?

<snip>

>>Size of the UFO from frame to frame may also reveal consistence  
>>or inconsistency of the object getting closer and farther from  
>>the viewer (object) in relation to movement direction (but the  
>>UFO could be moving erratically so this isn't conclusive  
>>either). As I pointed out earlier, directional information is in  
>>the 3D at the Horizon point in the 3D overlap (either his

>>movement or the UFO).

>I suggested some time ago that if you rescale the distant  
>landscapes, which means reducing #3 by about 6% in relation to  
>#2, the UFO in #3 (flange diameter estimated by reference to  
>proportionality of #1) still appears to be about 7% \_larger\_  
>than in #2. On the face of it this seems inconsistent with the  
>sequence as reported. It could be consistent with the camera  
>moving closer to a small model just beyond the window, since the  
>window width has enlarged at the same time by almost 5% between  
>#2 and #3. This should be taken as a minimum value for the  
>difference in range between lens and window since, as I pointed  
>out, there is a very small perspective foreshortening of the  
>window width in #3. Allowing for this, it isn't ruled out that  
>the proportion change in angular width of the UFO and of the  
>window frame have not only the same sign but the same exact  
>value.

>This needs to be investigated with more care on high-resolution  
>images, which we (or I at any rate) do not possess. Possibly  
>this issue, and a number of other issues that have been raised  
>recently, by several people, on this List and in off-List  
>exchanges with Ann Druffel and Bob Wood, will be addressed in  
>their and Ed Kelson's forthcoming JSE paper this summer. Or if  
>not then hopefully the images can then be made available for  
>wider study. Meanwhile, all one can say is that the above  
>result - considered alone - would be consistent with a model  
>just beyond the window. As I also pointed out the direction of  
>displacement of the images against the landscape is also  
>consistent with a stationary model just beyond the window, close  
>to the range of the mirror, but not a stationary model beyond  
>the mirror. This is in turn consistent with Tim Shell's original  
>idea about the stereo coincidence. But...

I brought this up, in my response to Bruce Macabee's post a while ago - see:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m25-026.shtml>

><snip>

>>My point was that an actual experiment with that camera has to  
>>be entertained not a digital one).

>I agree. That doesn't mean David's experiment has no value  
>though, especially if the hypothetical model needs to have been  
>within only a few tens of inches of the lens, which is what I  
>said the evidence suggests (and I think David now agrees?).

I didn't say it had no value, I've only been saying that  
experiments with the actual film and setting have to be done...  
oversaturation conditions need to be explored \_real  
settings\_real film\_real camera.... I've been saying that since  
the beginning.

>It's also possible that Heflin got the order wrong. Remember the  
>film pack was not numbered and he marked them 1 to 4 at some  
>time later. So he could have transposed #3 and #4 quite easily I  
>imagine. It wouldn't seem particularly important to him at the  
>time. In fact if you reverse them you end up with a coherent  
>sequence of reducing angular size. Of course the cost of doing  
>that is to make the #3 "smoke trail" less intelligible, since  
>this becomes #2 and presumably heading in the opposite  
>direction.

I was first to bring of the film order as it relates to  
directional information on the object in question and brought  
that up a while ago. (in private to Tim Shell too). If the order  
is, reversed the 3D becomes inverted too - remember my first  
post... see:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m24-010.shtml>

>Alternatively the similarity of relative position is a  
>coincidence. This is also possible. Consider that however you  
>look at the testimony, this approximate point in the sky is the  
>point at which the object, quite slow moving, was reported  
>performing a tight course reversal. It stands to reason that  
>only a small angular translation is to be expected between #2  
>and #3 at this point; it stands to reason that it will be right  
>to left; the photographer cannot physically move far and so

>could only possibly intriuduce a small angular displacement; and  
>it also stands to reason (psychologically and physically) that  
>any movement of the photographer will be in the direction he did  
>demonstrably move, so that any compensation will be in the  
>direction of reducing the relative angular displacement. That  
>two small quantities which are naturally of opposite sign will  
>cancel to a much smaller residual is inherently quite likely.

The coincidence still stands and I brought that up among my first postings: That it was unusual to have exactly compensated for the movement of the object such that it ends up in overlap when the car frame is used as the reference point. Remember, I brought up the importance that TWO 3D images are possible with the images not ONE: one with the car frame (shows movement of the Photographer with respect to the car), the other at the horizon point (this shows movement of object relative to the ground with an understanding that it has to be compensated for (relative to the first 3D): in order to understand TRUE directionality... why else would I have mentioned these points. Again, experimentation is in order.

><snip>

>>Questions:

>>What was the infinity setting on the camera he used under the >>specific physical conditions?

>The only camera controls were a colour/black & white selector >and the shutter release.

>>What camera did he use? What was the model and make?

>Polaroid 101. David already answered these questions from you in >a previous post.

>>What are the lens characteristics?

>FL 114 mm, f8 - ~f42. Ditto.

>>Was the window rolled up?

>Yes the window was rolled up. This is published info. You should >go and read some of the case literature Viktor!

>>I can think of one another way to suspend a small object without >>thread. If the object was suspended in between two panes of thin >>glass. Perhaps the car window is one of them? I guess it would >>have lead me to become very observant at the evidence and >>witnesses houses during that time.

>Think about this. If you look at the opened triangular side vent >in #2 and #3 you can see what the darkening due to the >overlapped edge of a second sheet of glass looks like. Now >visualise the internal obstructions due to the shape of the cab, >side window divider, windscreen post etc. Then visualise the >obstruction caused outside the window by the mirror support >structure. I don't see any anomalous lines that look like the >edge of a second sheet of glass. A second sheet of glass would >have to be cut and positioned so that its edge did not overlap >the window glass anywhere.

>Maybe close examination of enhanced high-res scans of the >originals will show the edge of a glass sheet, but I doubt it. >This is not a very simple job, never mind the odd problem of how >to trap a moving model between two such sheets of glass such >that it apparently tips and rotates without moving around, then >arranging a support mechanism for the whole contraption.

This does not preclude large sheet glass that fills the entire view just leaning against the car. It is also possible to glue the backside to a single sheet of glass. I also mentioned other orientations for the string. I think it's fair to say (read all my posts) that I'm looking at this from many angles\_ specifically inconsistencies and consistencies both. David's experiment lacks comparisonwirth:

a) Real Film and Real settings.

b) Only string orientaions in one focal plane are explored close up.

c) Oversaturation conditions aren't explored since digital cameras are predominantly automatic, Heflin's lacked a certain amount of compensation here.

>>Yours is all good, but in the final analysis, still too weak to  
>>climb out of the Heflin Hole. That he would have had to  
>>compensate for the movement of the object, such that it  
>>maintains the same exact relative position within the window  
>>frame.

>See above.

My posts are meant for most readers not specific ones. Many of my comments are rhetorical too. I always make points that look for specific inconsistencies and contrast them as I've shown above. I've presented data on both sides of the argument. If it looks like I haven't read some literature, it's to illustrate what types of questions need addressing, that's all. I knew that they were available and David already had supplied answers to most of them in private before this posting of mine \_ which proves that I've intended this for all readers not just a few\_ so that we all have the information and we know what types of questions are most likely pertinent. I also have confidence that many people on this site will supply me with the specifics about the case... which has been true.

Thanks & 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 07:17:18 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:53:40 -0400  
Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

>From: Ed Gehrman <[egehrman.nul](mailto:egehrman.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:16:10 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thursday, June 01, 2006 4:03 AM  
>>Subject: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>Source: Darren Ethier's Blog  
>><http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=22>  
>>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>>Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

>>I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary Bates  
>>last night.

><snip>

>>I don't want to write too much about Gary Bates conclusions  
>>about UFOs here because of the profound amount of evidence he  
>>amasses and the well-thought out progression he takes through  
>>the book to reach them. For me to just list the conclusion  
>>might prevent some from reading the book because of bias' they  
>>may already have. However, I will say this - my eyes were  
>>opened - WIDE OPENED - to the reality of the UFO phenomom and  
>>how far off from the truth most people are when reading about it  
>>and explaining it.

>I thought the List enjoy the following review from Amazon:

><http://tinyurl.com/g6gkw>

>-----

>26 of 33 people found the following review helpful:

>GREAT Book! Blows the LID Off of the TRUTH  
>About Aliens!, July 18, 2005  
>Reviewer: Ed Leed "Jesus says, 'Go and Sin No More!'"  
>(Dayton, OH USA) -

<snip>

Hello Ed:

At least one thing isn't clear to me here.

- 1) Are all 8 paragraphs above the statements/opinions of the reviewer, or is some of that you writing?
- 2) If they are all from the reviewer, what is your take on what he says?

I appreciate the quotes either way. This helps clarify what the book is all about, and possibly why I didn't know about it..

Thanks in advance,

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:28:23 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:56:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 05:01:29 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>Point being is I suspect that if we had 3 "professional people"  
>who actually do 3 D work for a living doing an analysis of the  
>Heflin photos, we would likely end up with different answers.

We do have professionals doing the 3D analysis. As a Geologist  
(Aerial 3D is vital) and materials scientists working with  
microscopy on a daily basis, photoanalysis is routine for me.

Please read all my posts... if you don't understand a point or  
two, Id be more than happy to assist as I've already mentioned.  
I try to make my posts understandable to most readers. I don't  
think this is beyond anyone's understanding.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 11:47:54 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 10:59:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 13:22:01 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 16:20:55 -0700  
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>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.

As I said in a separate post, "very true", but my being  
persuaded that your conclusions regarding Roswell/MJ-12 (or of  
the pros and cons in any individual case) is not the same  
thing as my being persuaded of anything regarding the origin and  
nature of the UFO phenomenon - which is my point in the text you  
quoted from my post. Again, nice sleight of hand. I've noticed  
that you have a special talent for this, Stan, and employ it  
quite often - that is, taking several separate elements and  
shrewdly rolling them into one so that your comments, which  
really are accurate in only one narrow context or to one element  
- an element that is really not the point of focus - appear to  
apply to the other elements that are the point of focus.

Since I know how not to be distracted by this sleight of hand  
and how to keep my mind on the points I'm making, we should  
either end the conversation - which is the best thing to do if  
you're going to keep making it look like my refusing to get into  
Roswell/MJ-12 is the same thing as me not being specific about  
why I think your conclusions that some ET spacecraft are  
premature, and if you're going to keep bending my remarks to  
give them an apparent different meaning) or continue on - with  
me being very specific as I've been doing - with our  
discussion of how the 'other components' in the big UFO picture  
make your conclusions that some UFOs are ET spacecraft, at the  
very least, premature at this stage of UFO research and  
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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Stupid TV Making Earth Safe From Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 11:07:16 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 11:07:16 -0400  
Subject: Stupid TV Making Earth Safe From Aliens

Source: Daytona Beach News-Journal - Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/mk68>

June 02, 2006

Stupid TV Making Earth Safe From Aliens  
By Rick De Yampert  
Vox Pop

Yes, the angst level on our planet is rising daily. Just check out all the scary headlines.

But I was relieved to read last week that our government, Hollywood and American parents are defending our planet from the extraterrestrial menace.

OK, that wasn't a screaming headline in The Daytona Beach News-Journal, or even in some tabloid. But I figured out this shocking yet comforting truth when, on the same day last week, I read two seemingly disparate articles: an Associated Press story in The News-Journal headlined "Study finds parents encouraging tots to watch TV," and an interview of Yale-trained biophysicist Clifford Pickover in the book "Conversations on the Edge of the Apocalypse."

Any aliens that exist will be picking up our TV signals in their quadrant of the universe, Pickover says. Couple that with the AP article that notes parents are propping their infants in front of the boob tube at increasingly younger ages, and it's clear: Our nation has commenced a secret program to indoctrinate and repel aliens, and to train our youth to do the same.

"If technologically advanced aliens exist on other worlds, Earthlings have only recently become detectable to them with our introduction of radio and TV in the latter part of the 1900s," Pickover says in "Conversations," a 2005 book which also features interviews with Noam Chomsky, Deepak Chopra, Bruce Sterling, Robert Anton Wilson and still more outside-the-box thinkers (including George Carlin!).

"Our TV shows are leaking into space as electromagnetic signals that can be detected at enormous distances by receiving devices not much larger than our own radio telescopes," Pickover says. "Whether we like it or not, Paris Hilton's sex video is heading to Alpha Centauri and 'South Park' is shooting out to the constellation Orion.

"What impressions would these shows have on alien minds? It is a sobering thought that one of the early signs of terrestrial intelligence might come from the mind of Bart Simpson."

Don't have a cow, man. It's all part of the plan by what Agent Fox Mulder called the "military-industrial-entertainment complex" during an episode of "The X-Files."

What you and I consider to be stunningly mind-numbing TV fare -- say, "Wife Swap," "Beauty and the Geek" or "Cheaters" -- is being manufactured by Hollywood and our government to numb, stun and frighten Zog and his fellow inhabitants of the planet Zoitoid. What alien race would dare mess with a civilization that upchucks something such as "Cheaters"?

No wonder Earth scientists haven't discovered signs of intelligent life on Mars or around the Horsehead Nebula -- all extraterrestrials left the neighborhood a few minutes after they picked up wayward broadcasts of "When Animals Attack."

And now comes news that a study by the Kaiser Family Foundation "found a generation of parents raised on TV is largely encouraging the early use of television, video games and computers by their own children. These parents say TV and computer games teach how to share and the ABCs when they don't have the time."

I'm not buying that explanation. Rather, TV for tots is part of our nation's covert alien defense program: We're grooming a new generation to design stupid TV that will turn aliens' bulbous brains to mush and-or scare the antennae off their gray skulls.

America, it's your patriotic duty to watch and support "Punk'd," "Blind Date," "Date My Mom," "Maury," "The Jerry Springer Show," etc., ad nauseam. Who knew Maury Povich was serving our country, and our planet, so nobly?

Rick de Yampert is The Daytona Beach News-Journal's entertainment writer. He can be reached at

rick.deyampert.nul-jrnl.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 11:26:30 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:13:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

This is a follow-up to my post on the observation of some possible rotational blurring in Heflin Photo 1.

Possible evidence in favor of Heflin: (estimates)

Calculation of velocity of a dual pendulum swing. Please note that the weight of the object is not a factor nor am I assuming a large amount of mass of the string as compared to the object in question. Non Steady State vibrations are implied here: Picture one pendulum hanging off the end of the other: The end velocity examined here is that imparted to the swing of the alleged model at the end of the arrangement described. Both average and instantaneous velocities are shown: More complex calculations can be done, but the end result, on max velocity, should not be remarkably different.

Pendulum 1: a fishing rod with a string at 5 feet length with an object of any weight at the end (UFO model). Assume a swing length of 1 foot (side-to-side sweep) which is actually still very close to 1 foot arc length within the angle generated.

$T$  (time period of full swing) =  $2 \times 3.1416 [\sqrt{L/g}]$   
 $L$  = length of string (5 feet),  $g$  = acceleration of gravity at 32 feet/sec<sup>2</sup>

Therefore,  
 $T = 2.5$  sec and with an arc sweep of 1 foot (estimated) gives a velocity of  $V1 = D / T$ ;  $D$ = full length of sweep

$V1(\text{average}) = (2 \times 1)/2.5 = 0.8$  feet/sec or = ~ 9.6 inches/sec

Pendulum 2: a pendulum swing at the end point of the above pendulum with a separate swing at 1 inch or 0.083 feet length (side-to-side sweep), which is still very close to 1 inch arc length at the small angle generated.

$T$  (time period of full swing) =  $2 \times 3.1416 [\sqrt{L/g}]$   
 $L$  = length of string (0.083 feet),  $g$  = acceleration of gravity at 32 feet/sec<sup>2</sup>

Therefore.  
 $T = 0.32$  sec and with an arc sweep of 1 inch (0.083 ft) gives a velocity of  $V1 = D/T$ ;  $D$ = full length of sweep

$V2(\text{average}) = (2 \times 0.083)/ 0.32 = 0.5$  feet/sec or 6 inches/sec

Assuming the end Total velocity is a combination of  $V1 + V2$   
 $V(\text{total}) = V1 + V2$  at maximum this gives an upper limit of about

...  $V$  (total/averaged)= ~15 inches/sec, (maximum) This is a velocity reading averaged over the entire swing of both pendulum actions at maximum vector for each.

However, maximum velocity is reached at the very bottom of each swing: So in the extreme of both reaching maximum velocity at the same time in the same direction:

Note: that this would be generally much more perpendicular to



the noted blur and is therefore, value-wise, probably much greater ... than what is implied by the actual noted blur. (maximums only)

$V$  (bottom) =  $\sqrt{2 \times g \times H}$ ,  $H$  is the height max of each swing.

So, if we factor in this possibility (won't bore you with the math), we get a maximum instantaneous velocity at maximum contributions of both of about ~ 25 inches per second . .

... $V$  (instantaneous summed /bottom) = 25 inches/sec

Still, well below half of the 170 inches/sec estimated from yesterday. However, If the rod was jerked, it may require a motivation to simulate such an artifact and practice with repeated photography (which is easy with Polaroid)

In any event, it is unlikely a small object was used as a means of faking the object at close range with some of the following restriction: This would indicate that Photo 2 and Photo 3 are just coincidentally at the same  $x$  and  $y$  coordinates within the window frame and thereby giving a false 3D reading of distance (which has always been a possibility). Or, this may simply mean that the model used had a bit of asymmetry built into it and none of what I've done above or mentioned yesterday has any bearing (limited case). Or, the assumed fishing rod may have been jerked suddenly to emulate the observed and possible recorded blur/translation. This may also eliminate the scenario of the object having been attached to a larger sheet of glass (my earlier post), given the great difficulty in moving it in this fashion and speed.

I've seen other enhancements of the photos in question which show linear features above the object. However, I'm not sure of the provenance of these other digital images and their subsequent enhancements. My final opinion remains open until such time the original photos are made available and experiments with the same camera, film, and settings are examined more fully.

Please note that other calculations are possible upon making different assumptions. I've only entertained a reasonable one (only maximum vector addition was examined with the upper limits shown. In actuality, contributive readings from summing both swings may show much lower values when juxtaposed with obvious geometric (vector summed) restrictions and the noted blur direction being in a predominantly vertical direction. This only helps Heflin's case). A maximum umbrella value is being sought here... in actuality the values will probably be much less, including zero velocity values.

My posts are meant to contain the analysis issues that are at play. I'm not inferring, in any way, strong opinions in either direction. Trying to stay objective.

What you'll find following many posts here, is the attempt of others to extract just a few sentences from an earlier post and thereby infer you hadn't addressed a certain issue or they ignore entire other postings... all for the sake of spectacle for the lazy readers that we all know we are sometimes. And, sometimes these are just unintentional oversights. I try to include the entire passages of others for clarity and respect for all readers (reading in the moment). I'm not perfect either by I'm simply stating what my intentions are.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:40:49 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:15:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

Why, then, did he not reveal such things to NICAP and other investigators? Was it because most of the people who interviewed Heflin were 'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic?>

Hi Chris,

Define 'believers'. This way Dick Hall will have a better idea of your psych eval of him.

Don

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:16:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:44:24 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 12:48:05 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>... this is a premature conclusion (that some UFOs are ET  
>>spacecraft) because the data shows that the category you are  
>>referring to - your gold ore - is not a separate category from  
>>the other components of the UFO phenomenon but instead blends  
>>into the more bizarre. You can't just pick and choose nice neat  
>>little perfect nuts and bolts cases - cut it off there - when  
>>some perfect nuts and bolts cases blur (through bizarre  
>>characteristics) into the other components of the UFO  
>>phenomenon. You're drawing arbitrary lines and roping off a  
>>category (in effect, creating a category) that may not exist in  
>>the sense you're defining it.

>This is pretty silly. Please note the results of the chi-square  
>analysis in Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14. The  
>probability that the UNKNOWNNS are just missed KNOWNNS is less  
>than 1%. I really don't care about the blur-zone nor about ore  
>whose gold content is too low for profitable mining.

It's not silly at all! To begin with, the chi-square analysis saying  
that the probability that 'unknowns' are just 'missed knowns' is less  
than 1% does not prove that these 'unknowns' - even if they definite  
anomalies - are ET spacecraft as opposed to craft from older Earth  
civilizations, or some other phenomenon such as projections from a  
higher consciousness, for example. Where is the copy of the scientific  
study done - retrieved from government files or from other sources - that  
indicates, just for starters, that the biology of the alleged bodies  
found in the desert are ET as opposed to anything and everything else?

>>You may be correct that some UFOs are ET spacecraft but you  
>>can't conclude this yet until you adequately explain the 'blur  
>>zone' between the well-behaved nuts and bolts cases and the nuts  
>>and bolts cases that possess characteristics of the 'other  
>>components' aspect of the total UFO phenomenon.

>>>So I am very happy to end this discussion.

>>Works for me too, Stan, especially if you're going to keep  
>>trying to make it look like my refusal to get drawn into a  
>>debate over Roswell/MJ-12 with you is the same thing as me  
>>refusing to be specific about why I think your conclusions that  
>>some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature.

>Keep your blur-zones. I think they are irrelevant

Isn't this the whole point that I've been making all along -  
that you think the blur zones are irrelevant? And that they're  
not! They are extremely relevant. They are extremely relevant if  
you want to understand the UFO phenomenon - not just that little  
roped-off area of flying saucers, the apparent high-tech

vehicles that you've arbitrarily seperated from the bigger UFO picture to justify your premature conclusions that some UFOs are ET spacecarft.

I can provide loads of cases just like the Webster/Bedford case that shows your nuts and bolts high tech vehicle cases - with and without the apparent alien pilots - is not the seperate little category you've created and defined and that these cases you call the gold ore of ET spaceships needs to be looked at much more closely. And lots of research - such as done by Alvin Lawson - that shows the mind probably plays a bigger part - even in your nuts and bolts high-tech vehicle cases - than you're even remotely willing to consider.

Yes, gold ore exists in small quantities in places that sometimes makes it profitable for mining. But the gold ore is not always present. In some areas, there may not be enough for profitable mining. The gold ore you're so fond of talking about may not be present in the area you're talking about. Or you may find fool's gold. What you think you have in your hands - gold ore - may be simple fool's gold because you got caught up in the glint and glitter rather than consider the other characteristics of the compound you were holding.

Are you sure, Stan, you've found gold ore and aren't just jumping in excitement over a pile of fool's gold? I'm simply taking my prospector's magnifying glass out and having a closer look at that gold ore you've got there and using my prospector's hammer to chip away at it a little more to see just what's in your hand, or more exactly, what's in the hands of everyone whose jumping around all excited shouting they've found gold.

Remember the old saying, "All that glitters is not gold"?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:11:36 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:19:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 23:31:43 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 22:06:19 +0000  
>>Subject: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>Quite a few recent posts have raised questions about important  
>>or classic UFO cases of the past from an extremely naive and  
>>uninformed viewpoint. Like re-inventing the wheel, or being  
>>doomed to repeat the mistakes of history because of not studying  
>>the historical record.

>>There is a world of information out there that you need to  
>>bone up on.

><snip>

>>"we all know and appreciate  
>>Dick's persona as a walking Swiss army knife, able to cut  
>>through mountains of ufological BS within a millisecond."

>>That - i.e., my long experience and extensive knowledge of the  
>>UFO field - is what informed my quick dismissal of the Condign  
>>report, not some sort of arrogance or superiority complex as  
>>some relatively new people seem to think.

>>Despite our desires and wishful thinking, there is no simple,  
>>glib, 100% accurate interpretation of what is going on and what  
>>it all means. One needs to gather and study data carefully,  
>>consider the views of knowledgable and experienced people, and  
>>always be willing to reconsider on the basis of new evidence.

>>But, if you ignore the investigations by skilled and competent  
>>people that have gone before, you are being arrogant and  
>>dismissive.

>Dick

>Since it is plain as a pikestaff to anybody that I am one of the  
>targets of your criticism here I would like you to be specific  
>about:

Geez, you take things far too personally. I did intend the  
comments about the Helfin case to apply to you, among several  
others. I see no evidence (until today) that you ever looked at  
the NICAP investigation. Other than that, my remarks were far  
more broadly aimed. Lighten up, Martin. I actually respect a  
lot of your work.

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 14:28:29 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:35:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 18:13:57 +0000  
>Subject: Mexican FLIR Footage Update [was: MSNBC's Cosby Show]

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 1 Jun 2006 09:03:53 -0400  
>>Subject: MSNBC's Cosby Show

>>Some of you may have caught the Rita Cosby Show last  
>>night on MSNBC between 10 and 11 PM EST.

<snip>

>>I saw portions of the FLIR video from Mexico over  
>>and over (this section of the Mexican DOD sighting  
>>is probably ground lights, at least the Mexican AF  
>>hasn't reported on any experiments or data that would  
>>prove otherwise)

>The Mexican Airt Force doesn't have to prove anything, Sir.  
>You've only done your own personal study and analysis of the  
>footage, not the whole case. In the end your results reflect  
>only your own personal conclusions which don't establish, in any  
>way, the true facts of what happened that day in the Campeche  
>air space.

My "personal study and analysis" was done at the request of the  
Mexican Air Force (through Jaime Maussan). My analysis is posted  
at my web site:

<http://brumac.8k.com/MexicanDOD5mar04/>

One has to download this document or read it on the web. It is  
in Word format.

It may be true that the Mexican Air Force doesn't "have" to  
prove anything. However, I should think they would want to  
answer any questions related to the March 4, 2004 FLIR  
sightings. I did analyze the footage and also the verbal  
comments and managed to reconstruct the history of the sighting.  
I also provided analysis that showed A) the initial radar target  
is unexplained (radar UFO) and B) the FLIR lights were very  
likely distant and may have been as distant as the oil field  
fires about 100 miles away.

After I submitted the first draft of my analysis to the Mexican  
DOD in the summer of 2004 I was told they were "happy" with it.  
I also made several suggestions as to experiments they could do  
with their system to prove or disprove the oil field theory. I  
was never told that they did any such experiments, even though  
various types of experiments could have been carried out as part  
of their routine surveillance, such as flying along the same  
track again. (Better yet would have been flying from a location  
over the oil field toward the area where they had the sighting  
while recording the appearance of the oil fires.) I was told,  
without any evidence to support the statement, that "we fly in  
that area all the time and don't see oil fires" or something



like that. Well, if that were true, you'd think they could have sent me a copy of one of their FLIR video recordings made while flying in that area so I could compare it with the "UFO" FLIR video.

>Your conclusion is just an assumption

Hmmmm . . . . a conclusion is at the end, assumption is at the beginning. I have said that I analyzed the video and found that the FLIR light images were at least partially consistent with being ground lights a long distance from the aircraft (ten or more miles). I have concluded that the oil field flare theory is a possibility which must remain a possibility until proven otherwise by data such as I have requested.

>and not shared by many  
>other sources - as important and valuable as yours might be.  
You may be convinced by your own study but that will not change  
>anything in this case as your opinion is not fact, just a theory  
>like the others.

True, my opinion may not be "fact" but it is based on the facts of the case, as nearly as I can discern the facts.

>Here in Mexico we conducted a complete investigation along with  
>the original source that is the Mexican Air Force and they  
>provided much co-operation on this research including subsequent  
>flights over the zone in very similar conditions and never found  
>anything unusual - the phenomena never repeated and the FLIR  
>cameras didn't register those mysterious lights. Do I need to  
>say more?

So, further investigation was carried out by the Air Force. Wish I had been informed.

After the dozens of hours I spent on the analysis it would have nice to be able to prove something about the FLIR lights. (The experiments I requested were not difficult or time consuming.)

>To ask for a "test flight" of the Mexican Air Force is naive and  
>nonsense as they have national priorities like their anti- drug  
>operations and can't deviate from their programs and budgets to  
>please a foreign request in order to prove something not  
i>included in their agenda. This is easy to understand.

So they can request that a "foreigner" spend lots of time analyzing data that provide only part of the story but don't have the time to provide the data that prove "the rest of the story" (data that demonstrate the failure of the oil field hypothesis).

>However the Mexican Air Force and the Mexican DoD have been kind  
>enough to provide us results on their subsequent flights over  
>that area, including more FLIR footage confirming the phenomena  
>has not repeated or replicated since March 5, 2004.

>This response from the Air Force was according to the mutual  
>agreement of co-operation in this investigation and they  
>respected their commitment according to the rules established.

What you say above suggests that you have video FLIR data that disproves the oil field hypothesis. Then, I say, bring it on. Show us FLIR video taken when the plane was flying in the same area and the same direction (eastward) and looking in the same direction (toward the oil field) and under comparable weather conditions which shows no oil fires.

>We, as the civilian researchers are satisfied with their  
>information, results and evidence. We have kept this research to  
>ourselves here in Mexico with a huge database on this case. We  
>don't have any doubts and don't need any outsider to come and  
>question facts that have been established and proven.

>It's useless to argue, over and over, the same issue without  
>being directly involved with the original source. We respect  
>other opinions but don't accept them as 'fact' as they will  
>always suffer from insufficient data to support their claims.

>So far the Mexican Air Force UFO case continues being a

>milestone in Ufology, that's a fact.

No doubt it was a milestone in the release of information from a government source. Whether or not it is a milestone in the search for "infra-red proof" has yet to be conclusively determined, as least as far as the investigators outside Mexico are concerned.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 13:23:26 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 08:34:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 01:25:28 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thursday, June 01, 2006 4:03 AM  
>>Subject: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>Source: Darren Ethier's Blog

>><http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=22>

>>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>>Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

>>I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary  
>>Bates last night. The summary and title of the book intrigued me  
>>because from childhood I have always been interested in stories  
>>involving 'ETs' (extraterrestrials) and UFOs. I remember doing a  
>>presentation on UFOs as a project for one of my classes in high  
>>school. The reason why this book interested me is because I  
>>discovered a website for it advertised in the Creation  
>>Ministries International flyer that I recieved in the mail and  
>>after checking it out I thought the book would be worth a read  
>>(because of my already piqued interest in ETs). Here's the  
>>description found on the back of the book:

>>---

>>UFOs have been seen throughout the centuries. But in our  
>>enlightened technological age, are we any closer to solving the  
>>mystery? This book revisits the most famous events that have  
>>defined UFO culture, such as Roswell and alien autopsies;  
>>astronaut Gordon Cooper's sightings; Major Donald Keyhoe's  
>>allegations of official silence; and the claims of famous  
>>contactees Billy Meier and George Adamski.

><snip>

>I'm completely blind-sided by this.

>Does anyone on the List know much about the book, or its writer  
Gary Bates? I had never heard of either.

Another aliens are demons book, Larry-good verses evil. Tough to  
tell the difference when it comes to religion. I lost interest  
as soon as I saw this in the reviews.

Don

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 17:32:40 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 08:41:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>If I might add to my note of some days ago. Richard Hall took me  
>up on the matter of Heflin being a skilled model maker, and  
>insisted this was a total falsehood. NICAP apparently did a  
>thorough check of Heflin's background and found zilch to support  
>the idea.

>I referred to a British TV program in which this claim appeared,  
>saying it was surprising that no confirmation of this allegation  
>had surfaced, even from skeptics.

>I now discover that the said 75-minute program was on May 9,  
>1968 and was presented by a Dr Stephen Black (a psychiatrist). I  
>have now come across two reviews of this program, written soon  
>after the broadcast. One review does not mention the Heflin  
>photos; the other review does mention them, and it confirms what  
>I wrote on this List. The reviewer said: "Rex Heflin revealed  
>that he was a keen model maker and Dr Black commented that it  
>was possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it."

>This confirms that I had recalled the TV show correctly, but  
>raises another point. Black had been around quite a bit visiting  
>UFO witnesses. It appears that Heflin himself revealed his  
>propensity for making models to Dr Black. Why, then, did he not  
>reveal such things to NICAP and other investigators? Was it  
>because most of the people who interviewed Heflin were  
>'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic? Otherwise, what  
>else took place during that interview? We shall likely never  
>know. But even this one admission (the only one I have come  
>across) is sufficient to cast considerable doubts over the  
>photos.

>By the way, I find it very hard to accept that someone could  
>'forget' he had faked a photo less than 3 years afterwards.

Hi Christopher

There's a description of some shennanigans between Heflin and  
Stephen Black in a piece by Ann Druffel posted at:

[www.uforesearcher.com](http://www.uforesearcher.com)

forum on March 12. It's from MUFON Journal, March 2006 and you  
should read it. The short extract below suggests that Black  
rubbed Heflin up the wrong way, and that Heflin was not above  
winding him up a little.

Martin Shough

-----

... The following day McDonald, Heflin, Hartmann, and two  
visiting BBC documentarians, Philip Daly and a Dr. Black, who  
hoped to interview Heflin on-camera, journeyed to the site where

Heflin had taken Photo #4.

McDonald measured the telephone poles shown in the photo at about 30' high. Heflin pointed out where the object had emitted the bluish-black smoke-ring east of Myford Road, and McDonald estimated that the smoke-ring had been photographed at about 400 feet altitude.

Since Heflin had, just the evening before, stated that the ring had been at about 150 feet altitude when photographed, the rise in altitude in 4-knot winds seemed reasonable.

The position of the smoke-ring confirmed the wind data gathered by both himself and LANS - that the wind had been blowing from the SW.

Dr. Hartmann and Dr. Black set about making test shots using small models on strings, attempting to duplicate Heflin's Photos #1, #2, and #3.

They were trying to demonstrate that Heflin had hoaxed the photos, even though Dr. Robert Nathan, using 1965 JPL state-of-the-art computer enhancement equipment, had demonstrated that there were absolutely no strings or other supporting mechanisms visible in Heflin's photos.

This didn't matter to Hartmann, for he later wrote up the Heflin case in the Condon Report, judging the photos "in- conclusive."

Quietly watching Hartmann and Dr. Black photographing the models on stings, Heflin did not visibly show annoyance.

However, when Dr. Black began to ask him questions, beginning with the inquiry, "Are you religious?" Heflin replied that he was a Christian Scientist, adding that his religion "didn't let him recognize laws of the state."

This statement puzzled Black, but he didn't follow it up. He then asked Heflin if he was married. Heflin replied straight-faced, "More than once, but I don't want you to refer to it on camera lest my five wives find out where I am."

McDonald wrote all this down!! Realizing that Heflin was employing his own offbeat sense of humor which he typically used when irritated, rather than displaying open anger. LANS and other friendly colleagues had also recognized this, but the two BBC documentarians hadn't a clue.

Dr. Black suggested that they go ahead and film an interview. Heflin allowed them to film a very brief segment, in which he stated that he understood why various investigators were interested in the photos, and that everyone had the right to draw their own conclusions.

He explained how the automatic light meter on his camera had allowed the sky to appear flat and featureless in the first three photos taken inside his van, but showed the light cloud cover in Photo #4 which was taken outside the van in full light.

Black pressed him for a fuller interview, but Heflin flatly refused, stating that an American producer, John MacDonald, had already done a credible job for ITV. Why didn't they simply borrow his film? Bewildered, Black stopped talking to him.

- Why did Heflin act in this enigmatic way? For two and one-half years this honest, affable man had been hounded and harassed because he'd photographed a UFO at close quarters and presented to science a fine set of UFO photos showing features on the disc and other inexplicable effects.

Not being a man who showed anger easily, his instinctive defense was dead-pan humor. This was the way he handled most situations that irritated him.

It was not his fault that the photos contained more data than scientists could absorb. The enigmatic smoke-ring was not his fault. Neither was the fact that the automatic light meter on his Polaroid camera made the overcast sky appear virtually featureless in the first three photos and as a clouded sky in the fourth.

Philip Daly and Dr. Black later discussed with McDonald whether or not Heflin was serious about his religion and his "wives." Both Daly and Black thought Heflin was completely serious.

Dr. Black, however, thought that Heflin had not had five wives, but rather five relationships which were, in Rex's eyes, marriages in some odd legal sense, possibly connected to his religion. Daly, in turn, felt Heflin was serious about his religion and his "wives"!

Unbeknownst to the two English-men, McDonald had phoned Epperson the day before to get her reaction on the "wives-religion" question.

"She had already talked to John Gray on all this, and John had guffawed at the five-wife bit," wrote McDonald in his "Heflin" file. They had recently learned from Heflin that he was a Christian Scientist, but still a bachelor.

Epperson told him they all felt rather sure Heflin was pulling the leg of the BBC because he was inwardly seething at being called out there to witness the "hoax" tests. McDonald pointed out that no set-up had been intended.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 17:34:00 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 08:43:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:29:30 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:28:23 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>snip

>>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?)

>Yes, very good point Martin, the camera and film are available  
>and currently on order. (I ordered them a few days ago)

Excellent Viktor.

>Observation:

>Surprisingly, no mention is made (that I've read) in Photo 1 on  
>the asymmetry of the object.

Actually I drew attention to exactly this in a post a few days  
ago Viktor, but nobody reacted - of course. You seem to be right  
that it hasn't been mentioned anywhere else.

>The left side is pinched off, where  
>as the right side is somewhat flared out. Assuming this to be a  
>representation of the craft in motion and depending upon the  
>speed of the shutter and movement pattern of the UFO, this could  
>confirm rotational (harmonic/wobble and the like) movement as  
>reported with a rough measurement of (angular projected)  
>velocity in the event distance is established. Certainly, safe  
>limits could be established amongst the two competing theories  
>(see below). I would find it a major fault if researchers, at  
>the time, had not handed Heflin a clay model and then asked him  
>to replicate the movement pattern, as this is an important piece  
>of information lost. This asymmetry, it not detected in the  
>other photos, is also proof of movement, movement that may not  
>be possible with a small suspended model, etc... this is strong  
>evidence in favor of it not being a hoax (see below)! If the  
>model was made of inferior quality, this could quite easily be  
>just one bad side of the handy work. In any event, staying  
>positive...

This is something else that needs investigating on the originals  
or on high res images, in part to separate the effect of  
scanning artefacts (the low-res pixel orientation may contribute



to distorting the near-vertical edges). But as I said here before, the suggestion of global asymmetry or skewing in #1 appears to almost (but not quite) parallel the direction of an oblique (relative to the expected axis of symmetry) linear texture in the dark band. If you play with the gamma and then emboss you can bring this out quite vividly - as you can see in the image I sent you off-List.

The similarity of this effect to the striations I found in the Trindade images remains very interesting to me. In both cases we may have an unexplained oblique linear "shadow" effect, a global skewing of the object outline, possible evidence of rapid oscillation in the plane of the photo, and a surrounding "vapour".

>A estimated calculation of instantaneous velocity given two  
>remarkably different distances to objects as proposed:

>Assuming two scenarios, one a fake model at 4 feet distance and  
>a larger Real one of 25 feet at 1/8 mile (near Rex's estimate)

>1) 1/8 mile scenario: craft 25 feet in diameter: (photo 1)

>Assuming a craft at ~25 (reasonable given the lens) feet in  
>diameter, the right hand blur rotation in feet observed is  
>approximately ~2.0 feet (5 degrees and very left side as the  
>rotation point). With a shutter speed at ~1/1000 second, that  
>gives a momentary velocity of ~2000 feet/sec or ~1,400 miles/hr.  
>I would consider this as nobservable. Perhaps a higher harmonic  
>of the reported wobble and blur factor historically mentioned.  
>(or, just a flaw in the UFO model/other possibilities?)

>2) A model at 4 feet distance: (Photo 1)

>Assuming a diameter of about two (consistent) inches the  
>equivalent blur movement as compared with above would be ~0.17  
>inches in ~1/1000 sec or ~170 inches/sec, which comes to about  
>9.6 miles an hour. Since I think it unlikely to purposely  
>include or accidentally move a model at that speed/orientation,  
>this lends great credibility to it being of a genuine craft.  
>But, it may turn out that this is reasonable for an object  
>vibrating on the end of a thread while being moved... need to  
>test that likelihood (I'm working on that scenario). If not, it  
>may just be a reasonable way of sorting out the two competing  
>scenarios. You may also cut my estimates in half to account for  
>error... an we still get somewhat high numbers?

>I offer the above as a pro despite the fact that 3D stereo-  
>scopic examination lends credibility to a model of small stature  
>at close range given the coincidence of Heflin exactly  
>compensating for the movement in order to place it at the same  
>x/y coordinates within the same window frame (as seen in 3D and  
>as I've previously mentioned)

A vertical component of oscillation in the region of 5000  
degs/sec seems extremely violent. Increase the shutter time to  
1/250 and it's still violent. Say, order of 1000 deg/sec. I  
don't see any estimate of the period of the wobble reported by  
Heflin but he described it as like a gyroscope slowing down. The  
impression is of a slowish and easily discernable wobble, not a  
rapid vibration. If we assume 10 degs for the amplitude then the  
period is in the order of 100 Hz and these could be minima. So  
not observable as described. But possibly as you say the  
photographed component could be a rapid harmonic of the slower  
fundamental period seen visually.

As for whether this could be test between a suspended model and  
a large distant object I'm not sure. If this is a simple  
harmonic motion where gravity is the restoring force then for  
small angles the disc acts approximately like a pendulum whose  
period is independent of mass but dependent on the length, do I  
have this right? I suppose the length would be the radius of the  
disc if the equilibrium position is horizontal in the plane of  
the centre of gravity, and this could be true (all else being  
equal) both for a thread-suspended disc and for a flying disc  
supported non-aerodynamically by some force acting at its centre  
of gravity.

In this simple case you could compare periods possibly, and say  
that a rapid oscillation suggests a proportionally small  
oscillator, favouring a model. But the possibility that what is

photographed is a "ringing" harmonic and not the fundamental period of the oscillator puts a spanner in this argument. And it's a big assumption to say that a large UFO would oscillate like a simple pendulum anyway. It assumes that  $g = \text{constant}$  applies, for a start (which depending on your preferred propulsion theory may not be true). It also assumes no aerodynamic effects, and a damped harmonic oscillator. If there's a periodic driving force applied then all bets are off.

On the other hand it's worth noting that Brad Sparks measured a vertical blurring due to suggested oscillation on the Trindade photos with a value of 400 - 800 degs/sec, not too dissimilar.

<snip>

>The wire depicted stretching off into the distance in photo one  
>could be used as a great reference (agree with Martin) with  
>strings of various thickness as compared to their counterpart if  
>a mock setup at closer distance is entertained.

By the way, notice that the wires on the poles along the distant freeway are also visible on #1. These are fully 1500 ft from the lens. In fact NICAP's Ralph Rankow described this in 1967 (a conciliatory nod here in the direction of Dick Hall; Rankow's article originally in Fate appears also in FSR 14,1.). Rankow points out that even these distant wires are "finely resolved". Unfortunately Rankow's piece doesn't consider the fact that this is likely to be an image of several parallel wires, not a single wire. The nearby poles on Myford Road carry three; it's presumably possible that poles on the main highway carried more. Does anyone know? If the perspective effect were of a 1.5" bundle of wires (say) then the subtended angle would be about 0.004 deg or about 15 arcsec. This is still in the order of 10 times as coarse as a very fine thread a few feet away.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: UFOs In Journal of American Folklore - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:44:33 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 08:50:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal of American Folklore - Hall

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 28 May 2006 18:05:54 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFOs In Journal Of American Folklore

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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 Reason challenges me to produce even one example of a controversy in the social sciences that was decisively settled one way or the other. This is only a preliminary reply; I am consulting my brother, Robert L. Hall, professor emeritus of sociology and social psychology, so that I can give a more definitive reply.

Meanwhile, part of my response is that the physical sciences often fail to resolve anything decisively either, usually for reasons of political intrusion into scientific questions. Agent Orange, Gulf War Syndrome, particle physics, age of the earth/universe, antiquity of man on the planet, just to name a few. Still hotly debated; still searching for additional evidence.

That's the nature of science. Technically, very little of any consequence is ever decisively settled. Everything is only probable to a greater or lesser degree. Everything is hypothetical.

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 13:46:15 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:02:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:44:24 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 12:48:05 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>Are you sure, Stan, you've found gold ore and aren't just  
>jumping in excitement over a pile of fool's gold? I'm simply  
>taking my prospector's magnifying glass out and having a closer  
>look at that gold ore you've got there and using my prospector's  
>hammer to chip away at it a little more to see just what's in  
>your hand, or more exactly, what's in the hands of everyone  
>whose jumping around all excited shouting they've found gold.

>Remember the old saying, "All that glitters is not gold"?

I'm not saying here that we have nothing of value. Maybe what's glittering is not gold but is instead another type of precious gem. Stan's "gold" is ET spacecraft. Maybe the UFO phenomenon represents something different but equally important. Something just as big. I am saying that the RT (Reality Transformation) components of the UFO phenomenon require us to take a closer look at the ET spacecraft explanation. Too many apparent nuts and bolts cases have elements that suggest they are part of something more bizarre or mysterious. Until we explain this, we should be suspicious of any explanation of what the nuts and bolts high-tech vehicle cases are. I don't think the 'blur zones' represent 'missed knowns' but require us to take a closer look at what a lot of researchers have been accepting on face value as high-tech vehicles.

And, since I don't know the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon, nor do I know the motive or motives of the apparent intelligence behind it, I can't say it wouldn't stage a crash or wouldn't dump little bodies in the desert for our attention. So, while I don't out-and-out dismiss Roswell, I do think the pros and cons thrown out there by a number of very competent researchers, when weighed one against the other, justifies my strongly leaning away from the case as being an important one.

My refusal to get into any further discussion of these pros and cons of Roswell has nothing to do with why I think Stan's conclusions that some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature - my point from square one one - and I've been very specific as to why I believe he can't make this conclusion yet.

The 'blur zones' are very relevant. They may represent the

portal through which we find the answer to the UFO enigma.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 13:43:49 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:04:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Joe Faccenda <[Uforth.nul](mailto:Uforth.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 15:32:43 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>If I might add to my note of some days ago. Richard Hall took me  
>up on the matter of Heflin being a skilled model maker, and  
>insisted this was a total falsehood. NICAP apparently did a  
>thorough check of Heflin's background and found zilch to support  
>the idea.

>I referred to a British TV program in which this claim appeared,  
>saying it was surprising that no confirmation of this allegation  
>had surfaced, even from skeptics.

>I now discover that the said 75-minute program was on May 9,  
>1968 and was presented by a Dr Stephen Black (a psychiatrist). I  
>have now come across two reviews of this program, written soon  
>after the broadcast. One review does not mention the Heflin  
>photos; the other review does mention them, and it confirms what  
>I wrote on this List. The reviewer said: "Rex Heflin revealed  
>that he was a keen model maker and Dr Black commented that it  
>was possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it."

>This confirms that I had recalled the TV show correctly, but  
>raises another point. Black had been around quite a bit visiting  
>UFO witnesses. It appears that Heflin himself revealed his  
>propensity for making models to Dr Black. Why, then, did he not  
>reveal such things to NICAP and other investigators? Was it  
>because most of the people who interviewed Heflin were  
>'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic? Otherwise, what  
>else took place during that interview? We shall likely never  
>know. But even this one admission (the only one I have come  
>across) is sufficient to cast considerable doubts over the  
>photos.

>By the way, I find it very hard to accept that someone could  
>'forget' he had faked a photo less than 3 years afterwards.

Possible to fake a photo and then forget that it was faked? I  
suppose "anything" is possible!

But if he told Black several (3?) years later then he didn't  
forget.

Are we to assume he faked the four photos and then immediately  
forgot and that's why he didn't tell the UFO investigators  
during the initial investigation?

But then several years later he remembered and told Black?

Sounds to me as if the Black "Possible" theory is spurious... if

not ludicrous.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 15:21:59 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:09:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:29:15 -0300  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>>By the way, I find it very hard to accept that someone could  
>>'forget' he had faked a photo less than 3 years afterwards.

>CDA you are correct, but we all know that all witnesses lie and  
>only debunkers tell the truth.

>Did it ever occur to you that Dr. Black might have asked whether  
>Rex had liked making models as a child? The answer might have  
>been "sure, when I was a kid. I was pretty good at it, too."

>Most models were made from kits.

>Never saw a kit like the one in the photo.

>Did Black make a tape or take notes? Had he ever expressed other  
>opinions about UFOs? Was he a Freudian? Does Black have a full  
>name? Is there a clip available?

>I do recall your once claiming that Don Menzel's post WW II  
>intelligence connections were well known. You gave a reference  
>which I checked. It only noted, as everybody knew, that Menzel was  
>in the Navy during WW II... not the same thing as his close  
>connections with the CIA, NSA, etc., in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s.

I found a website that mentions the TV program and Dr. Stephen  
Black and Heflin and gives a minute by minute summary of the  
program, [open.bbc.co.uk/catalogue/infax/programme/LSF5044L](http://open.bbc.co.uk/catalogue/infax/programme/LSF5044L)

It says nothing about Heflin making models, though that doesn't  
prove that somebody didn't say that. Perhaps CDA has the actual  
quote and the source i.e. Heflin, Black, narrator?

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:55:23 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:15:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:29:15 -0300  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>If I might add to my note of some days ago. Richard Hall took me  
>>up on the matter of Heflin being a skilled model maker, and  
>>insisted this was a total falsehood. NICAP apparently did a  
>>thorough check of Heflin's background and found zilch to support  
>>the idea.

>>I referred to a British TV program in which this claim appeared,  
>>saying it was surprising that no confirmation of this allegation  
>>had surfaced, even from skeptics.

>>I now discover that the said 75-minute program was on May 9,  
>>1968 and was presented by a Dr Stephen Black (a psychiatrist). I  
>>have now come across two reviews of this program, written soon  
>>after the broadcast. One review does not mention the Heflin  
>>photos; the other review does mention them, and it confirms what  
>>I wrote on this List. The reviewer said: "Rex Heflin revealed  
>>that he was a keen model maker and Dr Black commented that it  
>>was possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it."

>>This confirms that I had recalled the TV show correctly, but  
>>raises another point. Black had been around quite a bit visiting  
>>UFO witnesses. It appears that Heflin himself revealed his  
>>propensity for making models to Dr Black. Why, then, did he not  
>>reveal such things to NICAP and other investigators? Was it  
>>because most of the people who interviewed Heflin were  
>>'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic? Otherwise, what  
>>else took place during that interview? We shall likely never  
>>know. But even this one admission (the only one I have come  
>>across) is sufficient to cast considerable doubts over the  
>>photos.

>>By the way, I find it very hard to accept that someone could  
>>'forget' he had faked a photo less than 3 years afterwards.

>CDA you are correct, but we all know that all witnesses lie and  
>only debunkers tell the truth.

>Did it ever occur to you that Dr. Black might have asked whether  
>Rex had liked making models as a child? The answer might have  
>been "sure, when I was a kid. I was pretty good at it, too."

>Most models were made from kits.

>Never saw a kit like the one in the photo.

>Did Black make a tape or take notes? Had he ever expressed other  
>opinions about UFOs? Was he a Freudian? Does Black have a full  
>name? Is there a clip available?

His name is given as Dr Stephen Black. I wrote the review of the programme (but I had forgotten about it, as it was a long time ago). I will post a copy of it (I am waiting for someone to scan it for me).

I found some details of this programme, titled Flying Saucers And The People Who See Them, on a BBC web site which appears to be attempting to catalogue all BBC programmes ever shown. You might have trouble finding your way around, as it is still being developed. The URL for details of this program is:

<http://open.bbc.co.uk/catalogue/infax/programme/LSF5044L>

There is a summary and the bit about Heflin reads:

Var s of Rex Heflin, a traffic investigator of Orange County, Southern California, who has taken some very controversial photos of flying saucers. s of four of his pictures (51m47s-52m12s). Dr Black asks Heflin how he feels about having photographs scientifically investigated (55m28s-57m50s). Dr William Hartmann, an astronomer at the University of Arizona, talks about, and demonstrates, how to fake a photograph of a flying saucer, and the difficulty of actually getting at the truth behind these phenomena (52m12s-55m28s).

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:15:05 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:22:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Jeff Olson <[jlolson.nul](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 18:03:23 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:46:03 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>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.

Nowhere have I said that the evidence indicates non-nuts and  
bolts technology is responsible for the preponderance of  
substantive UFO cases. You had better re-read my posts.

>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.

There's a very important key word in your writing - it's the  
word "seem(s)". And are you implying that a UFO case is  
substantive only if seems 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.

So, you're sure the experience I had in my bedroom is (was) a  
lucid dream or a sundry mystical revelation? Is this your  
comfortable way of dismissing anything that threatens your  
'high-tech nuts and bolts aliens flying souped-up spacecraft'  
interpretation of the UFO phenomenon? Because there are plenty  
of so-called strong nuts and bolts cases that have the subtle  
transformation of reality that I'm talking about as a component  
of the case - and this RT component is not the lucid dream or  
sundry mystical revelation type experience that you're alluding  
to. The one in my bedroom - as well as the other experiences  
I've had and each of the three UFO sightings I've witnessed -  
had that subtle 'change' in reality that has occurred in many  
UFO events other than mine.

>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.

Your demand goes both ways - those claiming that UFOs, even some of them, are ET spacecraft should be able to offer strong evidence for this claim. Even tons of cases of high-tech vehicles doesn't meet this demand because you can't show the vehicles are ET as opposed to from older Earth civilizations. Are you getting the point? At best, all you have is evidence of high-tech vehicles - not ET high-tech vehicles.

And the 'blur zone' where apparent high-tech vehicle cases blend into the bizarre aspects of the UFO phenomenon tells us that apparent high-tech vehicle cases may not actually represent high-tech vehicles but instead could represent something more mysterious. The UFO phenomenon might be providing seeming manifestations of apparent high-tech vehicles - yes, even ones that can throw back a radar reflection - that is, it might be altering our perceptions of reality.

There are plenty of substantive cases that contain bizarre elements that are stranger than aliens and spaceships. It is an assumption that these elements are caused by alien's high technology as opposed to other possibilities. There are way more than enough of these types of cases to warrant that you put the brakes on and slow way down before assuming that the strong apparent nuts and bolts high-tech vehicles cases justifies a conclusion that there are indeed high-tech vehicles and that the vehicles are ET.

We also need to explain how the research conducted by researchers such as Alvin Lawson figures into the whole scenario before you can even begin to say you've explained the UFO phenomenon and the abduction phenomenon.

It might be ET. But even then you might have a big surprise when you figure out just what it is ET is doing within our environment. It might be something radically different than ET too.

>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.

I have great respect for all Stan has done. I just don't agree with his conclusions and I think his conclusion that some UFOs are ET spacecraft is premature. This conclusion of Stan's is not necessarily wrong, simply premature!

>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.

You see no reason? The fact that your friend's and relatives' assertions are based on total ignorance - that comes out of having no interest in UFOs and no motivation to research them - while researchers like Kevin Randle, Daniel Cohen, and others do have an interest in UFOs and do have motivation to research them as well as think about them - and, in fact, have done so as competently as Stan Friedman - might have a little bit to do with why you should see a reason to find their assertions regarding either Stan or Roswell more deserving of attention than your friends' or relatives' ignorant assertions about the silliness of UFOs.

I don't think you can compare the efforts of your family and friends to the efforts of Kevin Randle, for instance, and I'm alarmed regarding your ability to make judgements on the subject of UFOs if you would put him in the same boat as the others you've mentioned.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:15:46 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:23:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Steven Kaeser <[steve.nul](mailto:steve.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 08:27:29 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>From: Viktor Golubik [Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 26 May 2006 10:32:23 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>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.

This is fair and proper, Steve!

>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.

Again, Steve, his is how I see it.

>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.

As do I, Steve. I just urge caution.

>I think this book will be very interesting and I hope he puts in  
>many of his frustrations.

I think it's going to be very interesting, too, Viktor, and I  
already plan on buying it as well. As I said, I concede  
something appears to have happened at Roswell - I'm just not  
even remotely convinced yet it was 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:16:04 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:24:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 20:47:29 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>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.

You have so eloquently summed up my point of view on this and  
the reasons I refuse to get into a debate with Stan over  
Roswell/MJ-12. It's not charismatic handwaving or the inability  
to be specific. You've covered 'why and what it is' superbly!  
Thank 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 16:16:21 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:25:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Lan Fleming <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 24 May 2006 22:05:10 -0500  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto: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).

>I've always been amazed that self-styled "skeptics" can glibly  
>assert that writing a book decreases the credibility of a  
>witness' testimony,

Is this what you think I'm asserting?

>but I've never once heard any of them say  
>that not writing a book has ever increased anyone's  
>credibility.

Probably because it's a foolish notion, as is the notion you've  
suggested that I think writing a book adversely affects someones  
credibility.

>It seems that what they're really trying to say is:  
>"Heads I win, tails you lose."

No, what I'm trying to say is just be cautious! Plain and simple!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 20:25:14 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:28:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:13:14 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 20:24:07 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>The broad issue here is... why go through all this?

>>For "completeness" Viktor. :-)

>This was a rhetorical comment, please Martin!

Oh dear, sorry Viktor, that was just a humorous comment (hence the smiley). A little List-bird admonished me recently that a sense of humour was important!

>>>Well, after  
>>>30 seconds of viewing the 3D, I confirmed (as Tim Shell  
>>>originally did), that the climb to proving that this wasn't a  
>>>fake, was a steep one.

>>You can't possibly "prove it isn't a fake". If you began with  
>>this as an aim you were always going to end up throwing your  
>>hands in the air. But you can effectively refute the theory that  
>>it is genuine. The realistic aim is to test possible  
>>inconsistencies with that theory in as many ways as you can  
>>think of. The more you fail, the less confidently you can assert  
>>that it might still be a fake.

>All we can do is weigh possibilities, yes... anything new here  
>that is just as obvious as my earlier post?

Well the difference is important, as I'm certain you know. To you it may seem too obvious to waste time labouring the point, but not everybody out there appreciates that it has to be about conjectures and refutations. Some people seem bewildered and angered by any attempt to test cases critically, appearing to think that criticism equates to debunking. This is a real problem IMO. That's why I take the time to be explicit about it.

><snip>

>>>Size of the UFO from frame to frame may also reveal consistence  
>>>or inconsistency of the object getting closer and farther from  
>>>the viewer (object) in relation to movement direction (but the  
>>>UFO could be moving erratically so this isn't conclusive  
>>>either). As I pointed out earlier, directional information is in  
>>>the 3D at the Horizon point in the 3D overlap (either his  
>>>movement or the UFO).

>>I suggested some time ago that if you rescale the distant  
>>landscapes, which means reducing #3 by about 6% in relation to  
>>#2, the UFO in #3 (flange diameter estimated by reference to  
>>proportionality of #1) still appears to be about 7% larger  
>>than in #2. On the face of it this seems inconsistent with the

>>sequence as reported. It could be consistent with the camera  
>>moving closer to a small model just beyond the window, since the  
>>window width has enlarged at the same time by almost 5% between  
>>#2 and #3. This should be taken as a minimum value for the  
>>difference in range between lens and window since, as I pointed  
>>out, there is a very small perspective foreshortening of the  
>>window width in #3. Allowing for this, it isn't ruled out that  
>>the proportion change in angular width of the UFO and of the  
>>window frame have not only the same sign but the same exact  
>>value.

>>This needs to be investigated with more care on high-resolution  
>>images, which we (or I at any rate) do not possess. Possibly  
>>this issue, and a number of other issues that have been raised  
>>recently, by several people, on this List and in off-List  
>>exchanges with Ann Druffel and Bob Wood, will be addressed in  
>>their and Ed Kelson's forthcoming JSE paper this summer. Or if  
>>not then hopefully the images can then be made available for  
>>wider study. Meanwhile, all one can say is that the above  
>>result - considered alone - would be consistent with a model  
>>just beyond the window. As I also pointed out the direction of  
>>displacement of the images against the landscape is also  
>>consistent with a stationary model just beyond the window, close  
>>to the range of the mirror, but not a stationary model beyond  
>>the mirror. This is in turn consistent with Tim Shell's original  
>>idea about the stereo coincidence. But...

>I brought this up, in my response to Bruce Macabee's post a while  
>ago - see:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m25-026.shtml>

Hmm, I now see where this is going Viktor. So, just for the  
record

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m24-026.shtml>

establishes that all the above issues were actually raised in  
detail by me the previous day! Yippee! So there.

>><snip>

>>>My point was that an actual experiment with that camera has to  
>>>be entertained not a digital one).

>>I agree. That doesn't mean David's experiment has no value  
>>though, especially if the hypothetical model needs to have been  
>>within only a few tens of inches of the lens, which is what I  
>>said the evidence suggests (and I think David now agrees?).

>I didn't say it had no value, I've only been saying that  
>experiments with the actual film and setting have to be done...  
>oversaturation conditions need to be explored \_real  
>settings\_real film\_real camera.... I've been saying that since  
>the beginning.

Yeah me too. "precise photogrammetry with the identical truck",  
blah, blah.

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m25-002.shtml>

>>It's also possible that Heflin got the order wrong. Remember the  
>>film pack was not numbered and he marked them 1 to 4 at some  
>>time later. So he could have transposed #3 and #4 quite easily I  
>>imagine. It wouldn't seem particularly important to him at the  
>>time. In fact if you reverse them you end up with a coherent  
>>sequence of reducing angular size. Of course the cost of doing  
>>that is to make the #3 "smoke trail" less intelligible, since  
>>this becomes #2 and presumably heading in the opposite  
>>direction.

>I was first to bring of the film order as it relates to  
>directional information on the object in question and brought  
>that up a while ago. (in private to Tim Shell too). If the order  
>is, reversed the 3D becomes inverted too - remember my first  
>post... see:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m24-010.shtml>

Oh alright, if you say so, you were The First, whateve... ;-)

<snip>

>>>I can think of one another way to suspend a small object without  
>>>thread. If the object was suspended in between two panes of thin  
>>>glass. Perhaps the car window is one of them? I guess it would  
>>>have lead me to become very observant at the evidence and  
>>>witnesses houses during that time.

>>Think about this. If you look at the opened triangular side vent  
>>in #2 and #3 you can see what the darkening due to the  
>>overlapped edge of a second sheet of glass looks like. Now  
>>visualise the internal obstructions due to the shape of the cab,  
>>side window divider, windscreen post etc. Then visualise the  
>>obstruction caused outside the window by the mirror support  
>>structure. I don't see any anomalous lines that look like the  
>>edge of a second sheet of glass. A second sheet of glass would  
>>have to be cut and positioned so that its edge did not overlap  
>>the window glass anywhere.

>>Maybe close examination of enhanced high-res scans of the  
>>originals will show the edge of a glass sheet, but I doubt it.  
>>This is not a very simple job, never mind the odd problem of how  
>>to trap a moving model between two such sheets of glass such  
>>that it apparently tips and rotates without moving around, then  
>>arranging a support mechanism for the whole contraption.

>This does not preclude large sheet glass that fills the entire  
>view just leaning against the car. It is also possible to glue  
>the backside to a single sheet of glass. I also mentioned other  
>orientations for the string. I think it's fair to say (read all  
>my posts) that I'm looking at this from many angles\_  
>specifically inconsistencies and consistencies both.

Yes Viktor, and so am I - as is plain to see. (I agree very  
strongly with this approach, though I suspect it confuses and  
upsets some people who need to be able to line up ideological  
allies and antagonists on their respective "sides".) Hence my  
unpartisan responses to your arguments. It's important to think  
of everything on the one hand, and important to try to shoot  
it down on the other. I offered a valid observation that places  
constraints on your glass sheet theory. You adapt to try and  
evade those constraints. That's how it goes, eh?

>David's experiment lacks comparisonwirth:

>a) Real Film and Real settings.

>b) Only string orientaions in one focal plane are explored close  
>up.

>c) Oversaturation conditions aren't explored since digital  
> cameras are predominantly automatic, Heflin's lacked a certain  
> amount of compensation here.

I agree. Maybe David can adapt his experiment to take some  
account of these and other variables. But I agree that modern  
digital analysis of real polaroids in a photogrammetrically  
exact reconstruction is the way to go. That you have managed to  
get hold of film and camera is really excellent. I'm looking  
forward to some results.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints? - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 15:28:23 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:30:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints? - Maccabee

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 14:25:03 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints?

>Just a quick question. Who currently has the Trent/McMinnville  
>negatives and prints? I've been fiddling with the excellent  
>high-res scans at Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos's page:

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

>I'm running into a bit of trouble with them. There are problems  
>with the horizontal scaling, making me think they weren't  
>processed at the same time and place. Also, the one showing the  
>underside of the saucer, "mcminnville1.jpg" I think might be a  
>contact print of some kind, which also shows some evidence of  
>dodging around the saucer. I guess it was done to enhance the  
>saucer, but it messes up the size and diffusion comparisons. I  
>can make some adjustments myself, but I don't like to do that.

>Anyone know where there are some nice, alternate high-res prints  
>available somewhere? Particularly of the photo showing the  
>saucer underside?

I returned the negatives to the Trent's children several years ago. The prints given to Ray Stanford and featured at the Olmos site were 8 x 10 excellent prints, so far as I recall. Probably the digitization does not do justice to the image resolution inherent in the prints.

There are blowups of the UFO images and more info about the Trent case than you ever imagined at:

<http://brumac.8k.com>

From the opening web page scan down the left side to "papers" and click on "papers".

Then scan down to the bottom where you will find 3 'mondo' files on the Trent investigation.

The blowups of U01 and U02 were made by Wm. Hartmann of the Condon study in 1968 from the original negatives. The full frame pictures were made from 8x10 prints which had also been made from the original negatives.

Besides my own investigation and the Condon study, the original negatives have been studied at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory by Dr. Robert Nathan, who also investigated the Heflin case, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Brooks Institute of Photography.

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:34:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

<snip>

>But those are the precisely cases we need to keep looking at.  
>The ones we've grown most comfortable with. Even if a new scan  
>reveals the fishing line and the case blows up in our faces.  
>Because that's what science is about. Chipping away at belief  
>until all that remains is fact. Debunking in the purest sense of  
>the word, since it's foolish to tolerate bunk.

In an ideal world this would clearly be the case. But in the real world, as is all too obvious from postings on UpDates, this does not happen. No matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing line' has been revealed ufologists have become so comfortable with those cases that they regard any attempt to re-examine them critically as a form of heresy.

Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

### Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:46:01 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:36:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>If I might add to my note of some days ago. Richard Hall took me  
>up on the matter of Heflin being a skilled model maker, and  
>insisted this was a total falsehood. NICAP apparently did a  
>thorough check of Heflin's background and found zilch to support  
>the idea.

>I referred to a British TV program in which this claim appeared,  
>saying it was surprising that no confirmation of this allegation  
>had surfaced, even from skeptics.

>I now discover that the said 75-minute program was on May 9,  
>1968 and was presented by a Dr Stephen Black (a psychiatrist). I  
>have now come across two reviews of this program, written soon  
>after the broadcast. One review does not mention the Heflin  
>photos; the other review does mention them, and it confirms what  
>I wrote on this List. The reviewer said: "Rex Heflin revealed  
>that he was a keen model maker and Dr Black commented that it  
>was possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it."

>This confirms that I had recalled the TV show correctly, but  
>raises another point. Black had been around quite a bit visiting  
>UFO witnesses. It appears that Heflin himself revealed his  
>propensity for making models to Dr Black. Why, then, did he not  
>reveal such things to NICAP and other investigators? Was it  
>because most of the people who interviewed Heflin were  
>'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic? Otherwise, what  
>else took place during that interview? We shall likely never  
>know. But even this one admission (the only one I have come  
>across) is sufficient to cast considerable doubts over the  
>photos.

>By the way, I find it very hard to accept that someone could  
>'forget' he had faked a photo less than 3 years afterwards.

Do you think perhaps Black was just being polite?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <[egehrman.nul](mailto:egehrman.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 15:31:38 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:39:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Gehrman

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:44:24 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>I can provide loads of cases just like the Webster/Bedford case  
>that shows your nuts and bolts high tech vehicle cases - with  
>and without the apparent alien pilots - is not the seperate  
>little category you've created and defined and that these cases  
>you call the gold ore of ET spaceships needs to be looked at  
>much more closely. And lots of research - such as done by Alvin  
>Lawson - that shows the mind probably plays a bigger part - even  
>in your nuts and bolts high-tech vehicle cases - than you're  
>even remotely willing to consider.

EBK, List,

<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Vault/6521/>

Alvin Lawson:

"Thesis: Alien abductions are archetypal fantasies involving belief or deception, in which the subject's birth memories play a central role.

The articles incorporating this view are written by Alvin H. Lawson, Ph.D. Lawson has been an active CE3 researcher since 1973. He taught a class in UFO literature at CSU, Long Beach for ten years, and worked with hypnotist W. C. McCall, M.D., on more than 100 hypnotic regressions of "abductees" and related CE3 subjects. The Imaginary Abductee study was an early Lawson-McCall collaboration (see "Hypnosis of Imaginary Abductees" below, for discussion and four Imaginary transcripts)."

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:20:19 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:44:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:44:24 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 12:48:05 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>... this is a premature conclusion (that some UFOs are ET  
>>>spacecraft) because the data shows that the category you are  
>>>referring to - your gold ore - is not a separate category from  
>>>the other components of the UFO phenomenon but instead blends  
>>>into the more bizarre. You can't just pick and choose nice neat  
>>>little perfect nuts and bolts cases - cut it off there - when  
>>>some perfect nuts and bolts cases blur (through bizarre  
>>>characteristics) into the other components of the UFO  
>>>phenomenon. You're drawing arbitrary lines and roping off a  
>>>category (in effect, creating a category) that may not exist in  
>>>the sense you're defining it.

>>This is pretty silly. Please note the results of the chi-square  
>>analysis in Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14. The  
>>probability that the UNKNOWNS are just missed KNOWNNS is less  
>>than 1%. I really don't care about the blur-zone nor about ore  
>>whose gold content is too low for profitable mining.

>It's not silly at all! To begin with, the chi-square analysis saying  
>that the probability that 'unknowns' are just 'missed knowns' is less  
>than 1% does not prove that these 'unknowns' - even if they definite  
>anomalies - are ET spacecraft as opposed to craft from older Earth  
>civilizations, or some other phenomenon such as projections from a  
>higher consciousness, for example. Where is the copy of the scientific  
>study done - retrieved from government files or from other sources - that  
>indicates, just for starters, that the biology of the alleged bodies  
>found in the desert are ET as opposed to anything and everything else?

The amount of evidence for some UFOs as manufactured vehicles  
behaving in ways that vehicles we Earthlings can produce cannot  
behave, is very substantial. The huge expenditures on advanced  
military craft demonstrate our great military interest in high  
tech. Why invoke unknown civilizations for which no evidence has  
been provided or mental constructs for which no evidence has  
been provided? I expect advanced civilizations to have developed  
the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology  
sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems

>>>You may be correct that some UFOs are ET spacecraft but you  
>>>can't conclude this yet until you adequately explain the 'blur  
>>>zone' between the well-behaved nuts and bolts cases and the nuts  
>>>and bolts cases that possess characteristics of the 'other  
>>>components' aspect of the total UFO phenomenon.

>>>>So I am very happy to end this discussion.

>>>Works for me too, Stan, especially if you're going to keep  
>>>trying to make it look like my refusal to get drawn into a  
>>>debate over Roswell/MJ-12 with you is the same thing as me  
>>>refusing to be specific about why I think your conclusions that  
>>>some UFOs are ET spacecraft are premature.

>>Keep your blur-zones. I think they are irrelevant

>Isn't this the whole point that I've been making all along -  
>that you think the blur zones are irrelevant? And that they're  
>not! They are extremely relevant. They are extremely relevant if  
>you want to understand the UFO phenomenon - not just that little  
>roped-off area of flying saucers, the apparent high-tech  
>vehicles that you've arbitrarily seperated from the bigger UFO  
>picture to justify your premature conclusions that some UFOs are  
>ET spacecarft.

As far as I can see you have made proclamations without  
evidence. That is your privilege.

My lecture is "Flying Saucers ARE Real" NOT UFOs are Real.

I am not interested in the non spacecraft UFOs. All the people  
who don't have AIDS don't in general teach AIDS specialists much  
about those that do.. You can keep the IFOs and maybe UFOs. I  
will keep the flying saucers. I have a large gray basket. It is  
not my focus.

>I can provide loads of cases just like the Webster/Bedford case  
>that shows your nuts and bolts high tech vehicle cases - with  
>and without the apparent alien pilots - is not the seperate  
>little category you've created and defined and that these cases  
>you call the gold ore of ET spaceships needs to be looked at  
>much more closely. And lots of research - such as done by  
>Alvin Lawson - that shows the mind probably plays a bigger  
>part - even >in your nuts and bolts high-tech vehicle cases  
> - than you're even remotely willing to consider.

I knew Al Lawson, spoke at CSULB, and found that many have  
misinterpreted his results. The stories told by his subjects did  
not have the emotional content of those told by real abductees.

>Yes, gold ore exists in small quantities in places that  
>sometimes makes it profitable for mining. But the gold ore is  
>not always present. In some areas, there may not be enough for  
>profitable mining. The gold ore you're so fond of talking about  
>may not be present in the area you're talking about. Or you may  
>find fool's gold. What you think you have in your hands - gold  
>ore - may be simple fool's gold because you got caught up in the  
>glint and glitter rather than consider the other characteristics  
>of the compound you were holding.

>Are you sure, Stan, you've found gold ore and aren't just  
>jumping in excitement over a pile of fool's gold? I'm simply  
>taking my prospector's magnifying glass out and having a closer  
>look at that gold ore you've got there and using my prospector's  
>hammer to chip away at it a little more to see just what's in  
>your hand, or more exactly, what's in the hands of everyone  
>whose jumping around all excited shouting they've found gold.

>Remember the old saying, "All that glitters is not gold"?

There is another one. Proclaiming something isn't the same as  
providing evidence to establish its truth.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints? - Olmos

From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <[ballesterolmos.nul](mailto:ballesterolmos.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 00:36:11 +0200 (CEST)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:48:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints? - Olmos

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 14:25:03 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Trent/McMinnville High-Res Prints?

>Just a quick question. Who currently has the Trent/McMinnville  
>negatives and prints? I've been fiddling with the excellent  
>high-res scans at Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos's page:

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

>I'm running into a bit of trouble with them. There are problems  
>with the horizontal scaling, making me think they weren't  
>processed at the same time and place. Also, the one showing the  
>underside of the saucer, "mcminnville1.jpg" I think might be a  
>contact print of some kind, which also shows some evidence of  
>dodging around the saucer. I guess it was done to enhance the  
>saucer, but it messes up the size and diffusion comparisons. I  
>can make some adjustments myself, but I don't like to do that.

>Anyone know where there are some nice, alternate high-res prints  
>available somewhere? Particularly of the photo showing the  
>saucer underside?

>Thanks!

Tim,

Those scans were produced for me by Ray Stanford from  
first-generation prints delivered to him by Dr Bruce Maccabee  
several year ago. To the best of my knowledge these are  
undoctored images and they faithfully represent actual from the  
original negatives.

I invite Bruce to comment.

Best,

Vicente-Juan

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 11:41:07 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:54:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:40:49 -0300  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Why, then, did he not reveal such things to NICAP and other  
>investigators? Was it because most of the people who interviewed  
>Heflin were 'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic?>

>Hi Chris,

>Define 'believers'. This way Dick Hall will have a better idea of  
>your psych eval of him.

>Don

Bit of a skeptic; the guy is such an obvious outright debunker that I seriously doubt he ever talked to or interviewed Heflin. He probably assumed (which as pilot witness Bill Nash once famously said to Dr. menzel, "to ass-u-me is to make an ass out of u and an ass out of me") that Heflin must have been an ardent model builder and faker.)

And Don is right, our investigators were certainly not slack-jawed "believers." They actively looked for any evidence of hoax or fraud and were quite thorough and objective. And by the way, Heflin wouldn't have had to 'reveal' his model building to NICAP. They were in his home and got to know him very well, all of his activities included.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Corrales Heights Woman Swears She Saw UFO Here

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:58:25 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 09:58:25 -0400  
Subject: Corrales Heights Woman Swears She Saw UFO Here

Source: Rio Rancho Observer - New Mexico, USA

<http://www.observer-online.com/articles/2006/06/03/news/story11.txt>

June 3, 2006

Corrales Heights Woman Swears She Saw UFO Here

By Gary Herron/Observer Staff Reporter

Charlott Motter has lived in Rio Rancho since 1975 but she hadn't seen an unidentified flying object since the mid-1950s, when she was at a park in the Washington, D.C., area.

Of course, she expects skepticism about her story.

Early last month, she said - and she can't recall exactly what time it was, just that it was dark - she walked out onto her patio.

"Don't ask me why I walked out," the 77-year-old Corrales Heights resident said.

"I saw about 6-8 white lights and it was hovering," she said of the object, or phenomenon. "It couldn't be a helicopter; a helicopter can hover but it's not quiet."

And a helicopter wouldn't be as close to the ground, estimating the object to be "about two houses high," maybe 25 feet aloft, as she guessed by the size of a nearby tree.

Motter said she thinks the object, which was west of her, was about an eighth of a mile away.

"I could not detect a shape because of the darkness," she said of the silent object.

"I wish I could have remained outside longer but, knowing about abductions, I came inside, feeling very lucky having witnessed this phenomenon," she said.

The Observer would have been remiss if it hadn't asked if she had been consuming alcohol at the time of the sighting.

"Hell, no - I don't keep it here and I don't drink when I go to parties, because my tongue swells up. I wasn't on any pills or anything, either," Motter added.

"I want people to know (UFOs) are in Rio Rancho," she said. "It's the first one I've seen in Rio Rancho. I wish I would have looked at the calendar immediately; when I did (make a note), it was the third of May. It was at nighttime; it was dark. I go to bed about 3 in the morning sometimes."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 09:09:47 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 10:19:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

Patient and gentle Listfolk:

>In an ideal world this would clearly be the case. But in the  
>real world, as is all too obvious from postings on UpDates, this  
>does not happen. No matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing  
>line' has been revealed ufologists have become so comfortable  
>with those cases that they regard any attempt to re-examine them  
>critically as a form of heresy.

Translation: These cases have stood up well over time, despite  
years' or decades' worth of attempts to discredit them. They  
strick in the craw, and do dishonorable motives for their  
persistence must be invented. See above for example.

Note, too, that John does not participate in the technical  
discussion of the Heflin photo, where a serious effort is made  
to resolve the controversy. Though in fact the matter is hugely  
complicated, he merely flaps wings and demands that the  
discussion be closed, implying that only bad people would  
continue it. This is not what is ordinarily thought of as a  
scientific approach.

>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

See above.

It also bears mentioning that one case, the famous Mantell  
incident, almost universally believed to be solved in ufology's  
canon of famous IFOs, is now undergoing a pretty serious  
reinvestigation which may call into question the Skyhook  
identification. The challenging of the widely accepted IFO  
identification caused a furious reaction on another List just  
recently. People, prominently including pelicanists, love their  
certainty.

It's called human nature, and even pelicanists give every  
evidence of having it, clinging to their own beliefs with a  
fierceness that never fails to startle the more conventionally  
open-minded inquirer.

>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

Squawk, squawk. Is there a sadder sight in the world than a  
pelicanist's tears? Or, here, a phonier rationalization for the

failure to mount a persuasive case against the hated incidents  
that keep the UFO question an open and interesting one?

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

From: **Bill Chalker** <[bill\\_c.nul](mailto:bill_c.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 00:15:17 +1000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 10:25:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 13:23:26 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 01:25:28 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Thursday, June 01, 2006 4:03 AM  
>>>Subject: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>>Source: Darren Ethier's Blog

>>><http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=22>

>>>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>>>Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

>>>I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary  
>>>Bates last night. The summary and title of the book intrigued me  
>>>because from childhood I have always been interested in stories  
>>>involving 'ETs' (extraterrestrials) and UFOs. I remember doing a  
>>>presentation on UFOs as a project for one of my classes in high  
>>>school. The reason why this book interested me is because I  
>>>discovered a website for it advertised in the Creation  
>>>Ministries International flyer that I recieved in the mail and  
>>>after checking it out I thought the book would be worth a read  
>>>(because of my already piqued interest in ETs). Here's the  
>>>description found on the back of the book:

>>>---

>>>UFOs have been seen throughout the centuries. But in our  
>>>enlightened technological age, are we any closer to solving the  
>>>mystery? This book revisits the most famous events that have  
>>>defined UFO culture, such as Roswell and alien autopsies;  
>>>astronaut Gordon Cooper's sightings; Major Donald Keyhoe's  
>>>allegations of official silence; and the claims of famous  
>>>contactees Billy Meier and George Adamski.

>>><snip>

>>>I'm completely blind-sided by this.

>>>Does anyone on the List know much about the book, or its writer  
>>>Gary Bates? I had never heard of either.

>>>Another aliens are demons book, Larry-good verses evil. Tough to  
>>>tell the difference when it comes to religion. I lost interest  
>>>as soon as I saw this in the reviews.

Hello List,

With regard to Gary Bates book Alien Intrusion - UFOs & The Evolution Connection, I believe I am in a reasonable position to make some informed comments.

I've read the book, seen a related DVD lecture he gave based on the book, and seen him lecture twice, once generally on the topic and specifically focused on his book's theme. All of these were in the context of religious ministry, of which he himself is the head of ministry development of Answers in Genies Ministries here in Australia.

I went along basically to inform myself of where he was coming from, to meet him and to discuss his position and agenda.

When one understands that his book emerges from an 'Answers in Genesis' perspective and that the book is mainly targeted at a Christian audience it is hardly surprising to see that Gary Bates' position is that the UFOs as the stuff of a "spiritual battle", and that they are works of deception, and are basically evil manifestations. Hence in this context John Keel and Jacques Vallee in their "deception" modes (Operation Trojan Horse, etc & "Messengers of Deception) are his main ufological touchstones.

Such narrow and un-scientific focuses left me with little room or point to undertake any serious discussion with Gary Bates. I found him to be a reasonable person, but his 'UFO ministry' is an article of faith, anchored specifically in the Book of Genesis/Creationist perspective. This argues that there is no extraterrestrial life and that evolution is a dangerous 'theory'.

All of this I find underwhelming and severely flawed. I clearly do not agree with his creationist take on UFOs and he expected that I would not. He told me that he wrote the book for Christians who are trying to understand what this subject is all about from a Creationist/Answers in Genesis perspective, and it was not a work he expected to be embraced by UFO researchers. Unless you are a Creationist with narrow Christian takes on the subject I would expect you would also find the work similarly of limited interest.

The work is essentially a piece of creationist 'propaganda' designed to try to alert people to the UFO 'alien' spiritual war. I do not care to buy into such religious debates, but it is of concerned when they are based on such unscientific analyses and are designed to 'rescue' lost souls. My feeling is that a far better response is for such people to develop a critical thinking ability anchored in science and common sense. The idea that all we need to know is in contained in the Biblical book of Genesis, is an extremely skewed and narrow Christian perspective, and is apparently not embraced by the religious mainstream.

Any serious scientifically orientated UFO researcher will find little of interest in Gary Bates book other than a primer on what Creationists are serving up in their campaign against acceptance of evolution, extraterrestrial life and UFO alien reality.

Regards,

Bill Chalker  
<http://theozfiles.blogspot.com>  
[www.theozfiles.com](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 10:15:40 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 10:27:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 30 May 2006 21:32:59 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>The max is 200 and the exact number is uncertain between 20  
>and 200. As you can see I was being generous:)

Not to belabor this point forever, but I did some research on  
this after your dogged insistence on 200.

Ctein, one of the acknowledged experts on this sort of thing,  
has a section on this topic at the beginning of his Post  
Exposure book. After his research on the subject he concludes  
that one can see 650 (or slightly more) shades of grey in the  
"entire range of human vision."

If you limit yourself to the density range of a photographic  
print (0 Dmin, 2.3 Dmax), you get about 250 shades of grey. He  
notes that although this number is similar to the 256 shades in  
an 8-bit greyscale, the two scales may not match-up evenly (the  
steps may be too small in one section and too large in another).

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 12:06:53 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:06:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 14:28:29 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 18:13:57 +0000  
>>Subject: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>The Mexican Air Force doesn't have to prove anything, Sir.  
>>You've only done your own personal study and analysis of the  
>>footage, not the whole case. In the end your results reflect  
>>only your own personal conclusions which don't establish, in any  
>>way, the true facts of what happened that day in the Campeche  
>>air space.

>It may be true that the Mexican Air Force doesn't "have" to  
>prove anything. However, I should think they would want to  
>answer any questions related to the March 4, 2004 FLIR  
>sightings. I did analyze the footage and also the verbal  
>comments and managed to reconstruct the history of the sighting.  
>I also provided analysis that showed A) the initial radar target  
>is unexplained (radar UFO) and B) the FLIR lights were very  
>likely distant and may have been as distant as the oil field  
>fires about 100 miles away.

>After I submitted the first draft of my analysis to the Mexican  
>DOD in the summer of 2004 I was told they were "happy" with it.  
>I also made several suggestions as to experiments they could do  
>with their system to prove or disprove the oil field theory. I  
>was never told that they did any such experiments, even though  
>various types of experiments could have been carried out as part  
>of their routine surveillance, such as flying along the same  
>track again. (Better yet would have been flying from a location  
>over the oil field toward the area where they had the sighting  
>while recording the appearance of the oil fires.) I was told,  
>without any evidence to support the statement, that "we fly in  
>that area all the time and don't see oil fires" or something  
>like that. Well, if that were true, you'd think they could have  
>sent me a copy of one of their FLIR video recordings made while  
>flying in that area so I could compare it with the "UFO" FLIR  
>video.

I do not see how they can avoid seeing the gas burn off flares.  
It is clear from a detailed examination of the 'UFO' FLIR video  
that at several times the crew zoom in on bright spots but they  
don't say anything and apparently "knew" these were not UFOs  
since they were apparently stationary (with respect to adjacent  
objects). One such light corresponded to a gas burn-off flare on  
land relatively close to the Campeche beach.

The Mexican military has an obligation to gather more footage to  
verify your analysis/conclusions since they apparently were  
concerned (at least we are told this) that such objects could  
potentially affect the 'mission', airspace security and national  
security. They should have not only gathered the FLIR at the  
same zoom magnitudes and same directions, but also tried to  
gather it in similar weather conditions (blockage due to haze

and clouds). I assume the gas burnoffs occur continuously but this also must be checked to make sure there are gas flares operating at the flight time.

>>Here in Mexico we conducted a complete investigation along with >>the original source that is the Mexican Air Force and they >>provided much co-operation on this research including subsequent >>flights over the zone in very similar conditions and never found >>anything unusual - the phenomena never repeated and the FLIR >>cameras didn't register those mysterious lights. Do I need to >>say more?

>So, further investigation was carried out by the Air Force. Wish >I had been informed.

I would not assume that it was done at all until we all saw the videos and are provided the data of the video (day/time/path/camera details/etc).

>>To ask for a "test flight" of the Mexican Air Force is naive and >>nonsense as they have national priorities like their anti- drug >>operations and can't deviate from their programs and budgets to >>please a foreign request in order to prove something not >i>ncluded in their agenda. This is easy to understand.

>So they can request that a "foreigner" spend lots of time >analyzing data that provide only part of the story but don't >have the time to provide the data that prove "the rest of the >story" (data that demonstrate the failure of the oil field >hypothesis).

It is odd that the Mexican Air Force is so unconcerned about this potential for false target identification and the impact to their "mission" and are unwilling to spend a little time to try to verify the possibility. Maybe the whole thing is too embarrassing. I am willing to speculate that subsequent crews were less willing to try to image such things. Thus we have a potential for a biased sample.

>>However the Mexican Air Force have been kind >>enough to provide us results on their subsequent flights over >>that area, including more FLIR footage confirming the phenomena >>has not repeated or replicated since March 5, 2004.

How can they know that the phenomena has not repeated unless they have continuous monitoring of the airspace.

>What you say above suggests that you have video FLIR data that >disproves the oil field hypothesis. Then, I say, bring it on. >Show us FLIR video taken when the plane was flying in the same >area and the same direction (eastward) and looking in the same >direction (toward the oli field) and under comparable weather >conditions which shows no oil fires.

Right on!

>>We, as the civilian researchers are satisfied with their >>information, results and evidence. We have kept this research to >>ourselves here in Mexico with a huge database on this case. We >>don't have any doubts and don't need any outsider to come and >>question facts that have been established and proven.

Funny! Yes, they have a big ole database but don't want to take a chance sharing any data with others because of the likelihood of holes being punched into it as easily as the original FLIR footage.

>>It's useless to argue, over and over, the same issue without >>being directly involved with the original source. We respect >>other opinions but don't accept them as 'fact' as they will >>always suffer from insufficient data to support their claims.

This is not the way of science or "real" research. Keeping data from the public and saying that other opinions are wrong because of the proof from "nondisclosed" data is pretty wrong! Talk about a "Disclosure" issue, here is a self-admitted one..they are covering up the "hidden" video data!

>>So far the Mexican Air Force UFO case continues being a >>milestone in Ufology, that's a fact.

>No doubt it was a milestone in the release of information from a  
>government source. Whether or nt it is a milestone in the search  
>for "infra-red proof" has yet to be conclusively determined, as  
>least as far as the investigators outside Mexico are concerned.

Yes!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 11:11:51 -0500  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:08:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark

>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 09:09:47 -0500  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>Patient and gentle Listfolk:

>>In an ideal world this would clearly be the case. But in the  
>>real world, as is all too obvious from postings on UpDates, this  
>>does not happen. No matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing  
>>line' has been revealed ufologists have become so comfortable  
>>with those cases that they regard any attempt to re-examine them  
>>critically as a form of heresy.

>Translation: These cases have stood up well over time, despite  
>years' or decades' worth of attempts to discredit them. They  
>strick in the craw, and do dishonorable motives for their

That should be "stick," and "do" should be "so." Sorry for my  
clumsy fingers.

Jerry Clark

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 13:54:31 -0300  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:09:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:20:19 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>The amount of evidence for some UFOs as manufactured vehicles  
>behaving in ways that vehicles we Earthlings can produce cannot  
>behave, is very substantial. The huge expenditures on advanced  
>military craft demonstrate our great military interest in high  
>tech.

By 'evidence' do you mean the tons of cases apparently  
describing high-tech vehicles performing beyond the capabilities  
of our technology? Because I know of no other evidence to date  
other than these huge number of cases with their accompanying  
physical effects, etc. to justify this statement. However, where  
is the evidence that these are ET vehicles? And how does the  
fact that our military spends so much on advanced military craft  
support the conclusion that some UFOs (the flying saucer ones)  
are ET spacecraft?

>Why invoke unknown civilizations for which no evidence has  
>been provided or mental constructs for which no evidence has  
>been provided? I expect advanced civilizations to have developed  
>the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology  
>suufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems

The proper question to ask here is: Where is the evidence you  
have that justifies ruling these out? And, where is your  
evidence that they are from outer space, that is, ET in  
origin? Also, you have evidence, I suppose, to justify your  
conclusion that all those high-tech vehicle cases that have  
characteristics you don't like are the result of "advanced  
civilizations having developed the world of the mind and the  
soul as well as technology suufficient to come here and to avoid  
our defense systems"?

So far, all I hear from you is those "proclamations" you're so  
fond of accusing everyone else about while you ignore the the  
facts and data they present that raises (justifiably) suspicions  
regarding yours.

>My lecture is "Flying Saucers ARE Real" NOT UFOs are Real.

>I am not interested in the non spacecraft UFOs. All the people  
>who don't have AIDS don't in general teach AIDS specialists much  
>about those that do.. You can keep the IFOs and maybe UFOs. I  
>will keep the flying saucers. I have a large gray basket. It is  
>not my focus.

I know what you mean, Stan. Not all UFOs are flying saucers. I'm  
talking about the flying saucer type ones too. Why are you  
trying to make it look like I'm talking about a different group  
than you are? I'm curious about your use of the words "not

interested in the non spacecraft UFOs" - seems you've jumped from talking about high-tech vehicles to non-spaceship UFOs. Again, where is your evidence that we're dealing with spaceships? I'm sure there are IFOs and I'm sure there are UFOs - and I'm even sure there are flying saucers among the UFOs - but I'm not convinced there are spaceships yet. I don't want to jump to conclusions yet even though my grey basket is pretty big too.

>I knew Al Lawson, spoke at CSULB, and found that many have >misinterpreted his results. The stories told by his subjects did >not have the emotional content of those told by real abductees.

The emotional content may not have been present simply because it was an 'imaginary abduction.' You have conveniently avoiding mentioning all the similiarities that occurred during the 'imaginary abductions' and the 'real' ones - these are extremely significant in view of the fact that the 'blur zone' contains numerous strong nuts and bolts cases that contain the bizarre elements of the 'imaginary abductions' yet these were invoked during a 'real' UFO event - often a real 'flying saucer' event.

People may often misinterpret Lawson's work. But I'm not! And can demonstrate same!

>>Remember the old saying, "All that glitters is not gold"?

>There is another one. Proclaiming something isn't the same as >providing evidence to establish its truth.

Just one question, Stan: Where is the evidence you have provided that your flying saucers are ET spacecraft as opposed to everything else? We keep hearing you going on about the hugh number of high-tech vehicle cases that exist (let's forget for the moment that the blur zone exists and that research like Lawson's exists and just consider these high-tech vehicle cases, accepting them on face value as high-tech vehicles) but where is your evidence that these are ET vehicles?

I'm not asking for much, Stan. I just want the evidence you have that some UFOs - the flying saucers - are ET spaceships. Aw, heck, while you're at it, how about throwing in the evidence you have that rules out all the other explanations for these flying saucers.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Uzi Baron <[uzibaron.nul](mailto:uzibaron.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 12:02:16 -0500  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:11:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

According to the Medical Imaging web site:

[http://www.medicalimagingmag.com/issues/articles/2006-03\\_06.asp](http://www.medicalimagingmag.com/issues/articles/2006-03_06.asp)

"... there are between 500 and 700 just-noticeable differences that the human eye can discern".

Article titled "RETURNING PICTURES FROM SPACE" on the Arizona State University:

<http://europa.la.asu.edu/education/activities/rpfs/rpfs.html>

mentions that "In fact, the human eye can separate less than 2 dozen shades of gray."

I am confused now...

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 14:14:35 -0300  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:15:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Ledger

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>In an ideal world this would clearly be the case. But in  
>the real world, as is all too obvious from posts on UpDates,  
>this does not happen. No matter how often the metaphorical  
>'fishing line' has been revealed ufologists have become so  
>comfortable with those cases that they regard any attempt to  
>re-examine them critically as a form of heresy.

>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on  
>one of these cases is simply to call the person making the  
>criticism a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or  
>tolerated.

Of late I've found myself debunking the Mantell case, John. I didn't seek out this task but just found it sort of thrust upon me by the violent reaction to my supportive remarks of another debunker who questioned a few details about the facts in the Mantell case. Imagine, 58 years later, new information has come to light that has suggested the accepted solution to the case was in error. And now I find myself on the opposite side of the mainstream - you know the true believers - thinking about the Mantell case.

I don't think Thomas Mantell was chasing a Skyhook balloon. But I was wondering, when do I get my wings? Is there a protocol for this? Me being a former British subject, does that grease the wheels or is there a waiting period, regardless?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 17:15:18 +0000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:20:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 17:32:40 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>If I might add to my note of some days ago. Richard Hall took me  
>>up on the matter of Heflin being a skilled model maker, and  
>>insisted this was a total falsehood. NICAP apparently did a  
>>thorough check of Heflin's background and found zilch to support  
>>the idea.

>>I referred to a British TV program in which this claim appeared,  
>>saying it was surprising that no confirmation of this allegation  
>>had surfaced, even from skeptics.

>>I now discover that the said 75-minute program was on May 9,  
>>1968 and was presented by a Dr Stephen Black (a psychiatrist).

<snip>

>Hi Christopher

>There's a description of some shennanigans between Heflin and  
>Stephen Black in a piece by Ann Druffel posted at:

>[www.uforesearcher.com](http://www.uforesearcher.com)

Now this (the following) tells us something worthwhile. Two  
clueless Brits on a mission to debunk. Heflin's behavior as  
described here has it right. It is exactly the way he reacted to  
harassment and fools. How did they expect him to react as they  
imply that he faked it with a model?

>forum on March 12. It's from MUFON Journal, March 2006 and you  
>should read it. The short extract below suggests that Black  
>rubbed Heflin up the wrong way, and that Heflin was not above  
>winding him up a little.

>... The following day McDonald, Heflin, Hartmann, and two  
>visiting BBC documentarians, Philip Daly and a Dr. Black, who  
>hoped to interview Heflin on-camera, journeyed to the site where  
>Heflin had taken Photo #4.

<snip>

>Dr. Hartmann and Dr. Black set about making test shots using  
>small models on strings, attempting to duplicate Heflin's Photos  
>#1, #2, and #3.

>They were trying to demonstrate that Heflin had hoaxed the  
>photos, even though Dr. Robert Nathan, using 1965 JPL state-of-  
>the-art computer enhancement equipment, had demonstrated that  
>there were absolutely no strings or other supporting mechanisms  
>visible in Heflin's photos.

>This didn't matter to Hartmann, for he later wrote up the Heflin  
>case in the Condon Report, judging the photos "in- conclusive."

>Quietly watching Hartmann and Dr. Black photographing the models  
>on stings, Heflin did not visibly show annoyance.  
>However, when Dr. Black began to ask him questions, beginning  
>with the inquiry, "Are you religious?" Heflin replied that he  
>was a Christian Scientist, adding that his religion "didn't let  
>him recognize laws of the state."

>This statement puzzled Black, but he didn't follow it up. He  
>then asked Heflin if he was married. Heflin replied  
>straight-faced, "More than once, but I don't want you to refer  
>to it on camera lest my five wives find out where I am."

>McDonald wrote all this down!! Realizing that Heflin was  
>employing his own offbeat sense of humor which he typically used  
>when irritated, rather than displaying open anger. LANS and  
>other friendly colleagues had also recognized this, but the two  
>BBC documentarians hadn't a clue.

>Dr. Black suggested that they go ahead and film an interview.  
>Heflin allowed them to film a very brief segment, in which he  
>stated that he under- stood why various investigators were  
>interested in the photos, and that everyone had the right to  
>draw their own conclusions.

<snip>

>Black pressed him for a fuller interview, but Heflin flatly  
>refused, stating that an American producer, John MacDonald, had  
>already done a credible job for ITV. Why didn't they simply  
>borrow his film? Bewildered, Black stopped talking to him.

>- Why did Heflin act in this enigmatic way? For two and one-half  
>years this honest, affable man had been hounded and harassed  
>because he'd photographed a UFO at close quarters and presented  
>to science a fine set of UFO photos showing features on the disc  
>and other inexplicable effects.

>Not being a man who showed anger easily, his instinctive defense  
>was dead- pan humor. This was the way he handled most situations  
>that irritated him.

>It was not his fault that the photos contained more data than  
>scientists could absorb. The enigmatic smoke-ring was not his  
>fault. Neither was the fact that the automatic light meter on  
>his Polaroid camera made the overcast sky appear virtually  
>featureless in the first three photos and as a clouded sky in  
>the fourth.

>Philip Daly and Dr. Black later discussed with McDonald whether  
>or not Heflin was serious about his religion and his "wives."  
>Both Daly and Black thought Heflin was completely serious.

>Dr. Black, however, thought that Heflin had not had five wives,  
>but rather five relationships which were, in Rex's eyes,  
>marriages in some odd legal sense, possibly connected to his  
>religion. Daly, in turn, felt Heflin was serious about his  
>religion and his "wives"!

>Unbeknownst to the two English-men, McDonald had phoned Epperson  
>the day before to get her reaction on the "wives-religion"  
>question.

>"She had already talked to John Gray on all this, and John had  
>guffawed at the five-wife bit," wrote McDonald in his "Heflin"  
>file. They had recently learned from Heflin that he was a  
>Christian Scientist, but still a bachelor.

John Gray was the engineer in the primary investigation team.

>Epperson told him they all felt rather sure Heflin was pulling  
>the leg of the BBC because he was inwardly seething at being  
>called out there to witness the "hoax" tests. McDonald pointed  
>out that no set-up had been intended.

Exactly right. Thanks, Martin.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 12:17:38 -0500  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:24:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Lehmborg

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

><snip>

>>But those are the preceisely cases we need to keep looking at.  
>>The ones we've grown most comfortable with. Even if a new scan  
>>reveals the fishing line and the case blows up in our faces.  
>>Because that's what science is about. Chipping away at belief  
>>until all that remains is fact. Debunking in the purest sense of  
>>the word, since it's foolish to tolerate bunk.

Three cheers for brave science and the men who practice it.  
Hoist its prideful banner high... Onward scientific soldiers,  
marching as to war... and we'll fight fight on to triumph  
and the glory, and the honor, wiping the slobber from slack jaws  
as we go and fighting the never ending battle for truth,  
justice, and the scientific way...

I don't mean to mock you, Mr. Shell, but notwithstanding the  
unerring accuracy of your sentiment? You are in no way allowing  
for the dark side of same. And there is a dark side, Sir. It  
remains predictably unacknowledged first by persons of Mr.  
Rimmer's conflicted caliber but then, and I think largely  
because they are honorable men willing to continue to play by  
the honorable rules as codified... even as others are not? Even  
by men of such erudition, intellect, and honor as Richard Hall  
and Jerry Clark.

I resurrect my analogy of the locker rupture and the mal-  
intellectual thugs who prosecute it:

In my country, while attending high school, one had to be very  
careful to insure that ones locker door closed and locked  
completely and didn't let so much as a thread of gym shorts show  
through the small crack betwixt door and casement. If you  
didn't, that thread would be ferreted out by a diligent juvenile  
delinquent and the shorts torn and ruined as they were worried  
and jerked out of the locker crack shred by tattered shred... We  
called them "locker ruptures."

Our ufological delinquent Mr. Rimmer's intransigently obdurate  
performance remains almost admirable if he balanced his  
obsessive energies in the service of ferreting out, once in a  
while, threads of procedural and logical error abundant in the  
arguments and researches of pelicanists and skepti-bunkies  
(while -pretending- to challenge the "conventional wisdoms" of  
quality cases abundantly assessed)... but that's not likely...  
It counters the by-laws of garden variety pelicanists. But for  
tatters he has largely manufactured himself, out of whole cloth,  
the Trindade case (et sig al) has an obvious solidity that Mr.  
Rimmer attempts to ruin like the gym shorts just described.

He has grasped his "find one more witness" tatter (of Trindade) like one of those juvenile delinquents I alluded to earlier, and biting down hard on it in his little English bulldog's teeth he is content to hang on for dear life, prosecuting his dull obstinacy like stubbornness was a virtue. It is not, just as it's not about Mr. Rimmer's "one more witness." It wouldn't matter to Mr. Rimmer if Philip Klass stumbled forward from the grave and said that he was on the boat at Trindade, in the yard at McMinnville, or in the cab with Heflin and in truth, saw , himself, the UFOs in contention.....

It is about looking beyond the usual, thinking out of the box, and removing oneself from the center of a trumped up "God's" universe. It's about reading to the period, accepting the larger reality, and combating reactionary denial. It is about truth, justice, and the sentient's way. In my opinion, anything else is reactionary stodginess, obsessive pig-headedness, blithering anti-science, and the death of a progressive rationality... ..as Tim Shell assiduously points out.

Mr. Rimmer should let the current tatter go while his humiliation can be repaired. He wastes our energy and his, and he performs no service, still. Verily, he's unaware that the locker and gym shorts he's trying to rupture through the locked door are actually his own.

See? The mechanism of re-hashing the musty hash on the already well parsed hash of old cases is two-fold, and it's all aimed at the otherwise distracted observer who still sits on the fence regarding the legitimacy of UFOs. If the 'pelicanistic-skeptibunky-klasskurtxian' can demonstrate, even fraudulently, that a jury is still out on the best cases... it is to these cases discredit first... and then, by extension, to all ufological cases. If the old bulletproof cases can be made to appear dodgy, then all ufological cases can be made to be perceived, to the fence-sitting masses, as the same kind of dodgy... and by fallacious extension the impetus to investigate any and all ufological cases, past, present, and future is thwarted and ham-strung.

>In an ideal world this would clearly be the case.

Are we going to forget for a moment your complicity in keeping us from the benefits of that ideal world, Mr. Rimmer? Are we to disregard your scurrilous affect and duplicitous campaign with regard to same? Are we to overlook your program, your design, your prosecution, and your mechanism to facilitate what you would pretend to decry here? Not on my watch. You are not a truth-seeker, Sir! You are a truth-bleeder!

>But in the  
>real world, as is all too obvious from postings on UpDates, this  
>does not happen.

Only because of the insentient and duplicitous 'worrying' activity of you and yours, Mr Rimmer, and your portentous willingness to destroy a perfectly good set of gym shorts torn from a perfectly serviceable locker on which you've unethically broken the casement or warped the door! The Hope diamond can be turned to dust with an errant sledge... Mr. Rimmer, proving nothing but the inadvisability of having diamonds, around you, at all.

>No matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing  
>line' has been revealed ufologists have become so comfortable  
>with those cases that they regard any attempt to re-examine them  
>critically as a form of heresy.

Oh what a pompous load of klasskurtxian crap. No matter how often the 'fishing line' can be demonstrated not to have been there, bumptious avians have become so adept and comfortable crapping on them that they regard any attempt to protest their duplicitous 'reexamination' as a form of heresy. What you would have said in that better world about which you moan through your crocodile tears, Sir.

>Cases such as McMinnville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

Ceaselessly criticizing cases such as McMinnville, Trindade, etc, are part of the klasskurtxian bag of scurvy skeptibunky tricks and shall be defended at all costs, and beyond all logic, from the protests of more honorable truth-seeking men and women regarding same.

>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

Mr. Rimmer! You and yours shredding metaphorical shorts from the broken casements of a ruptured lockers is the only way you can mount your meepy challenge or prosecute your inconsequent mal-critical assault on UFOs. The pelicanist is known by its squawk and the fetid droppings it leaves in its wake, only, Sir, and by anything they would utter in an otherwise reasonable and reasoned discourse. Be not proud.

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 18:52:42 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:26:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 09:09:47 -0500  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>Patient and gentle Listfolk:

>>In an ideal world this would clearly be the case. But in the  
>>real world, as is all too obvious from postings on UpDates, this  
>>does not happen. No matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing  
>>line' has been revealed ufologists have become so comfortable  
>>with those cases that they regard any attempt to re-examine them  
>>critically as a form of heresy.

>Translation: These cases have stood up well over time, despite  
>years' or decades' worth of attempts to discredit them. They  
>strick in the craw, and do dishonorable motives for their  
>persistence must be invented. See above for example.

>Note, too, that John does not participate in the technical  
>discussion of the Heflin photo, where a serious effort is made  
>to resolve the controversy. Though in fact the matter is hugely  
>complicated, he merely flaps wings and demands that the  
>discussion be closed, implying that only bad people would  
>continue it. This is not what is ordinarily thought of as a  
>scientific approach.

Jerry, it's always a good idea to read what I say before you  
reply to me, although I realise this is not your usual modus  
operandi.

Where did I demand that discussion on the Heflin photograph be  
closed down? I did not comment on Heflin because I do not have  
the technical expertise to do so. For the record I think the  
case is 'puzzling', which is, of course, the usual Pelicanist  
get-out.

>>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

>See above.

>It also bears mentioning that one case, the famous Mantell  
>incident, almost universally believed to be solved in ufology's  
>canon of famous IFOs, is now undergoing a pretty serious  
>reinvesigation which may call into question the Skyhook  
>identification. The challenging of the widely accepted IFO  
>identification caused a furious reaction on another List just



>recently. People, prominently including pelicanists, love their  
>certainty.

We shall see.

>It's called human nature, and even pelicanists give every  
>evidence of having it, clinging to their own beliefs with a  
>fierceness that never fails to startle the more conventionally  
>open-minded inquirer.

Who are these 'conventionally open-minded' inquirers? There seem  
to be precious few of them around. Far too many people seem to  
be part of the 'tradition of belief', where the solution to a  
problem is clear even before it is examined.

>>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

>  
>Squawk, squawk. Is there a sadder sight in the world than a  
>pelicanist's tears? Or, here, a phonier rationalization for the  
>failure to mount a persuasive case against the hated incidents  
>that keep the UFO question an open and interesting one?

I can't quite work out what the above is intended to mean. Are  
you saying that sceptics have been unable to argue against  
phony rationalisations of UFO cases? And just what are the  
'hated incidents'?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 17:43:40 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:29:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 17:34:00 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>A vertical component of oscillation in the region of 5000  
>degs/sec seems extremely violent. Increase the shutter time to  
>1/250 and it's still violent. Say, order of 1000 deg/sec. I  
>don't see any estimate of the period of the wobble reported by  
>Heflin but he described it as like a gyroscope slowing down. The  
>impression is of a slowish and easily discernable wobble, not a  
>rapid vibration. If we assume 10 degs for the amplitude then the  
>period is in the order of 100 Hz and these could be minima. So  
>not observable as described. But possibly as you say the  
>photographed component could be a rapid harmonic of the slower  
>fundamental period seen visually.

>As for whether this could be test between a suspended model and  
>a large distant object I'm not sure. If this is a simple  
>harmonic motion where gravity is the restoring force then for  
>small angles the disc acts approximately like a pendulum whose  
>period is independent of mass but dependent on the length, do I  
>have this right? I suppose the length would be the radius of the  
>disc if the equilibrium position is horizontal in the plane of  
>the centre of gravity, and this could be true (all else being  
>equal) both for a thread-suspended disc and for a flying disc  
>supported non-aerodynamically by some force acting at its centre  
>of gravity.

>In this simple case you could compare periods possibly, and say  
>that a rapid oscillation suggests a proportionally small  
>oscillator, favouring a model. But the possibility that what is  
>photographed is a "ringing" harmonic and not the fundamental  
>period of the oscillator puts a spanner in this argument. And  
>it's a big assumption to say that a large UFO would oscillate  
>like a simple pendulum anyway. It assumes that  $g = \text{constant}$   
>applies, for a start (which depending on your preferred  
>propulsion theory may not be true). It also assumes no  
>aerodynamic effects, and a damped harmonic oscillator. If  
>there's a periodic driving force applied then all bets are off.

>On the other hand it's worth noting that Brad Sparks measured a  
>vertical blurring due to suggested oscillation on the Trindade  
>photos with a value of 400 - 800 degs/sec, not too dissimilar

Hey Martin,

By the way, I'm not saying the UFO would operate like a simple  
Pendulum? We need MUCH MORE DATA (See below). I'm just ascribing  
that singular behavior to the that of small and simple hanging  
model on the end of a fishing pole. I'm so glad I can clear that  
Up... whew!

Yes, I'm aware of these points and understand oscillatory  
behavior, but I'm just trying to eliminate the pendulum-like  
action of a small model suspended by a string... that it  
couldn't possibly account for this observed "single" caught

action of the photographed object. Can we separate the two, get some space between the small Model and A big UFO far off in the distance, etc. I think we probably can if we make certain assumptions, etc.

If it was a small model, we can get that behavior down really well! Get reasonable values for instantaneous velocity in the various modes of oscillation and estimate reasonable upper bound values... Are these upper bounds far short of the lower bounds of the object's recorded blur = velocity, etc? THAT is the Whole Point of what I was doing ... applying a means of filtering and separating the two actions. We only have ONE instantaneous action of the UFO: blur over time and distance equals velocity, etc. Where is What When \_ the corner stone of Physics. I am implying oscillatory behavior of the UFO but I' not buying it all the way ... that's it, nothing more, the UFO is a Big Black Box.

As far as what the UFO was actually doing at that moment? We need more data points in order to ascribe particular models and modes of vibration. Yes, we don't know it's center of mass, how the mass is distributed, we don't know where the torque is being applied and at what angle. We don't know the complete action of the object. But we could've known more! As I said, I don't know if anyone put a model in Heflin's hand to asked him how it actually behaved. And, yet some of the behavior he observed may not have been apparent to him since certain actions the object undertook where too fast to be observed, etc. Maybe the camera caught some of that. And, if we knew a little more about it's gross behavior, we might be able to link the two in a mathematically consistent and coherent way. Now I'm ready to do the Calculus with a real objective!

What type of wobble? Saying it had a wobble (Heflin) isn't good enough for me because I know that process can be affected by extraneous forces creating damped, critically damped, underdamped oscillatory behavior... who knows? The sky is the limit. If we had a few more key observations, we might very well gather and extract the needed information to get a handle on some of the observed dynamics... that it might open a few cracks as to how these things operate during some of their activity: The Big Balck Box gets a coat of dull of paint... let's pick a color and celebrate.!

By the way, I'm well aware of the Trindade Case and also made similar observation. However, I'm not ready to buy that the object was flipping over in that fashion. Why, because, once again, no one put a model in his hand and asked him how it moved... the translation of the two languages leaves the door open on whether it was flipping or tipping... not sure? The lateral blur of the Trindade UFO is much more straight forward.

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](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 20:33:19 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:30:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

><snip>

>>But those are the preceisely cases we need to keep looking at.  
>>The ones we've grown most comfortable with. Even if a new scan  
>>reveals the fishing line and the case blows up in our faces.  
>>Because that's what science is about. Chipping away at belief  
>>until all that remains is fact. Debunking in the purest sense of  
>>the word, since it's foolish to tolerate bunk.

>In an ideal world this would clearly be the case. But in the  
>real world, as is all too obvious from postings on UpDates, this  
>does not happen. No matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing  
>line' has been revealed ufologists have become so comfortable  
>with those cases that they regard any attempt to re-examine them  
>critically as a form of heresy.

>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

I've spent a lot of time re-examining Trindade critically, and  
by "Trindade" one obviously means the historical corpus of  
accounts and evidence and interpretations from people of all  
shades of opinion that constitute the half-century long "case  
file". I've found quite a bit of nonsense and illogic in there  
which I certainly would not defend at any cost. Some of it has  
been yours.

I have never called anyone a pelicanist. Far from not tolerating  
discussion I have actively sought it with a number of well-known  
doubters and tried to engage in debate about various unresolved  
aspects of the case. Some - for example Tim Printy, Martin  
Powell and especially Kentaro Mori - were open to useful  
exchanges of ideas, information and constructive criticism. I'm  
afraid I can't say the same for John Harney. And if you want to  
claim that I've ever shrunk from "challenging" your own  
"critical assult" then you're going to have to go back and  
refresh your memory from the archive.

It's true that some "believers" in Trindade also proved  
uncooperative, truculent, even abusive. You're right that for  
some people the idea of questioning a case like this is a sort  
of sacrilege. I've had the same thing over Santa Ana just  
recently from correspondents accusing me of being a traitorous  
debunker for even thinking about it on-List! Really. But on

the other side, it appears to me that your complaint about this inviolate "canon of ufology" is a kind of projection of your own fixations, as though there is a syndrome of compulsive denial that is a mirror of these others' compulsive belief. All of you seem engaged in some conflicted folie a deux and perhaps need each other.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 21:06:41 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:44:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 11:41:07 +0000  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:40:49 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Why, then, did he not reveal such things to NICAP and other  
>>investigators? Was it because most of the people who interviewed  
>>Heflin were 'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic?>

>>Hi Chris,

>>Define 'believers'. This way Dick Hall will have a better idea of  
>>your psych eval of him.

>>Don

>Bit of a skeptic; the guy is such an obvious outright debunker  
>that I seriously doubt he ever talked to or interviewed Heflin.  
>He probably assumed (which as pilot witness Bill Nash once  
>famously said to Dr. menzel, "to ass-u-me is to make an ass out  
>of u and an ass out of me") that Heflin must have been an ardent  
>model builder and faker.)

It appears that Stephen Black certainly did talk to and  
interview Heflin in company with MacDonald, Hartmann and others  
in Nov 1967. See

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jun/m04-002.shtml>

But the account by Ann Druffel suggests that Black's  
relationship with Heflin was a little strange. I have emailed  
William Hartmann to ask if he can shed any light on this alleged  
remark. I'll report back anything he may have to say.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 15:08:20 -0700  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:50:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 13:23:26 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 01:25:28 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>>Source: Darren Ethier's Blog

>>><http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=22>

>>>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>>>Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

>>>I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary  
>>>Bates last night. The summary and title of the book intrigued me  
>>>because from childhood I have always been interested in stories  
>>>involving 'ETs' (extraterrestrials) and UFOs. I remember doing a  
>>>presentation on UFOs as a project for one of my classes in high  
>>>school. The reason why this book interested me is because I  
>>>discovered a website for it advertised in the Creation  
>>>Ministries International flyer

<snip>

>>>UFOs have been seen throughout the centuries. But in our  
>>>enlightened technological age, are we any closer to solving the  
>>>mystery? This book revisits the most famous events that have  
>>>defined UFO culture, such as Roswell and alien autopsies;  
>>>astronaut Gordon Cooper's sightings; Major Donald Keyhoe's  
>>>allegations of official silence; and the claims of famous  
>>>contactees Billy Meier and George Adamski.

>><snip>

>>I'm completely blind-sided by this.

>>Does anyone on the List know much about the book, or its writer  
>>Gary Bates? I had never heard of either.

>Another aliens are demons book, Larry - good verses evil.  
>Tough to tell the difference when it comes to religion.  
>I lost interest as soon as I saw this in the reviews.

Hi Don: Yeah, same impression here. I could have keyed off of  
the review having come from "Creation Ministries International"  
but wanted to check anyway.

Best

-Larry



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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Saskatchewan Sightings Being Investigated

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:58:37 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 06:58:37 -0400  
Subject: Saskatchewan Sightings Being Investigated

Source: The Meadow Lake Progress - Saskatchewan, Canada

<http://www.meadowlakeprogress.com/story.php?id=234143>

Sunday June 04, 2006

UFO Sightings Being Investigated

By Kathy Gallant  
Progress Staff

Within the past week, people at various locations in the Waterhen Lake region have noticed some strange phenomena.

There were reports that quite a few people witnessed seeing bright lights and formations in the sky - what they believed could be UFOs.

Barbara Campbell, who is a UFO researcher based out of Maidstone, heard wind of the sightings, and travelled to Waterhen to investigate this past week.

She said after doing her preliminary research, that a large number of people in the area - 75% in fact - say that they saw something out of the ordinary in the sky at night.

"I will have to do some more indepth research into this, but at this point, it seems very credible," she said.

"Video footage was actually obtained as well, and there were five to seven objects captured on film."

Campbell said that she will be conducting some investigative activities in the area, as soon as possible.

"I would like to do a minimum of a week's worth of surveillance," she stated.

"At this point, I have no idea of the scope of this occurence, aside from having spoken with several witnesses."

Some people thought that it was some sort of military aircraft doing practices.

"They seem to be able to differentiate between the two things," commented Campbell.

"And they say it feels different and besides, military jets wouldn't be showboating the way they say these objects have been. One person said that once they saw a sighting the size of a house, with orange glowing lights."

She also mentioned that the craft seem to be interested in the water.

"Eye witnesses said that they noticed one was hovering around the lake," said Campbell.

"People find this very surreal and frightening, and we will be seriously looking into it."

[See video:

<http://tinyurl.com/ju2rx>

Listen:

[http://www.cbc.ca/clips/Sask/ram-audio/ufos060529\\_11.ram](http://www.cbc.ca/clips/Sask/ram-audio/ufos060529_11.ram)

--ebk]

[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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## UFOs Over Sacred Sites

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 07:08:25 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 07:08:25 -0400  
Subject: UFOs Over Sacred Sites

Source: FATE Magazine - Lakeville, Minnesota, USA

<http://www.fatemag.com/issues/2000s/2006-06article1a.html>

Subscribe to FATE

<http://www.fatemag.com/subscribe.html>

June 2006

UFOs Over Sacred Sites  
By Brad Steiger

In the early 1970s, numerous metaphysical groups began conducting pilgrimages to ancient sacred sites around the world. Travel agencies were soon formed that specialized in offering tour packages designed to attract those individuals seeking spiritual enlightenment, rather than exotic locales, on their two-week vacation. Many of these spiritual pilgrims returned to report dramatic sightings of UFOs hovering above sacred areas.

My wife Sherry and I believe them, for we have witnessed UFO activity at Petra, the ancient Nabatean city in Jordan; Machu Picchu, the Incan metropolis located high in the Andes; the Great Pyramid of Giza; the Sphinx; the mystical city of Luxor in Egypt; Masada, the hilltop fortress at the edge of the Judean Desert; the remains of the Essene community at Qumran; the transformational vortex areas of Sedona, Arizona; the powerful Kahuna shrines of Hawaii; the Temple of the Sun in Cuzco, Peru; Mt. Nebo, the legendary burial place of Moses; the ancient Incan healing springs at Tambo Machay; the gigantic, sprawling mystery lines in the Nazca Desert; the sacred Peruvian city of Ollantaytambo; tribal medicine power places in Santa Fe and the Four Corners area of the Southwest; and an ancient pre-Navajo monastery recently discovered on private property outside of Sedona.

Higher Awareness

In addition to having observed UFO activities at these sacred sites, a number of spiritual pilgrims also claimed a personal mystical encounter with otherworldly intelligences. To many of these UFO experiencers, the contact that they received during an encounter with an alien or multidimensional intelligence at these holy places served as an initiation into higher awareness. Their interaction with an intelligence that had previously existed far beyond their normal mundane world of ordinary expectations served as an impetus to awaken their consciousness to consider undreamed facets of the universe.

At some level of the universe, these experiencers declare, there is a Force that blends and interconnects each of us to the other-97and to all other living things. On some level of consciousness, every living cell is in communication with every

other living cell. The UFO experience, some maintain, may be yet another method the Universe has devised to get humankind in touch with aspects of self and of other life forms in the cosmos.

In recent years the hologram has been found to be a workable analogy to illustrate the concept of the Oneness of things. What is most remarkable about a hologram is that every single part of it contains all the information about the whole, just as the DNA in each cell of the body contains the blueprint for the entire physical structure. Split a hologram in half, shine a laser through it, and the whole object is reconstituted in three dimensions.

It has been postulated by some that the entire universe may be a single hologram. It may well be that information about all of the cosmos is encapsulated in each part of it. And that includes each of us human beings. We may all be unfolded images of aspects that exist in a higher reality.

#### UFO as Symbol

In Wholeness and the Implicate Order, physicist David Bohm of the University of London urges contemporary men and women to become aware that the modern view of the world has become fragmented, especially in the sciences, but also in the execution of our daily lives. In science's efforts to divide our universe into stars and atoms, it has separated us from nature. In humankind's penchant for dividing itself into races, nations, ethnic groups, political parties, and economic classes, we have fragmented ourselves from any underlying wholeness with each other.

Perhaps there is a Higher Intelligence that has been striving for centuries to bring our species into the Wholeness, the Oneness. Perhaps the circular shape of the UFO is a symbol of the wholeness of life in the universe.

Since the most ancient of times, tribal elders, priests, and religious orders have worked to develop traditions of spirituality to provide inspiration for life's challenges. Rituals and rites were designed to reveal certain truths, explain various mysteries, and present a process by which initiation into a higher awareness might be achieved. Spiritually, the significance of initiation lies in the death of the egoistic, physical self and its rebirth in the divine, transcendental order.

In some sacred traditions, such special knowledge and power were kept secret and remained exclusive to the initiated. Other great teachers focused their energies on arousing the sleeping spiritual senses of their students, thereby bringing about enlightenment through the personal mystical experience. These wise masters were aware that the individual mystical experience was the catalyst that awakened the initiate to the Inner Voice that speaks of a sense of Oneness with All That Is and the wisdom that the Great Mystery dwells within each soul.

Many great spiritual teachers have declared that initiation may be bestowed upon the sincere seeker by entities that exist on higher planes of being. The UFOs that appear above sacred sites may combine ancient symbols of initiation with the space age. Among these images capable of elevating one to higher awareness are the following:

#### Egyptian Icons

The Sphinx, created by the oldest human priesthood, represents in its majestic combination of human head, bull's body, lion's paws, and eagle's wings the living unity of nature's kingdoms. These same four animal representations also manifest in the otherworldly entities in Ezekiel's vision of a wheel within a wheel; and they are the four constituent elements of microcosm and macrocosm—water, earth, air, and fire, the foundations of esoteric science.

The answer to the ancient riddle of the Sphinx—What first walks on four legs, then two, then three?—is the human being, the divine agent that includes within itself all the elements and forces of nature. Achieving higher awareness with the Sphinx teaches the initiate, the experiencer, how human nature evolves

from animal nature and develops "eagle wings" to travel to other dimensions of a greater reality.

Many spiritual teachers believe that the Great Pyramid was a holy place in which sacred initiations were conducted rather than a tomb for Egyptian royalty, and that the sarcophagus in the King's Chamber was an agent of the initiate's resurrection into the Light.

In recent years, dozens of UFO and metaphysical conferences have been held near the Great Pyramid and thousands of spiritual seekers have lain in the ancient sarcophagus to make contact with the essence of the alien or multidimensional beings that they believe actually constructed the pyramid as a kind of cosmic educational toy to stimulate the nascent human thinking process.

#### Biblical Figures

The mysterious figure of the prophet Elijah, messenger of God, who had no known parents, who came from nowhere to challenge the forces of darkness, and who returned to heaven in a fiery chariot has come to represent to certain UFO experiencers the very pinnacle of otherworldly wisdom and resolve. For many UFO contactees, Elijah has become their spiritual mentor, or, in some cases, his essence serves as the conduit that connects them with their own personal spiritual guide.

Melchizedek, King of Salem, priest of Elohim, initiated Father Abraham with wine served in a golden chalice. Jesus of Nazareth was also a priest of the Order of Melchizedek. Many UFO experiencers have expressed their belief that the beings that they have encountered came to Earth to perpetuate the Order of Melchizedek. These beings, many believe, hold the golden chalice of Melchizedek, a symbol of supreme spiritual transformation and divine inspiration, and give assurance that the Divine Being that exists above the soul dwells in each of us.

Since very ancient times, the image of a serpent gripping its tail in its mouth and becoming a living circle has represented the ineluctable cycle of universal life. The fact that so many UFO experiencers state that their contact was with reptilian entities presents little difficulty. Throughout human history, the serpent has represented wisdom, and vast numbers of early culture bearers were described as being reptilian in appearance. From these serpentine alien intelligences, UFO experiencers say that they have been able to envision the universe as a living whole, endowed with intelligence, soul, and will. The universe is but the reflection of an invisible order of cosmogenic forces and spiritual kingdoms, classes, and species which through their perpetual involution into matter produced the evolution of life.

#### Child of Man, Child of God, Cross of Stars

A great number of UFO experiencers insist that the alien intelligences with whom they have been in contact revere the sign of the cross and that the cross is a symbol of profound universal teachings. The ancient Doctrine of the Divine Word taught by Krishna in India, by the priests of Osiris in Egypt, by Pythagoras in Greece, and by the prophets of Israel reveals the great mystery of the Child of Man and the Child of God.

In Hindu, Egyptian, and Greek initiations, the term "Child of God" meant a consciousness identified with Divine Truth and a will capable of manifesting it. The universal sign of the Child of Man is that of four stars in the form of a cross.

This sign of ancient spiritual transformation was familiar to the priests of Egypt, preserved by the Essenes, and worshiped by the sons of Japhet as the symbol of earthly and heavenly fire. Native American medicine practitioners and other initiates have seen in the Cross of Stars the symbol of balance, the wholeness of the Great Mystery, the image of the Ineffable Being that reveals itself in the Cosmos.

#### Initiation

The ancient masters predicted a time when the great mass of earthbound humanity would pass to a higher dimension of consciousness to begin a new cycle of evolution. As we have seen since the 1950s, one of the principle messages of the UFO

contactees has to do with Homo sapiens graduating to a higher vibratory state and moving into a higher dimension.

Both the ancient teachers of wisdom and the contemporary UFO experiencers state that in the series of cycles that constitute the planetary evolution of Earth, all humankind will one day develop the intellectual, spiritual, and transcendent principles that were previously manifested only in the Great Initiates. Such a development may require many more thousands of years and will likely bring about unimaginable changes in the overall condition of humankind. The supreme goal of spiritual transformation is to reproduce divine perfection in the soul. Only when spiritual seekers can say that they have acquired divine freedom and conquered fate can they become true prophets, seers, healers, and initiators. Only those who control themselves through spiritual discipline can teach others. Only those who have set themselves free can set others free.

In Healing States by Alberto Villoldo and Stanley Krippner, the shaman Don Eduardo speaks of the true meaning of initiation:

"Initiation represents a readiness to assume responsibility for the planet and for serving humanity.

"Initiation helps one to forge a link between oneself and an ancient lineage of knowledge.

"Initiation is not graduation. It is only the beginning of the great work that lies ahead of the initiate.

"Initiation is basically a salute to the spirit of a person whose consciousness has been awakened."

And, as Don Eduardo emphasizes, initiations are taking place all the time: "Initiations can occur on the way to the supermarket or on top of the Himalayas. And the most powerful initiations=85are bestowed from the hands of the masters who work directly from the =9loverworld.=92 These initiations may occur in our dreams or during meditation or may take us by surprise=85when we least expect them. But in the final analysis we make the choice to be initiated ourselves."

Brad Steiger is a professional writer who deals with the all aspects of the strange and unknown.

Subscribe to FATE

<http://www.fatemaq.com/subscribe.html>

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Object Lessons

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 06:56:51 -0500  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 08:06:53 -0400  
Subject: Object Lessons

Some whine faux-knowledgeably about the damage world society would suffer in the aftermath of a disclosure, a ufological glasnost... a para-normal perestroika. That governments, churches and institutions would tremble precipitously in the after-shocks.

Well, look around.

Religion is corrupt, discredited, and disruptively hate mongering, already. Governments are increasingly corrupt, in turmoil, illegitimate and tragically short-sighted, now, and getting worse.

People are already terrified by egregious physical and intellectual threats real and imagined and then further corrupted by a culture insisting that they be treated as infants without respect and in ignorance!

Culture has never been the friend of the efficacious individual and that's what keeps us locked in a cycle of tribal warfare where the few benefit at the expense of the many and where every day thirty thousand children starve to death!

Economies are already holding bated breaths, and the tiniest prick could bring these air castles of pecuniary nonsense crashing down around our ears...

The world is already in the state feared, good reader!

Now is the time for change.

Restore John Ford!

More:

<http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2006/06/object-lessons.html>

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)

[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Altrincham UFO Conference This Saturday

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 08:10:45 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 08:10:45 -0400  
Subject: Altrincham UFO Conference This Saturday

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's 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 =93No=94 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!

-----  
>From Canada, Internationally Renown 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:

=93In 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.=94

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: 15.00 Pounds Sterling on the day at the door - 12.50 in advance. For advance bookings, cheques only I'm 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[at]btinternet.com 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 12:04:53 +0000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 08:13:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 20:33:19 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:51:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

>>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

>I've spent a lot of time re-examining Trindade critically, and  
>by "Trindade" one obviously means the historical corpus of  
>accounts and evidence and interpretations from people of all  
>shades of opinion that constitute the half-century long "case  
>file". I've found quite a bit of nonsense and illogic in there  
>which I certainly would not defend at any cost. Some of it has  
>been yours.

<snip>

>It's true that some "believers" in Trindade also proved  
>uncooperative, truculent, even abusive. You're right that for  
>some people the idea of questioning a case like this is a sort  
>of sacrilege. I've had the same thing over Santa Ana just  
>recently from correspondents accusing me of being a traitorous  
>debunker for even thinking about it on-List! Really. But on  
>the other side, it appears to me that your complaint about this  
>inviolate "canon of ufology" is a kind of projection of your  
>own fixations, as though there is a syndrome of compulsive  
>denial that is a mirror of these others' compulsive belief. All  
>of you seem engaged in some conflicted folie a deux and perhaps  
>need each other.

>Martin Shough

This is a very perceptive comment. On both ends of the spectrum  
there are 'true believers,' but there is also a rational middle  
ground that needs to be cultivated. See my article  
"Conceptualizing UFOs" on my web site for a discussion along  
very similar lines.

[www.hallrichard.com/conceptualizufos.htm](http://www.hallrichard.com/conceptualizufos.htm)

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 12:15:36 +0000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 08:20:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 21:06:41 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 11:41:07 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:40:49 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 13:01:36 +0100  
>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>Why, then, did he not reveal such things to NICAP and other  
>>>>investigators? Was it because most of the people who interviewed  
>>>>Heflin were 'believers' but Black was a bit of a skeptic?>

>>>>Hi Chris,

>>>>Define 'believers'. This way Dick Hall will have a better idea of  
>>>>your psych eval of him.

>>>>Don

>>Bit of a skeptic; the guy is such an obvious outright debunker  
>>that I seriously doubt he ever talked to or interviewed Heflin.  
>>He probably assumed (which as pilot witness Bill Nash once  
>>famously said to Dr. menzel, "to ass-u-me is to make an ass out  
>>of u and an ass out of me") that Heflin must have been an ardent  
>>model builder and faker.)

>It appears that Stephen Black certainly did talk to and  
>interview Heflin in company with MacDonald, Hartmann and others  
>in Nov 1967. See

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jun/m04-002.shtml>

>But the account by Ann Druffel suggests that Black's  
>relationship with Heflin was a little strange. I have emailed  
>William Hartmann to ask if he can shed any light on this alleged  
>remark. I'll report back anything he may have to say.

Martin,

Yes, this has now been established. What I would like to know,  
and am not clear on, is how did Black fit into the picture. Was  
he hired by BBC as a skeptical consultant interviewer? Was he  
asked to try to pick holes in Heflin's story? Heflin's behavior,  
his so-called dry sense of humor, was perfectly typical of him.

In any event, I discovered that I have the BBC-TV program on

videotape and intend to review it fairly soon (very busy on other matters right now). My notes tell me that at the time I thought it to be one of the very best TV documentaries on UFOs ever produced. It contains some rare film footage of people like McDonald, including Heflin, so I will review it shortly.

More later on this.

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel]

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:19:31 -0400  
Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel]

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 13:54:31 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:20:19 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>The amount of evidence for some UFOs as manufactured vehicles  
>>behaving in ways that vehicles we Earthlings can produce cannot  
>>behave, is very substantial. The huge expenditures on advanced  
>>military craft demonstrate our great military interest in high  
>>tech.

>By 'evidence' do you mean the tons of cases apparently  
>describing high-tech vehicles performing beyond the capabilities  
>of our technology? Because I know of no other evidence to date  
>other than these huge number of cases with their accompanying  
>physical effects, etc. to justify this statement. However, where  
>is the evidence that these are ET vehicles? And how does the  
>fact that our military spends so much on advanced military craft  
>support the conclusion that some UFOs (the flying saucer ones)  
>are ET spacecraft?

>>Why invoke unknown civilizations for which no evidence has  
>>been provided or mental constructs for which no evidence has  
>>been provided? I expect advanced civilizations to have developed  
>>the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology  
>>suufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems

>The proper question to ask here is: Where is the evidence you  
>have that justifies ruling these out? And, where is your  
>evidence that they are from outer space, that is, ET in  
>origin? Also, you have evidence, I suppose, to justify your  
>conclusion that all those high-tech vehicle cases that have  
>characteristics you don't like are the result of "advanced  
>civilizations having developed the world of the mind and the  
>soul as well as technology suufficient to come here and to avoid  
>our defense systems"?

>So far, all I hear from you is those "proclamations" you're so  
>fond of accusing everyone else about while you ignore the the  
>facts and data they present that raises (justifiably) suspicions  
>regarding your conclusions.

>>My lecture is "Flying Saucers ARE Real" NOT UFOs are Real.

>>I am not interested in the non spacecraft UFOs. All the people  
>>who don't have AIDS don't in general teach AIDS specialists much  
>>about those that do.. You can keep the IFOs and maybe UFOs. I  
>>will keep the flying saucers. I have a large gray basket. It is  
>>not my focus.

>I know what you mean, Stan. Not all UFOs are flying saucers. I'm  
>talking about the flying saucer type ones too. Why are you  
>trying to make it look like I'm talking about a different group  
>than you are? I'm curious about your use of the words "not  
>interested in the non spacecraft UFOs" - seems you've jumped  
>from talking about high-tech vehicles to non-spaceship UFOs.  
>Again, where is your evidence that we're dealing with  
>spaceships? I'm sure there are IFOs and I'm sure there are UFOs  
>- and I'm even sure there are flying saucers among the UFOs -  
>but I'm not convinced there are spaceships yet. I don't want to  
>jump to conclusions yet even though my grey basket is pretty big  
>too.

>>I knew Al Lawson, spoke at CSULB, and found that many have  
>>misinterpreted his results. The stories told by his subjects did  
>>not have the emotional content of those told by real abductees.

>The emotional content may not have been present simply because  
>it was an 'imaginary abduction.' You have conveniently avoiding  
>mentioning all the similarities that occurred during the  
>'imaginary abductions' and the 'real' ones - these are extremely  
>significant in view of the fact that the 'blur zone' contains  
>numerous strong nuts and bolts cases that contain the bizarre  
>elements of the 'imaginary abductions' yet these were invoked  
>during a 'real' UFO event - often a real 'flying saucer' event.

>People may often misinterpret Lawson's work. But I'm not! And can  
>demonstrate same!

>>>Remember the old saying, "All that glitters is not gold"?

>>There is another one. Proclaiming something isn't the same as  
>>providing evidence to establish its truth.

>Just one question, Stan: Where is the evidence you have  
>provided that your flying saucers are ET spacecraft as opposed  
>to everything else? We keep hearing you going on about the high  
>number of high-tech vehicle cases that exist (let's forget for  
>the moment that the blur zone exists and that research like  
>Lawson's exists and just consider these high-tech vehicle cases,  
>accepting them on face value as high-tech vehicles) but where is  
>your evidence that these are ET vehicles?

>I'm not asking for much, Stan. I just want the evidence you  
>have that some UFOs - the flying saucers - are ET spaceships.

>Aw, heck, while you're at it, how about throwing in the  
>evidence you have that rules out all the other explanations  
>for these flying saucers.

Deduction is still part of the scientific method. If it looks  
like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it is  
most likely a duck.

Ted Phillips' thousands of physical trace cases from more than  
70 countries indicate clearly manufactured objects of some size  
(much larger than a breadbasket) landing and taking off silently  
from unprepared landing sites in the middle of nowhere. Often the  
physical traces are quite impressive such as drying out soil in a  
10' ring down 14".

About 1/6th of those cases involve reports of typically small  
mobile beings associated with the craft. Craft are clearly under  
intelligent control as they maneuver around high performance  
vehicles. Often they are observed to go up and away...

It takes a substantial manufacturing effort to produce such high  
performance vehicles often observed both visually and by radar  
and various cameras. If they were manufactured on Earth, they  
would play a role in the military activities of the planet. They  
certainly don't seem to. They were therefore made somewhere else  
and are by definition of ET origin.

Such cases as the JAL radar on the ground and in the sky, and  
visual from the sky, sighting of Martin Jacek's Yukon case  
indicate very large flying craft indeed. I can find no reason to  
say that objects that look like that and act like that originate  
on Earth.

You have certainly provided no reason. I have no idea why you are averse to the notion of ET spacecraft.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:23:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:22:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 17:43:40 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 17:34:00 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>By the way, I'm well aware of the Trindade Case and also made  
>similar observation. However, I'm not ready to buy that the  
>object was flipping over in that fashion. Why, because, once  
>again, no one put a model in his hand and asked him how it  
>moved... the translation of the two languages leaves the door  
>open on whether it was flipping or tipping... not sure? The  
>lateral blur of the Trindade UFO is much more  
>straight forward.

Hi Viktor

I agree this is an unresolved issue with Trindade. But there is no witness evidence whatsoever to suggest an object inverting or "flipping". Even allowing for ambiguity in the language, no one said or implied that they saw this. "Tipping" in isolation could arguably be construed that way, if you really had to, but in context with other pieces of narrative description the overt meaning makes sense, and the vertical edge blurring in the photos could be consistent with a bounded oscillation connected to the jerky flight and "undulation" reported visually.

True, if you work out the probability that Barauna would have actually photographed a complete rapid inversion in progress it turns out to be low. But a relatively small amplitude oscillation is simpler, can probably explain the apparently migrating "dark spot", and is probably consistent with testimony.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 06:57:09 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:27:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 13:54:31 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:20:19 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

>>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:44:19 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>I'm not asking for much, Stan. I just want the evidence you  
>have that some UFOs - the flying saucers - are ET spaceships.  
>Aw, heck, while you're at it, how about throwing in the  
>evidence you have that rules out all the other explanations  
>for these flying saucers.

Eugene:

Yes, it is a leap and maybe one of faith, to make the flying saucer pilots ET's. But it is a small one. These are not plasma, or any other known natural phenomenon. They are metallic, presumed heavier-than-air, and showing flight behaviors that are unaffected by inertia, gravity, or wind speed.

Magneto-aerodynamics may explain how this type of flight can occur in the high-tech, human-made aircraft of today. But that tech was unknown to anyone prior to the first sightings of these craft.

Maybe the flying saucer drivers aren't ET. Maybe they're 'just' intelligent and other than the humanity we know.

Maybe all the abductees who claim to have been taken aboard UFO's are mis-'taken'.

Is anything certain all the time?

What infallible, eternal truths do you hold dear?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 09:30:31 -0500  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:31:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Clark

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 18:52:42 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 09:09:47 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

John,

>>Note, too, that John does not participate in the technical  
>>discussion of the Heflin photo, where a serious effort is made  
>>to resolve the controversy. Though in fact the matter is hugely  
>>complicated, he merely flaps wings and demands that the  
>>discussion be closed, implying that only bad people would  
>>continue it. This is not what is ordinarily thought of as a  
>>scientific approach.

>Jerry, it's always a good idea to read what I say before you  
>reply to me, although I realise this is not your usual modus  
>operandi.

I know, I know, John, your words have some sort of hidden or  
occult meaning not discernible to the ordinary mortal. I do  
concede, however, that I should be more fully fortified with  
coffee before approaching keyboard in the morning, thus reducing  
the typo quota.

>Where did I demand that discussion on the Heflin photograph be  
>closed down? I did not comment on Heflin because I do not have  
>the technical expertise to do so. For the record I think the  
>case is 'puzzling', which is, of course, the usual Pelicanist  
>get-out.

I'm glad we can agree on something, and thanks for clarifying  
that the Heflin case, unlike others, may still be discussed  
without the participants' being demonized. Too bad that you  
don't have the same generous impulse toward - as you have  
mentioned specifically - McMinnville, Trindade, et al., or at  
least toward those who persist in their refusal to be persuaded  
that speculative negative claims about them mean that no further  
discussion is warranted.

>>It also bears mentioning that one case, the famous Mantell  
>>incident, almost universally believed to be solved in ufology's  
>>canon of famous IFOs, is now undergoing a pretty serious  
>>reinvestigation which may call into question the Skyhook  
>>identification. The challenging of the widely accepted IFO  
>>identification caused a furious reaction on another List just  
>>recently. People, prominently including pelicanists, love their  
>>certainty.



>We shall see.

No, where pelicanistic certainty is concerned, we've already seen. Repeatedly.

>>It's called human nature, and even pelicanists give every  
>>evidence of having it, clinging to their own beliefs with a  
>>fierceness that never fails to startle the more conventionally  
>>open-minded inquirer.

>Who are these 'conventionally open-minded' inquirers? There seem  
>to be precious few of them around. Far too many people seem to  
>be part of the 'tradition of belief', where the solution to a  
>problem is clear even before it is examined.

It is easy to understand why an ideologue would have difficulty grasping the concept of open-minded inquiry. You're certainly correct, however, in noting that there is no shortage of uncritical- to-credulous "investigators," on whom we concur in deploring. We have seen some cringe-worthy examples on this very List.

What pelicanists and extreme believers have in common, though, is a devotion to their own respective ideologies. The ideologies can be defined, in order, as disbelief and belief traditions. Where the former is concerned, in each ostensible UFO case the solution is presumed to be more or less evident, or at least potentially findable, generally without undue difficulty, within existing knowledge or a small extrapolation from same.

That's because the nature of ostensible UFO phenomena - there is no "UFO phenomenon" except as a cultural construct or the creation of credulous ufologists - is already known (as error, hoax, mental state, rare or [when all else fails] little-understood or unrecognized natural phenomena). Of course, on occasion - if the rhetorical necessity of the moment demands - pelicanists will grudgingly concede that a small detail or two may be missing and thus a whiff of uncertainty, if never more than that, remains.

One well-known disbelief traditionalist (and frequent Magonia contributor) has written that he can read a brief account of an alleged UFO or other anomalous experience and easily discern the psychological "need" that caused the individual to imagine the encounter, and thus solve the case. More recently, another disbelief traditionalist on this List noted the major consideration in controversies about anomalous experience is witness error and misinterpretation.

Open-minded inquiry demands the rejection, so far as is humanly possible, of belief and disbelief ideologies, thus enabling the inquirer to approach individual cases without predisposition. One who is cautiously open to the possibility of an anomalous, beyond-current-knowledge cause for some reports is at an advantage in approaching an individual claim, because no one case hangs on that particular possibility; thus, each can be assessed on its own merits or lack of same. That's why cases debunked by these sorts of investigators tend to stay debunked, and those undebunked stay undebunked.

The disbelief traditionalist, on the other hand, is hobbled by his absolutist premise, which demands as first principle that nothing of extraordinary interest (e.g., evidence of a nonterrestrial intelligence) exists or can be found here; thus no UFO case can be left standing if it implies as much. (The few cases conceded yet to be explained, of course, are dismissed with a flapping-wing gesture: they all will be solved when "further information," which so often proves elusive, comes to light.) That's a virtual definition of a disbelief ideology. Thus all ostensible evidence to the contrary is debunkable, and all who point to contrary, extraordinary implications are [fill in unflattering characterization] and operating from [fill in specific foolish-to-ignoble motivation].

Incidentally, not long ago, on this List, Dick Hall mentioned the excellence of the field investigations NICAP-affiliated researchers conducted in the organization's most active period. I fully concur. While researching the encyclopedia, I was able to read these reports (few ever published) in their entirety, and they represent a model of open-minded inquiry and a refutation of the absurd stereotypes so necessary to the

rhetoric of ideological critics. Suffice it to say that NICAP's investigators did not enter a case with the intention of proving spaceships, come hell or high water, and they were far more thorough than their competitors in Blue Book were in pursuing all possible angles and examining them sensibly.

>>>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one >>>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism >>>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

>>Squawk, squawk. Is there a sadder sight in the world than a >>pelicanist's tears? Or, here, a phonier rationalization for the >>failure to mount a persuasive case against the hated incidents >>that keep the UFO question an open and interesting one?

>I can't quite work out what the above is intended to mean. Are >you saying that sceptics have been unable to argue against >phoney rationalisations of UFO cases? And just what are the >'hated incidents'?

Do you read your own posts? Or are you, as usual, simply being disingenuous? Or, more charitably, maybe you just haven't had your morning tea yet.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 15:40:21 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:35:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 12:15:36 +0000  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 21:06:41 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>It appears that Stephen Black certainly did talk to and  
>>interview Heflin in company with MacDonald, Hartmann and others  
>>in Nov 1967. See

>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jun/m04-002.shtml>

>>But the account by Ann Druffel suggests that Black's  
>>relationship with Heflin was a little strange. I have emailed  
>>William Hartmann to ask if he can shed any light on this alleged  
>>remark. I'll report back anything he may have to say.

>Martin,

>Yes, this has now been established. What I would like to know,  
>and am not clear on, is how did Black fit into the picture. Was  
>he hired by BBC as a skeptical consultant interviewer? Was he  
>asked to try to pick holes in Heflin's story? Heflin's behavior,  
>his so-called dry sense of humor, was perfectly typical of him.

Hi Dick

I'm not sure either, but I think (from distant vague memory of  
the programme - you can confirm from the tape) that Black was  
more than just a hired interviewer. I imagine he was probably  
presenter, writer or co-writer and maybe even co-producer. The  
credits will show. The fact that he was (is) a psychiatrist  
probably tells its own story about the sort of presumptions he  
would have brought to the job.

>In any event, I discovered that I have the BBC-TV program on  
>videotape and intend to review it fairly soon (very busy on  
>other matters right now). My notes tell me that at the time I  
>thought it to be one of the very best TV documentaries on UFOs  
>ever produced. It contains some rare film footage of people like  
>McDonald, including Heflin, so I will review it shortly.

>More later on this.

Look forward to it. Incidentally has anyone thought of getting  
in touch with Stephen Black and asking him about this?

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 11:24:13 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:37:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:29:15 -0300  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Most models were made from kits.  
>Never saw a kit like the one in the photo.

The only one I can think of that even comes close is this Aurora kid from The Invaders TV show (1967-1968). It doesn't match the side-angle shot, though. Also, no antenna.

[http://www.culttvman.com/joel\\_tavera\\_s\\_invaders\\_ufo.html](http://www.culttvman.com/joel_tavera_s_invaders_ufo.html)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## UFOs In The House of Commons

From: Joe McGonagle <[joe.mcgonagle.nul](mailto:joe.mcgonagle.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 17:43:12 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:42:07 -0400  
Subject: UFOs In The House of Commons

In a recent check on the British Parliament site:

<http://tinyurl.com/q8h3o>

I came across the following interesting exchange:

---

Written Answers to Questions [10 May 2006]  
Columns 290W, 291W

UFOs

Mr. Hayes: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence pursuant to his Answer to the Hon. Member for Lewes (Norman Baker) of 28 March 2006, Official Report, column 904W, on unidentified flying objects, on how many occasions there has been an assessment of evidence of risk to the integrity of UK airspace in the last five years; and what the job title is of desk officers assigned to this task. [68757]

Mr. Watson: Over the last five years evidence of risk to the integrity of UK airspace from a reported unidentified flying object has been assessed on 12 occasions; in no case was there considered to be any actual risk. Analysis of reports for this purpose is made by the military desk officer responsible for airspace integrity within the UK operations branch.

---

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Karl Pflock Passes Away

From: Herb Taylor <[herbufo.nul](mailto:herbufo.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 02:19:28 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 07:39:40 -0400  
Subject: Karl Pflock Passes Away

To All:

It is my sad duty to report that Karl Pflock passed away at 3:16 P.M. Mountain Time on June 5, 2006, at his home in Placitas, New Mexico.

Karl was a close colleague of mine since 1994, and I will miss him terribly. He was one of the more rational thinkers in ufology, and his loss will be keenly felt. A voice that espoused critical thinking has been stilled! The large hole in ufology that Karl leaves behind him will not be filled in the foreseeable future.

His solid contributions to this field were many, and one can only speculate on those that almost certainly would have followed.

I have an occasional phone call, countless e-mails, and extensive correspondence to personally remember him by. They were always a pleasure, and often informative as well. He was one of the earliest supporters of my Satellite Object study, and graciously helped in any way that he could.

Karl, rest in peace!

Sadly,

Herb Taylor

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 20:03:40 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 08:11:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 14:14:35 -0300  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

<snip>

>Of late I've found myself debunking the Mantell case, John. I  
>didn't seek out this task but just found it sort of thrust upon  
>me by the violent reaction to my supportive remarks of another  
>debunker who questioned a few details about the facts in the  
>Mantell case. Imagine, 58 years later, new information has come  
>to light that has suggested the accepted solution to the case  
>was in error. And now I find myself on the opposite side of the  
>mainstream - you know the true believers - thinking about the  
>Mantell case.

>I don't think Thomas Mantell was chasing a Skyhook balloon. But  
>I was wondering, when do I get my wings? Is there a protocol  
>for this? Me being a former British subject, does that grease  
>the wheels or is there a waiting period, regardless?

The correct procedure, as Jerry Clark will confirm, is to attend  
a meeting of the Sceptics' Club at the Pelican Pub (taking care  
to avoid the bread rolls thrown by members of the Drones' Club.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 20:56:55 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 08:17:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 20:33:19 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

>>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

>I've spent a lot of time re-examining Trindade critically, and  
>by "Trindade" one obviously means the historical corpus of  
>accounts and evidence and interpretations from people of all  
>shades of opinion that constitute the half-century long "case  
>file". I've found quite a bit of nonsense and illogic in there  
>which I certainly would not defend at any cost. Some of it has  
>been yours.

I'd be interested to know which parts of the nonsense about  
Trindade were mine.

>I have never called anyone a pelicanist. Far from not tolerating  
>discussion I have actively sought it with a number of well-known  
>doubters and tried to engage in debate about various unresolved  
>aspects of the case. Some - for example Tim Printy, Martin  
>Powell and especially Kentaro Mori - were open to useful  
>exchanges of ideas, information and constructive criticism. I'm  
>afraid I can't say the same for John Harney. And if you want to  
>claim that I've ever shrunk from "challenging" your own  
>"critical assault" then you're going to have to go back and  
>refresh your memory from the archive.

As you have never called anyone a 'pelicanist' it is clear that  
you were not one of the people I was referring to. I have also  
never suggested that you do not tolerate discussion. I'm not  
quite sure why you thought my generalised comments were a  
personal attack,

>It's true that some "believers" in Trindade also proved  
>uncooperative, truculent, even abusive. You're right that for  
>some people the idea of questioning a case like this is a sort  
>of sacrilege. I've had the same thing over Santa Ana just  
>recently from correspondents accusing me of being a traitorous  
>debunker for even thinking about it on-List! Really.

So you do agree with me after all!

>But on  
>the other side, it appears to me that your complaint about this  
>inviolate "canon of ufology" is a kind of projection of your  
>own fixations, as though there is a syndrome of compulsive

>denial that is a mirror of these others' compulsive belief. All  
>of you seem engaged in some conflicted folie a deux and perhaps  
>need each other.

I do not think there is an 'inviolable canon of ufology', but there seem to be many people, some of whom are contributors to this list, who are unwilling to debate cases openly (you describe such a situation above) and who seem to have the attitude that any form of critical analysis of a well-known UFO case is a personal affront.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 21:49:40 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 08:32:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:55:23 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>His name is given as Dr Stephen Black. I wrote the review of the  
>programme (but I had forgotten about it, as it was a long time  
>ago). I will post a copy of it (I am waiting for someone to scan  
>it for me).

Here it is, from MUFOB Volume 1, Number 3, May-June 1968:

On May 9th, (1968) BBC Television presented a documentary programme on UFOs narrated by Dr Stephen Black, a researcher in neuro-physiology. For this programme Dr Black chose only UFO witnesses he believed to be sincere.

He soon revealed the peculiar subjective aspects of UFO sightings. First was Captain Howard concerning the famous sighting made by himself, his crew and passengers from a BOAC airliner on June 29th 1954. When Howard had told his story, Dr Black asked him how he felt at the time. Howard said that he felt "kindly disposed towards them," He said he discussed it with other members of his crew afterwards and they agreed that they felt "some sort of bond of affection between us and 'them'." Captain Howard described it as a "very strange and powerful feeling."

Another fascinating interview was with Lonnie Zamora of Socorro, followed by a conversation between Dr Black and Dr Hynek. Both agreed that Zamora saw what he said he saw, Dr Hynek said that it was one of the most interesting cases he had come across.

There followed an interview with Joe Simonton (the Eagle River case) who claimed to have received four pancakes from spacemen in a flying saucer in exchange for a jug of water. Dr Black said that Simonton was "not lying,"

Then we were shown engineer Brian Winder lecturing to a joint meeting of the British Interplanetary Society and Royal Aeronautical Society, at Bristol, on the subject of his flying saucer model based on an atomic power source. The camera, also showed us his audience, some listening attentively, others smirking.

We were shown Dr William Hartman, an astronomer who is responsible for the investigation of all photographic evidence for the Condon Committee, attempting to duplicate the famous Heflin photographs. Hartman pointed out the difficulty of obtaining acceptable photographic evidence, if any particular photograph could be duplicated by faking, then this weakened the arguments in favour of the genuineness of that photograph. He compared the situation to the assassination of President Kennedy, for which event there were many eyewitnesses, photographs and physical evidence, such as bullets. In spite of all this people still argue as to exactly what happened, and who really fired the shots and a number of books have been written expounding contradictory theories. Rex Heflin revealed that he was a been model maker and Dr Black commented that it was quite

possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it.

The most significant part of the programme was the discussion of the Betty and Barney Hill "abduction" story. Dr Benjamin Simon, the Boston psychiatrist who examined the Hills said that he was at first very puzzled by the story, Both gave the same story under hypnosis and Betty described the alleged abduction in great detail. Dr Simon was baffled until he recognised the dreamlike quality of the story. In dreams such things can exist, be acceptable and not require a diagnose of mental disorder. This led him to recall that Betty's original problem had been nightmarish dreams. It turned out that these dreams and the dreams which she had written down in 1961 (just after their UFO experience) were all the same. Dr Simon felt pretty convinced that the abduction part of the story, at least, was merely a dream.

Betty denied telling these dreams to Barney and Barney denied being told about them. However, Betty admitted telling the dreams to her supervisor and her sister and it finally emerged that Barney had been at home at the time she was talking about the dreams so that he could have absorbed some of the details without realising it. A suggestion by Betty's supervisor that they might not be dreams but reality led to the complete repression of the whole thing, leading to the gap in memory. Dr Simon said, in answer to a question from Dr Black, that both of the Hills were deep trance hypnotic subjects.

Summing up, Dr Black said that a lot of apparent movement of lights in the sky might be due to a well-known mechanism in the brain which makes a flickering light in a darkened room appear to move. The eyeballs remain still; movement is "all in the mind". Some scientists believe the rate of flicker to be critical and this rate has to be the same as an important brain-wave rhythm about 10 times a second. Stars sometimes twinkle at the rate of 10 times a second, and the Hills' experience began with their attention being drawn to what appeared to be a star. However, stars never seem to move as much as UFOs are said to move.

Barney Hill had said that he did not believe in flying saucers, but Betty did, so to some extent suggestion was going on in their home, Both Hill's are deep hypnotic subjects, and such people are only 5% of the general population. Dr Black said that he wished to test as many convincing UFO witnesses as possible for hypnotisability. This was somewhat difficult to arrange, but only six deep-trance witnesses in a row would be necessary to prove statistically a connection. So far he had had five such subjects and the odds against this being due to chance were 3 million to one against. Dr Hynek agreed that this discovery was very interesting and required following up.

He said that deep trance subjects, so far as we know, do not hallucinate spontaneously. They need a hypnotist to suggest at least the beginnings of the delusion. He then asked "Could a flickering light, the way people react in groups and hypnosis all combine to explain UFOs?" He concluded that perhaps some, though certainly not all sightings could be explained in this way. the Captain Howard sighting could not be explained as a delusion as such an explanation in this case would surely involve telepathy!

---

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:14:45 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 08:51:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:13:14 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 20:24:07 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 08:39:57 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700  
>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<big snip>

>>I suggested some time ago that if you rescale the distant  
>>landscapes, which means reducing #3 by about 6% in relation to  
>>#2, the UFO in #3 (flange diameter estimated by reference to  
>>proportionality of #1) still appears to be about 7% larger  
>>than in #2. On the face of it this seems inconsistent with the  
>>sequence as reported. It could be consistent with the camera  
>>moving closer to a small model just beyond the window, since  
>>the window width has enlarged at the same time by almost 5%  
>>between #2 and #3. This should be taken as a minimum value for  
>>the difference in range between lens and window since, as I  
>>pointed out, there is a very small perspective foreshortening of  
>>the window width in #3. Allowing for this, it isn't ruled out that  
>>the proportion change in angular width of the UFO and of the  
>>window frame have not only the same sign but the same exact  
>>value.

I get the exact opposite result from Martin. Once #3 has been  
rescaled so that the distant features match up in size, I end up  
with the object in #3 being about 4-5% smaller than in #2.  
This would place #3 further away from the camera, which is  
consistent with Heflin's account.

>>This needs to be investigated with more care on high-resolution  
>>images, which we (or I at any rate) do not possess. Possibly  
>>this issue, and a number of other issues that have been raised  
>>recently, by several people, on this List and in off-List  
>>exchanges with Ann Druffel and Bob Wood, will be addressed in  
>>their and Ed Kelson's forthcoming JSE paper this summer. Or if  
>>not then hopefully the images can then be made available for  
>>wider study. Meanwhile, all one can say is that the above  
>>result - considered alone - would be consistent with a model  
>>just beyond the window. As I also pointed out the direction of  
>>displacement of the images against the landscape is also  
>>consistent with a stationary model just beyond the window,  
>>close to the range of the mirror, but not a stationary model  
>>beyond the mirror. This is in turn consistent with Tim  
>>Shell's original idea about the stereo coincidence. But...

If the model is too close to the car window, we would very definitely be seeing its shadow cast on the window. The sun was high in the sky (about 77 deg. elevation at 12:30 PDT) and about 30 deg. right of the view (or at 160 deg azimuth). More of the lower window is visible in photo 2 (where a model would have been 4-5 inches closer in). This works out to about 4 inches as the nearest any model could be without its shadow being visible in the lower part of the window of photo 2, or roughly out at mirror distance.

Now if the model was stationary, then this distance would also about account for the small sideways image shift of the object between 2 and 3. BUT, this wouldn't account for what I measure as 3 being smaller by 2, which means 3 is further away than 2. Any simple stationary model hoax scenario isn't going to work.

>I brought this up, in my response to Bruce Macabee's post a while ago - see:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m25-026.shtml>

>><snip>

>>>My point was that an actual experiment with that camera has >>>to be entertained not a digital one).

>>I agree. That doesn't mean David's experiment has no value >>though, especially if the hypothetical model needs to have >>been within only a few tens of inches of the lens, which is what >>I said the evidence suggests (and I think David now agrees?).

I don't recall ever disagreeing that a model would have been a short distance outside the window. I just think the preponderance of evidence now points to the photos being genuine and not a model. I find the apparent "smoke trail" now found by photo enhancement in #3 and other similar "steaming" coming off the object in #2 to be particularly convincing.

>I didn't say it had no value, I've only been saying that >experiments with the actual film and setting have to be >done... oversaturation conditions need to be explored real >settings real film real camera.... I've been saying that since >the beginning.

Well, go to it Victor. I suspect such experiments with identical film and camera were already carried out multiple times when this case was first investigated 40 years ago, but maybe without using test threads of various thickness and color.

I do remember Hartmann generated some hoax photos using a suspension thread, but Heflin pointed that he could easily see Hartmann's thread in the resulting photos. Hartmann's thread thickness and photo distances weren't specified.

Martin Shough has already pointed out in a previous post that the power lines in the original photos are already a rough indication of photo resolution of dark, being isolated linear objects like suspension threads.

Unfortunately we currently don't have access to the best possible digital images to see just what this resolution might be. In the JSE pdf reproduction degraded photos, the power lines in photo 1 fade out just before reaching the first visible power pole, or roughly 200 feet away. (I can't see any power lines in the mirror-reflected image of photo 2.)

Martin used a 1/4 inch thick power line, but I'll assume 1/2 inch, which I think is a little more realistic. This works out to about 0.7 arc min of width when it disappears. In contrast, a 200 micron thick thread at 45 inches (114 cm) is about 0.6 arc min of width, or about the same. I'm willing to bet the resolution of the best digital images of the photos is 2 or 3 times this. So this would make something like a sewing thread as likely being visible in any near model (unless Heflin used something much thinner or used a suspension filament that blended in very well with the background sky).

A suspension thread was not detected back in 1967 when Robert Nathan of JPL analyzed the photos, nor was one detected in 1993 when Jeff Saino of MUFON reanalyzed the pictures nor in 2000

when the original prints were reanalyzed in the JSE paper.

William Spaulding of Ground Saucer Watch claimed otherwise and declared the pictures a hoax, but was working from copies several generations removed from the original. So he may have been detecting nothing but an artifact, such as a scratch.

>>It's also possible that Heflin got the order wrong. Remember >>the film pack was not numbered and he marked them 1 to 4 at >>some time later. So he could have transposed #3 and #4 quite >>easily...

Correction: this should be #3 and #2 here (the "stereo" pair). #4 is of the large smoke ring.

Since I also disagree with Martin's assessment that the object in #3 is larger than in #2, I don't think Heflin got his #2 and #3 photos reversed in sequence. The sequence of the photos Heflin provided is consistent in all details with this back story of what happened.

>>I imagine. It wouldn't seem particularly important to him at the >>time. In fact if you reverse them you end up with a coherent >>sequence of reducing angular size. Of course the cost of doing >>that is to make the #3 "smoke trail" less intelligible, since >>this becomes #2 and presumably heading in the opposite >>direction.

>I was first to bring of the film order as it relates to >directional information on the object in question and brought >that up a while ago. (in private to Tim Shell too). If the >order is, reversed the 3D becomes inverted too - remember my >first post... see:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m24-010.shtml>

No, no, no! If the order of the photos is reversed, the 3D does not become inverted. Otherwise the most distant objects would become the closest; the closest objects (like the window and mirror) would be way off in the distance. If you think about it for a moment, this would be absurd.

I think you are confusing swapping pictures when viewing stereoscopically, i.e., viewing the right-most picture (#3) with the left eye and the left-most picture (#2) with the right eye. This will invert depth.

However, treating the photos individually does not change any of the stereo disparity information. The leftmost photo will still show disparity shifts consistent with being the leftmost photo and ditto for the rightmost photo. It doesn't matter which order the photos are taken.

>>Alternatively the similarity of relative position is a >>coincidence. This is also possible. Consider that however you >>look at the testimony, this approximate point in the sky is the >>point at which the object, quite slow moving, was reported >>performing a tight course reversal. It stands to reason that >>only a small angular translation is to be expected between #2 >>and #3 at this point; it stands to reason that it will be right >>to left; the photographer cannot physically move far and so >>could only possibly introduce a small angular displacement; and >>it also stands to reason (psychologically and physically) that >>any movement of the photographer will be in the direction he did >>demonstrably move, so that any compensation will be in the >>direction of reducing the relative angular displacement. That >>two small quantities which are naturally of opposite sign will >>cancel to a much smaller residual is inherently quite likely.

Another way of stating this is the photographer tries to keep the object framed near the center of view as the object does a course change. This will also minimize changes in sideways position. So if the object moves left between photos 2 and 3, Heflin moves right to keep the framing about the same in the window.

>The coincidence still stands and I brought that up among my >first postings: That it was unusual to have exactly compensated >for the movement of the object such that it ends up in overlap >when the car frame is used as the reference point.



First of all, the compensation is not necessarily "exact." The object lies a little bit right in the window frame in photo 3 of where it was in photo 2. And second, it isn't so much of a "coincidence" if a distant object is moving and the photographer is trying to keep the framing the same.

Now here's a real serious coincidence for the hoax pushers to consider. As discussed further below, the object in #2 and #3 is at virtually the exact same elevation angle compared to the horizon (to within about 1 or 2 percent measurement error). However #3 object is (according to my measurement after rescaling photo 3) about 4-5% smaller. Further, #3 photo is taken about 5% closer to the window, which, if you had a stationary model, would make a model in #3 5% larger, instead of the other way around. Thus a model in #3 has to really be about 9-10% further away than in #2. (Else Heflin has to use two models, not one, with the #3 model being 9+% smaller.)

However, in a static model, if Heflin simply pushes #3 object out 9+% further, the object would have an apparent drop in elevation of several tenths of a degree (depends on distance and how far below the model the camera is) if it stayed at the same height. To compensate, Heflin would have had to raise the model a little bit (or lower the camera). So that's one possible coincidence.

The same argument also applies to a lesser extent to a distant object. Here different camera distances from the window are insignificant and only the 4-5% image size difference matters. The object in #3 would be 4-5% further away. I get an elevation angle of 7.8 deg. in photo 2, and to maintain that angle in photo 3 at the greater distance, the object would have to rise a few feet (how much depends on absolute altitude and distance).

This again corresponds to Heflin's story (even though it's a very subtle detail gotten through very careful examination of the photos). Initially the object seemed to be in level flight and moved away slowly (photos 1 to 2), then it wobbled and showed its bottom (photo 2), then it seemed to gain stability and increased its speed and altitude leaving behind a "smoke-like vapor" (photo 3).

In a moving model hoax theory, Heflin swings the model to get the necessary size difference. However if he has the model stationary in one photo and swings it in the other (either towards or away from the camera), then the model in photo #3 is either going to be noticeably higher or lower than in #2. E.g., if he has the model stationary in #2 and swings it out in #3, the model is now too high. Thus, if Heflin swings the model, and it has to swing both ways, a little bit inward for photo #2 (by about 2 inches) and a little further out (by 2+ inches) in photo #3 to keep the elevation angles the same, another remarkable hoaxing coincidence.

To me, the identical elevation angle coincidence in the model theory is much more improbable or difficult to explain than in a non-hoax scenario of where the object is starting to move away and increase its elevation. To me, the latter explains the matching (or nearly matching) elevation angles in a very natural way.

>Remember, I  
>brought up the importance that TWO 3D images are possible with  
>the images not ONE: one with the car frame (shows movement of  
>the Photographer with respect to the car), the other at the  
>horizon point (this shows movement of object relative to the  
>ground with an understanding that it has to be compensated for  
>(relative to the first 3D): in order to understand TRUE  
>directionality... why else would I have mentioned these  
>points. Again, experimentation is in order.

The movements of near and far objects are NOT independent of one another when the position of the camera shifts. Therefore, there are two unique camera positions (more left and more right) and one, not two stereo pairs.

>>>Questions:

<snip>

>>>Was the window rolled up?

>>Yes the window was rolled up. This is published info. You  
>>should go and read some of the case literature Viktor!

I agree. For one thing he should read Hartmann's account in the Condon report which provides much of the technical information. Dick Hall has also pointed out here that most of this technical information about the camera and film is also summarized in the short write-up on the case in "UFO Evidence II."

>>>I can think of one another way to suspend a small object  
>>>without thread. If the object was suspended in between two  
>>>panes of thin glass. Perhaps the car window is one of them?  
>>>I guess it would have lead me to become very observant at  
>>>the evidence and witnesses houses during that time.  
>>Think about this. If you look at the opened triangular side  
>>vent in #2 and #3 you can see what the darkening due to the  
>>overlapped edge of a second sheet of glass looks like. Now  
>>cab, visualise the internal obstructions due to the shape  
>>of the side window divider, windscreen post etc. Then  
>>visualise the obstruction caused outside the window by the  
>>mirror support structure. I don't see any anomalous lines  
>>that look like the edge of a second sheet of glass. A second  
>>sheet of glass would have to be cut and positioned so that  
>>its edge did not overlap the window glass anywhere.

>>Maybe close examination of enhanced high-res scans of the  
>>originals will show the edge of a glass sheet, but I doubt  
>>it. This is not a very simple job, never mind the odd problem  
>>of how to trap a moving model between two such sheets of  
>>glass such that it apparently tips and rotates without  
>>moving around, then arranging a support mechanism for the  
>>whole contraption.

I quite agree, and pulling off the whole hoax off while \_on the job\_ with his supervisor only a mile away. This falls into one of those "too clever by half" hoax scenarios.

>This does not preclude large sheet glass that fills the entire  
>view just leaning against the car.

The top of the van window is about 5 feet off the ground. Are you suggesting Heflin was hauling a 5 foot tall pane of glass around in the van just so he could pull off a UFO hoax? That would be a little awkward. No, he would need something much smaller and some sort of support or suspension mechanism for your hypothetical second pane of glass. All these hoax scenarios are not impossible, but just more and more elaborate and unlikely.

>It is also possible to glue  
>the backside to a single sheet of glass.

Of course it's "possible." It's also remotely "possible" he had a confederate who tossed a model up in the air (hence no thread) and also remotely possible that he still ended up with the model in almost identical positions in photos 2 and 3. Anything is "possible," but just how likely are these various hoax scenarios?

The more complicated the hoax and unlikely the outcome, the less likely the hoax scenario. E.g., if he glued the model to the hypothetical giant sheet of glass (already improbable), he still has to move the whole thing away from him to account for the size difference between #2 and #3. And he has to be extraordinary lucky in gluing the model or positioning the glass such that the elevation angles remain the same. On top of this, before the age of scanners and computers, Heflin has to be incredibly observant (maybe careful measurement of his photos under a microscope) to notice that #2 and #3 are at the same elevation in #2 and #3 and know a little math to cook up a back story about the saucer appearing to rise as it moved away in photo #3. Sure, it's all "possible," but collectively wildly improbable, just another too clever by half hoax scenario.

>I also mentioned  
>other orientations for the string. I think it's fair to say  
>(read all my posts) that I'm looking at this from many angles\_  
>specifically inconsistencies and consistencies both. David's  
>experiment lacks comparisonworth:  
>a) Real Film and Real settings.

No problems there. So go to a photo shop, rent an equivalent camera (if you can still find one), and buy a pack of ASA 3000 B&W Polaroid film. Polaroid film is only about \$3 a picture these days. (ugh!)

>b) Only string orientations in one focal plane are explored  
>close up.

The camera has a very large depth of field, another thing already noted 40 years ago. Close things like the window edges and side-view mirror are all in sharp focus as are more distant objects.

The point is, a model has to be outside the window (otherwise it would be completely shaded by the inside of the cab instead of being obviously exposed to the sun), and it also can't be very far outside the window judging by the object disparity differences in the #2 and #3. My preliminary measurements place the car window 38-40 inches from the two camera views, and any model probably less than foot beyond that (because of the observed horizontal disparities in object positions).

Further to get the size differences, object #3 has to be slightly further away than #2. Furthermore, camera view #3 is about 5% closer to the window than #2 (38 inches vs. 40 inches). To compensate for the closer camera, object #3 has to be moved another 5% further away. Overall, #3 object has to be 9-10% further away from the camera to account for the size and camera distance differences. If object #2 was at say 44 inches from camera #2, then #3 object has to be at around 46 inches from camera #3 (or 4 inches in back of #2, because #3 camera is already ~2 inches closer to the window).

With the photos already demonstrating a very large depth of field, the difference between 44 inches and 46 inches from the camera in terms of a suspension thread focus and detectability is insignificant. It also doesn't matter if the thread is slanted away or towards the camera. The few percent difference in thread width from top to bottom isn't going to make a helluva lot of difference in terms of detectability.

How about suspension thread movement? To introduce the observed size difference, #3 has to be further away, so either the model has to be swinging on the thread or, in an even more elaborate hoax, there is little or no swing and Heflin has to bother to push his "fishing pole" another 4 inches out from the window. In the latter hoax scenario, there is little or no movement to consider, so let's just examine the first one.

The period of a pendulum swing is given by  $2\pi \sqrt{L/g}$ , where  $L$  = length of the pendulum and  $g$  = gravitational constant of acceleration (980 cm/sec<sup>2</sup>). Suppose in a simpler hoax scenario (which also maximizes the rate of swing), Heflin's supporting "fishing pole" is laying directly on top of the roof, and we have a very short suspension thread of say only 6 inches or 15 cm. Then the period of the swing works out to .78 sec.

To account for the size difference, the length of the swing has to be around 4 inches, so the total swing during the period is 8 inches or 20 cm. Average speed is 20 cm/.78 sec = 26 cm/sec and maximum speed (at the very bottom of the swing) is about 40 cm/sec.

The Polaroid is using ASA 3000 film, which is VERY fast (which is why the film is also very "grainy"). It is daylight and the camera is going to be using a fast exposure time. Against this, the automatic exposure system is somewhat "confused" by the dark interior of the cab, so it probably selects a somewhat longer exposure time than the very shortest possible to compensate (hence the exterior details are somewhat overexposed). The alternative would be to open up the iris (smaller f-stop) to admit more light, but because the picture has such a large depth of field, I would guess the automatic exposure system in fairly bright lighting conditions (daylight) is at maximum f-stop (smallest iris) and instead "opts" for a longer exposure time. As a wild-ass guess (and to try to further maximize possible movement blur) I'll guess the exposure time is 1/250th of a second (instead of maybe 1/1000th of a sec.).

Then in this worse case scenario, the bottom of the thread will move at most 40 cm/sec x 1/250 sec = .16 cm or 1.6 mm or

1600 microns. I already noted my test sewing threads as being around 200 microns in thickness, so the maximum the thread moves during the exposure is about 8 thread widths.

Now this is worse case movement. In any realistic scenario, the actual thread movement will be considerably less. For starters, most of the motion is going to be line-of-sight either toward or away from the camera. Thus the image smear will be the thread getting very slightly smaller or larger in thickness during the exposure. If you calculate the percent change in thickness at likely model distances, this works out to about 0.4%, which wouldn't even be remotely detectable.

This leaves side-to-side swing motion blur. However, this would be limited in the hoax model theory by the fact that the pictures show only slight sideways shift in object position between photos 2 & 3. (The fact that there isn't much shift is what got this whole close model hoax theory stirred up again.).

You could get more sideways motion by pushing the model further out. Then you would have to swing the model somewhat left in photo 3 (or right in photo 2) to get the observed sideways disparity shift. E.g., you could push the model out to 56 inches from camera 2 then swing the model 5 inches back (to get the necessary image shrinkage) and about inch leftward (to get the sideways image shift). However, when projected back onto the film plane, the apparent sideways motion of the thread would be about 20% of maximum motion or about 1-1/2 thread thicknesses of sideways motion blur.

Thus even assuming maximum speed and sideways motion, you would get only a modest amount of thread motion blur for something the thickness of a sewing thread. However, something much thinner, like a human hair, would probably be blurred below detectable levels.

It has been assumed above, for worse-case blur considerations for a suspension thread, that both photos #2 and #3 were taken when the thread was in maximum motion. However, this is highly unlikely because of another subtle detail in the two photos already discussed above. The object is at essentially the same elevation angle in #2 and #3. However, suppose the model was at rest in #2 and swung out in #3 (to get the proper image size difference), then #3 would be at a substantially higher elevation angle (as much as the full width of the object itself), particularly if swung on a very short pendulum (to maximize speed). But it is not.

To keep the angles the same, #2 would have to be swung in and #3 swung out (a little bit more to compensate for difference in distance)). Thus if you have a short 6 inch pendulum and swing #2 inward by a little less than 2 inches and #3 outward by a little more, you already have a very large swing going. At either end of the swing, the pendulum thread isn't moving at all. In the worst-case scenarios, the maximum speed of the pendulum swing is at the bottom of the swing between the two end extremes. But the photo details indicate that a model would have to be near the ends of the swing when the model would have substantially slowed down or maybe even stopped.

Thus actual motion blur would be several-fold reduced again. Even in a worst-case sideways swing case with a slower shutter, we're probably down to a film motion blur on the order of maybe half the width of a sewing thread, or 100 microns. This will reduce only slightly the detectability of something as thick as a sewing thread. (It would reduce the contrast of the thread by about a third.)

The whole point of this very long discourse, is that motion blur is unlikely to have much effect on detectability of most common suspension threads. More important variables than motion are thread thickness and contrast with the background.

>c) Oversaturation conditions aren't explored since digital >cameras are predominantly automatic, Heflin's lacked a >certain amount of compensation here.

Heflin's exposure setting was automatic too. But the point about oversaturation is a valid one and would probably reduce thread contrast and visibility. However, I suspect this still wouldn't be enough to make a common thread invisible to the eye or in

computer enhancement.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/05/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:37:40 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 08:55:04 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/05/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 66  
June 5, 2006

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

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* WAITING FOR A RULING IN THE AIPAC CASE  
\*\* MANAGING WMD CIVIL SUPPORT TEAMS  
\*\* DISPOSAL OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN THE OCEAN, AND MORE (CRS)

WAITING FOR A RULING IN THE AIPAC CASE

In the near future a federal court will decide whether the prosecution of two former officials of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) for allegedly mishandling classified information can proceed, or whether it must be dismissed on First Amendment grounds.

It will be a fateful decision either way.

If the prosecution is permitted to proceed, it would reflect an unprecedented determination that private individuals who are not engaged in espionage can be punished for receiving and transmitting national defense information. Such a finding would instantly transform many national security reporters, researchers and others into potential criminals.

If the case is dismissed, it would imply a bold affirmation of First Amendment values against the encroachment of a Justice Department that keeps testing its ever-expanding boundaries.

In their latest pleading, the defendants called the attention of Judge T.S. Ellis, III, to a new decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which they said supports their argument for dismissal of the AIPAC case.

The Supreme Court decision last week, in a case called *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, held that when a government employee makes a statement as part of his official duties, he does not enjoy First Amendment protections against retaliation by his employer. The decision was widely viewed as a defeat for whistleblower rights.

But attorneys for the former AIPAC defendants pointed to the sharp distinction made by the Supreme Court between the speech of a government official, which the Court said is not protected by the First Amendment, and the speech of a member of the public, who still possesses First Amendment rights.

"Ceballos confirms the defendants' argument that while it may be proper to sanction a government employee for certain types of speech, the First Amendment does not allow the government to punish subsequent oral transmissions by non-government

individuals" like those in the AIPAC case, the defense attorneys wrote.

"The Motion to Dismiss should be granted."

See "Defendants' Notice of Supreme Court Decision Relevant to Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss the Superseding Indictment," filed June 2, 2006 in USA v. Rosen, Weissman:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/rosen060206.pdf>

#### MANAGING WMD CIVIL SUPPORT TEAMS

In the event of an attack against the United States involving weapons of mass destruction, National Guard units known as WMD civil support teams (CST) would be called upon to respond.

"The mission of the WMD CST is to support civil authorities at a domestic CBRNE [chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear or high-yield explosive] incident site by identifying CBRNE agents/substances, assessing current and projected consequences, advising on response measures, and assisting with requests for additional support."

The operation of WMD civil support teams was described in a recent National Guard publication on "Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team Management," January 12, 2006 (1.2 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/ngr-cst.pdf>

Further detail is presented in "Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures," U.S. Army Field Manual FM 3-11.22, June 2003 (233 pages, 6 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-11-22.pdf>

#### DISPOSAL OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN THE OCEAN, AND MORE (CRS)

"The U.S. Armed Forces disposed of chemical weapons in the ocean from World War I through 1970," the Congressional Research Service recalled in a valuable new report.

"At that time, it was thought that the vastness of ocean waters would absorb chemical agents that may leak from these weapons. However, public concerns about human health and environmental risks, and the economic effects of potential damage to marine resources, led to a statutory prohibition on the disposal of chemical weapons in the ocean in 1972."

"For many years, there was little attention to weapons that had been dumped offshore prior to this prohibition. However, the U.S. Army completed a report in 2001 indicating that the past disposal of chemical weapons in the ocean had been more common and widespread geographically than previously acknowledged."

"The Army cataloged 74 instances of disposal through 1970, including 32 instances off U.S. shores and 42 instances off foreign shores. The disclosure of these records has renewed public concern about lingering risks from chemical weapons still in the ocean today."

See "U.S. Disposal of Chemical Weapons in the Ocean: Background and Issues for Congress," May 24, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33432.pdf>

Some other recent CRS reports obtained by Secrecy News that are not readily available in the public domain include:

"Defense: FY2007 Authorization and Appropriations," updated May 31, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33405.pdf>

"The Changing Demographic Profile of the United States," updated May 5, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL32701.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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul) with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](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](http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 01:33:44 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 09:28:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 21:06:41 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>It appears that Stephen Black certainly did talk to and  
>interview Heflin in company with MacDonald, Hartmann and others  
>in Nov 1967. See

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jun/m04-002.shtml>

>But the account by Ann Druffel suggests that Black's  
>relationship with Heflin was a little strange. I have emailed  
>William Hartmann to ask if he can shed any light on this alleged  
>remark. I'll report back anything he may have to say.

Hi Martin, Listers,

I stand corrected that the person who allegedly unloaded the  
"model" theory was not nameless or faceless but in fact Pysc  
Stephen Black.

Now when you read the account by Ann Druffel, which came from  
McDonald's files we get the impression that Black, Hartmann and  
Heflin went out to where the photos were taken in an effort to  
prove that they were hoaxed. Apparently Heflin did not get  
angry, but used off humor... which apparently Black didn't  
understand or get. If this is correct (and no reason to doubt at  
this point) we can easily see where Black could walk away with  
some totally different impression (if he in fact did) of Heflin  
and his photos.

I say "if he in fact did" because we have not seen the  
documentary and we only have the so-called 'model connection'  
apparently from the pen of a reviewer at this stage of the game.  
We don't know the context of any so-called 'model' remark if any  
were made, and we don't know if that was an interpretation of  
what the reviewer saw in the documentary.

Bottom line, wait and see.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 07:20:46 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:00:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 11:24:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:29:15 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Most models were made from kits.  
>>Never saw a kit like the one in the photo.

>The only one I can think of that even comes close is this Aurora  
>kid from The Invaders TV show (1967-1968). It doesn't match the  
>side-angle shot, though. Also, no antenna.

>[http://www.culttyman.com/joel\\_tavera\\_s\\_invaders\\_ufo.html](http://www.culttyman.com/joel_tavera_s_invaders_ufo.html)

Hi Tim

I wonder about the likely meaning of any statement that Heflin may have made to Black about model-making. Judging from Ann Druffel's account it seems possible that Black may have failed to get off on the right foot with Heflin and unwittingly made himself the target of some ironic joke. Or if such a double-bluff theory seems a bit over-complicated he may have told the simple truth. But I can think of several scenarios in which this is neither an explicit nor an implicit confession of fraud.

For example, Black and Hartmann are out there in the Econoline van fumbling with models on strings with Heflin looking on.

Black remarks to Heflin: "You know I always enjoyed making models when I was a kid!"

Heflin replies conversationally, "Sure, so did I."

Result: Saucer Photographer Admits To Being Keen Model-Maker

There are many other analogous possibilities. Unless we find evidence from Black or Hartmann or elsewhere of explicit, damning, words out of Heflin's own mouth, this will always be an ambiguous area.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 09:17:02 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:07:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 11:24:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 09:29:15 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Most models were made from kits.  
>>Never saw a kit like the one in the photo.

>The only one I can think of that even comes close is this Aurora  
>kid from The Invaders TV show (1967-1968). It doesn't match the  
>side-angle shot, though. Also, no antenna.

>[http://www.culttyman.com/joel\\_tavera\\_s\\_invaders\\_ufo.html](http://www.culttyman.com/joel_tavera_s_invaders_ufo.html)

Incidentally does anyone recall this?:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

As far as I can see this story prompted absolutely no reaction whatsoever on-List at the time. The UFO was apparently just "a joke that got out of control" according to an Orange County resident. He saw the photos first hand in 1965 before all the publicity. He had personal knowledge that they were just a joke, and when the pictures were published he even called the Orange County Register to tell them but they didn't want to know. Heflin used a "toy train wheel" hung on some monofilament fishing line. Well, whether O gauge, HO or OO gauge, or maybe Meccano even, we aren't told; but on the whole this comes closer - in scale and in technique - to what the digital enhancements and photogrammetry together seem to indicate.

It's tempting to just hang this out as bait, in hope of entertainment, but it would be dishonest not to comment. Let's extract the facts of the story.

In July 1997 the Orange County Register publishes\* a new piece on the Heflin photos. (As far as I can make out, the Orange County Register seems to be the new name of the paper known as the Santa Ana Register when it first published one of the Heflin photos on Sept 20 1965.) One Ed Riddle then 'phones in to say that he recalls being shown the same pictures 32 years before during his lunch break by "some guy" he worked with at the local phone company. The said "some guy", who was "in a jolly mood", told him that "his neighbour or friend or somebody he knew" had taken them himself and intended to take them to the papers "for some fun". When the pictures did appear in the Register later that September, Ed Riddle was prompted by conscience or whatever other motive to call the paper and burst the bubble, but the paper didn't use his story because he had "no proof".

Well, maybe such a strict standard of proof seems a bit rich coming from a paper that has just published a man's amazing story of photographing a flying saucer. But then again, Ed Riddle's story was never more than hearsay. He didn't know

Heflin. What the paper was getting was not even second-hand, but third-hand, an impression formed by Riddle about the opinion formed in turn by "some guy" regarding pictures given him by "somebody he knew" who may or may not have been Rex Heflin himself.

According to the Air Force many copies of the pictures were in circulation that August. Within days, friends made copies and "handed [these] out to various friends of friends, until most of Santa Ana was saturated with the UFO pictures." No doubt the town was also awash with rumours and opinions about them. Could the paper not have given "some guy" the benefit of the doubt in the context of an outrageous saucer claim? If "some guy" had called the paper himself maybe they would. But apparently he didn't.

Look again at that UFO - can you see a flanged toy train wheel?

Maybe.

It is an interesting tale and could possibly be based on fact. But a reliable chain of evidence it is not.

Martin Shough

\* The Rex-Files: Roswell, Schmozwell - While the New Mexico town celebrates (and the Feds debunk) its claim to fame, we pause to observe Orange County's own UFO affair - the mysterious polaroids of Mr. Rex Heflin, by Amy Wilson - July 06 1997.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## UFO Review Issue #16

From: **Stuart Miller** <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:16:50 -0400  
Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

The latest issue of UFO Review, issue 16, is now available at:

<http://www.uforeview.net>

As usual, either of the two top, left-hand buttons depending on whether you want it in PDF or Word. And also as usual, a truly splendiferous edition of intellectual transgression, abject nonsense, stimulating humour, and profound observation. And all remarkably topical too.

And in this issue we have:

1. Conference reminder =09

2. "I'm A Bastard Crop Circle Faker Maker, A Government Agent, And A Serious Pain In The Ass (for Special Branch)"

One of the long forgotten men of Ufology, Matthew Williams is still alive and well and living down in Devizes. These days a much overlooked figure, he was the man who busted the crop circle myth wide open, made one or two researchers look a little stupid in the process, and who's evidence has been ignored ever since. And he was also the man who decided to get into Rudloe Manor, uninvited, and have a look around for himself. Those types of Direct Action days are now long gone; more's the pity. Fascinating interview with a Ufological warrior.

3. "Separated at birth #2" =09  
Amazing physical similarities between people in Ufology and people who aren't.

4. Robert Barrow's review of Wendy Connors' Night Journeys in Ufology: 1974-1977 Case Recordings, National UFO Reporting Center (Seattle WA), Vol 01

=09  
5. "Alien Autopsy Footage Apparently Not Real!! Cripes."

6. "Condign Report -- Interview with Joe McGonagle"  
The inside story from one of the men on the err inside. What it's like discovering a new secret document and what it's like facing the media with it

7. "There's A Rock Out There With Our Name On It"  
A look at the problem of rogue asteroids and what can be done about it. Interview with Italian Professor Palaeo Ontology

8. "A Saucerful of Secrets=94: An Interdisciplinary Analysis of UFO Experiences"  
The Journal of American Folklore article which has caused such a furore. Read it here. =09

=09

9. The Daily Spurt - Filey man is a real life alien hybrid=09  
Staggering scientific discovery here in the UK

10. The Light Fantastic

=09

Meticulous article from Kithra on orbs and rods

11. Documentbusters -- review of a new film from director Crass  
Parr =09

12. Chris Rolfe's FOIA re the Burmarsh incident

=09

Michael Howard hasn't had a good night's sleep since.

All this and a few cartoons thrown in just for good measure, all  
for the princely sum of zilch at:

<http://www.uforeview.net>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <[steve.nul](mailto:steve.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 08:28:49 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:24:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Kaeser

>From: Herb Taylor <[herbufo.nul](mailto:herbufo.nul)>  
>To: [project-1947.nul](mailto:project-1947.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 02:19:28 EDT  
>Subject: Karl Pflock Passes Away

>To All:

>It is my sad duty to report that Karl Pflock passed away at 3:16  
>P.M. Mountain Time on June 5, 2006, at his home in Placitas, New  
>Mexico.

<snip>

>Karl, rest in peace!

>Sadly,

>Herb Taylor

Karl was very active in the field and provided a needed voice to help provide balance and self-analysis. His work will live on and he will be remembered by many, who may or may not have agreed with him.

May his journey be smooth and my best to his family,

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Kimball

From: Paul Kimball <[TheRobieShark.nul](mailto:TheRobieShark.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 08:48:07 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:28:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Kimball

>From: Herb Taylor <[herbufo.nul](mailto:herbufo.nul)>  
>To: [project-1947.nul](mailto:project-1947.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 02:19:28 EDT  
>Subject: Karl Pflock Passes Away

>To All:

>It is my sad duty to report that Karl Pflock passed away at 3:16  
>P.M. Mountain Time on June 5, 2006, at his home in Placitas, New  
>Mexico.

This is terrible news, and a great loss for ufology.

I was happy to call Karl a friend, and appreciated the help and advice he gave me over the past few years. He once joked that I was Anakin to his Darth - at least I think he was joking! :-)

I first met Karl on September 9th, 2001, in Cedar Rapids, where I was interviewing him and Kevin Randle for the Stanton T. Friedman Is Real documentary - we flew Karl in from New Mexico.

He offered some pretty pointed criticism of Stan, particularly re. Roswell and MJ-12, but it was without malice; indeed, it was clear that he had a tremendous amount of respect for Stan as a person, even as they disagreed over particulars.

But, in my experience, and Karl and I had our disagreements, that was Karl - a good guy, through and through. It came through when I interviewed him, and in our private conversations and correspondence over the past four and a half years.

I'm glad I got the chance to know him.

I'll miss him. So will ufology.

Rest in peace, Karl.

Paul Kimball  
[www.redstarfilms.blogspot.com](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Karl Pflock Passes - Connors

From: Wendy Connors <[fadeddiscs.nul](mailto:fadeddiscs.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 08:14:27 -0600  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:31:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes - Connors

>From: Herb Taylor <[herbufo.nul](mailto:herbufo.nul)>  
>To: [project-1947.nul](mailto:project-1947.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 02:19:28 EDT  
>Subject: Karl Pflock Passes Away

<snip>

Karl and I were publicly, rams butting heads, but behind the scenes Karl and I were good friends.

I shall miss our cherry pie eating fests - his favorite pie - in my little office, as we bickered, bitched and moaned over cases and ideas.

Karl, cherry pie won't taste the same. I shall miss you!

Wendy Connors  
[www.fadeddiscs.com](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge Dies

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:38:49 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 10:38:49 -0400  
Subject: UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge Dies

Source: Southeast Missourian - Cape Girardeau, Missouri, USA

<http://www.semissourian.com/story/1155552.html>

Tuesday, June 6, 2006

Area UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge, 80, Dies

TJ GREANEY ~ Southeast Missourian

In 1980 he published Project Identification, which took a scientific approach to cataloguing UFO activity.

Dr. Harley Rutledge, 80, former chairman of the physics department at Southeast Missouri State University and UFO expert, died Monday at the Missouri Veterans Home.

Rutledge first joined the physics department at the university in 1963. He was department chairman there from 1964 to 1982. He retired from teaching in 1992.

Rutledge first gained national notoriety through an organization he launched in 1973 called "Project Identification." The project was a response to a flurry of UFO sightings near Piedmont, Mo. Over the next six years, Rutledge and crews of students, scientists and amateur enthusiasts spent 150 nights scanning the skies in Franklin County with cameras, audio recorders, telescopes and tools measuring electromagnetic field disturbances. The efforts were funded in part by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

In 1980 he published a book also called "Project Identification," which took a scientific approach to cataloguing the UFO activity. He tracked the velocity, distance and size of the objects he caught on video and said he was careful not to let his own hypotheses get in the way of the data.

"I don't want to scare anyone and the one way not to do that is by trying to explain these phenomena," said Rutledge in 1979.

"I treat reports of UFOs like bottles of medicine without labels. I can't use the medicine without the label, but I can put it on the shelf until I get a label for it."

In 1989, Rutledge claimed to have seen 164 UFOs during his life. At the end of this research he claimed to have 700 photographs of UFOs either taken by him personally or by associates.

His fame as a passionate investigator of the unexplained led him to be a featured expert on CNN and quoted in a Time-Life book on UFOs and an astrology textbook. He was also a lively interview subject featured on the radio talkshow circuit.

His unfulfilled dream, though, was to come face to face with an extraterrestrial.

"I've seen just about everything there is to see, but I haven't seen one of those little creatures," he said in an interview in 1988.

Dr. Art Soellner, a friend and colleague in the physics department, remembered Rutledge's ability to simplify complex science.

"What I remember most was that he was a very good teacher," said Soellner. "He had a way of working with the students that stood out. I had an office behind his classroom, and he was teaching a physical science general education course, which usually means a lot of students aren't too interested. But he got them involved and I could often hear he got good chuckles out of them."

Soellner also recalled that Rutledge was integral in building up the physics department at the university from a faculty of four when he was first hired to nine when he left.

During the past three years Rutledge had been suffering from Alzheimers. He is survived by his wife, Ruth. They were married for 52 years and have five children.

tgreaney-at-semissourian.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 06:05:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 12:05:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 06:57:09 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>Is anything certain all the time?

Yes. The only certainty is that nothing is certain.

Personally, I see no strong argument for the ET hypothesis. I see very strong arguments for the 'other' hypothesis, and if any certainty be possible, I think saying they are not us is pretty close.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Ancient Rock Art Depicts Exploding Star

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:32:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:32:35 -0400  
Subject: Ancient Rock Art Depicts Exploding Star

Source: Space.Com - New York, New York, USA

[http://space.com/scienceastronomy/060605\\_rock\\_art.html](http://space.com/scienceastronomy/060605_rock_art.html)

05 June 2006

Ancient Rock Art Depicts Exploding Star  
By Ker Than  
Staff Writer

A rock carving discovered in Arizona might depict an ancient star explosion seen by Native Americans a thousand years ago, scientists announced today.

If confirmed, the rock carving, or "petroglyph" would be the only known record in the Americas of the well-known supernova of the year 1006.

The carving was discovered in White Tanks Regional Park just outside Phoenix, in an area believed to have been occupied by a group of Native Americans called the Hohokam from about 500 to 1100 A.D.

The finding is being announced today at the 208th meeting of the American Astronomical Society in Calgary, Canada.

Night light

In the spring of 1006, stargazers in Asia, the Middle East and Europe recorded the birth of a "new star" above the southern horizon of the night sky, in the constellation Lupus, just south of Scorpio [simulation].

Unknown to them, what those ancient astronomers were actually witnessing was the swan song of a star as it blew itself apart in a violent explosion called a supernova.

Although nearly invisible today, the supernova of 1006, or SN 1006, was perhaps the brightest stellar event ever to occur in recorded human history. At its peak, the supernova was about the quarter the brightness of the Moon, so radiant that people could have read by its light at midnight, scientists say.

The Hohokam petroglyph depicts symbols of a scorpion and stars that match a model showing the relative positions of the supernova with respect to the constellation Scorpius. The model was created by John Barentine, an astronomer at the Apache Point Observatory in New Mexico and Gilbert Esquerdo, a research assistant at the Planetary Science Institute in Arizona.

"If confirmed, this discovery supports the idea that ancient Native Americans were aware of changes in the night sky and moved to commemorate them in their cultural record," said Barentine, who studies Southwest archeology as a hobby.

Astronomer by day

Barentine thinks the finding could also help archeologists date other petroglyphs in the Southwest and elsewhere in the world. Dating art made by prehistoric Native Americans has traditionally been difficult because many did not have a written language and shared little in common with the culture and folklore of tribes that came later.

"Quantitative methods such as carbon-14 dating are alternative means to assign ages to works of prehistoric art, but they lack precision of more than a few decades, so any depiction in art that can be fixed to a specific year is extremely valuable," Barentine said.

A similar petroglyph discovered near Penasco Blanco in Chaco Canyon National Monument, New Mexico is also believed to represent a supernova, but one that occurred later, on July 4, 1054.

[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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Burns

From: Chris Burns <[Thurstonoreggae.nul](mailto:Thurstonoreggae.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:20:40 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:34:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Burns

>From: Herb Taylor <[herbufo.nul](mailto:herbufo.nul)>  
>To: [project-1947.nul](mailto:project-1947.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 02:19:28 EDT  
>Subject: Karl Pflock Passes Away

>To All:

>It is my sad duty to report that Karl Pflock passed away at 3:16  
>P.M. Mountain Time on June 5, 2006, at his home in Placitas, New  
>Mexico.

Really sad news. He seemed like a good guy and one of the more  
responsible intelligent researchers.

RIP Karl.

Chris Burns

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Paijmans

From: Theo Paijmans <[th.paijmans.nul](mailto:th.paijmans.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 17:02:21 +0200  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:36:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Paijmans

>From: Herb Taylor <[herbufo.nul](mailto:herbufo.nul)>  
>To: [project-1947.nul](mailto:project-1947.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 02:19:28 EDT  
>Subject: Karl Pflock Passes Away

>To All:

>It is my sad duty to report that Karl Pflock passed away at 3:16  
>P.M. Mountain Time on June 5, 2006, at his home in Placitas, New  
>Mexico.

He will be missed, also in the Netherlands, Europe. My sincere  
sympathy to his family.

Regards,

Theo

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## The Burmarsh Incident

From: **Geoff Richardson** <[geoff.nul](mailto:geoff.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:42:34 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:38:59 -0400  
Subject: The Burmarsh Incident

The Burmarsh Incident is one of the most fascinating cases in UK Ufology, it involves virtually all of the aspects of a 'classic' UFO account. A young lady driving along a country road late at night, a large triangular craft hovering over a village, anonymous phone calls, official denials, M.I.B., threats and phone-tapping.

Who could ask for more?

See:

<http://www.thewhyfiles.net/burmarsh.html>

A precised version the article The Burmarsh UFO Incident by Stuart Miller of UFO Review.

Many thanks to Stuart for allowing this!

Also, thanks to Chris Rolfe and Jerry Anderson for giving permission for this incident to be covered by The WHY? Files.

Geoff Richardson  
[www.thewhyfiles.net](http://www.thewhyfiles.net)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:42:44 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:42:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Allan

>From: Paul Kimball <[TheRobieShark.nul](mailto:TheRobieShark.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 08:48:07 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away

>>From: Herb Taylor <[herbufo.nul](mailto:herbufo.nul)>  
>>To: [project-1947.nul](mailto:project-1947.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 02:19:28 EDT  
>>Subject: Karl Pflock Passes Away

>>To All:

>>It is my sad duty to report that Karl Pflock passed away at  
>>3:16 P.M. Mountain Time on June 5, 2006, at his home in  
>>Placitas, New Mexico.

>This is terrible news, and a great loss for ufology.

>I was happy to call Karl a friend, and appreciated the help and  
>advice he gave me over the past few years. He once joked that I  
>was Anakin to his Darth - at least I think he was joking! :-)

>I first met Karl on September 9th, 2001, in Cedar Rapids, where  
>I was interviewing him and Kevin Randle for the Stanton T.  
>Friedman Is Real documentary - we flew Karl in from New Mexico.

>He offered some pretty pointed criticism of Stan, particularly  
>re. Roswell and MJ-12, but it was without malice; indeed, it was  
>clear that he had a tremendous amount of respect for Stan as a  
>person, even as they disagreed over particulars.

>But, in my experience, and Karl and I had our disagreements,  
that was Karl - a good guy, through and through. It came through  
when I interviewed him, and in our private conversations and  
correspondence over the past four and a half years.

>I'm glad I got the chance to know him.

>I'll miss him. So will ufology.

I fully agree with these sentiments. Karl and I exchanged many  
letters and emails, and he kindly acknowledged my help in his  
Roswell book although my contribution was negligible.

He managed to maintain a sense of humor even while inflicted  
with ALS [ALS, Lou Gehrig's disease] - motor neurone disease  
- and his pungent writings both in 'Saucer Smear' and in  
the book 'Shockingly Close to the Truth' were a joy to read.

A genuine researcher and a top class one too.

CDA

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:59:23 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:44:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 07:20:46 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>There are many other analogous possibilities. Unless we find  
>evidence from Black or Hartmann or elsewhere of explicit,  
>damning, words out of Heflin's own mouth, this will always be an  
>ambiguous area.

Agreed. I made quite a few models when I was a kid, myself, and more than a few of them ended up tossed in the air and photographed, either by some little cheap camera or an 8mm movie camera. Most ended up destroyed by firecrackers, which is why an Invaders saucer (yeah, I had one, too) sells for hundreds of dollars on eBay these days.

Sad will be the day I see and photograph a "genuine" UFO, since my past and my amateur's ability with Photoshop will automatically render whatever I photograph a laughable fake. Even if it's in 3-D. Hopefully, they'll drop me some plans for a warp drive, but that's pretty unlikely.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:47:54 -0400  
Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

I received some response about my comment last week about apparent dodging I found in the high-resolution Trent/McMinnville scans I was playing stereo with, so I thought I'd post this link to clarify what I was talking about:

<http://img392.imageshack.us/img392/5507/mcmindodge3sz.jpg>

One is just a simple brightness/contrast adjustment, the other is a dreaded embossing (what can I say, sometimes it helps). Maybe there's some kind of contrast bleed thing happening I don't understand here. Or hey, maybe it's a force field. I don't know.

Anyway, this is what made me think that perhaps the photo showing the saucer underside (#1) was a contact print of some kind. Or maybe that maybe Trent didn't get the original negatives back from the Men In Black.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 16:27:48 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:48:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Hall

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 06:05:35 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 06:57:09 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>Is anything certain all the time?

>Yes. The only certainty is that nothing is certain.

>Personally, I see no strong argument for the ET hypothesis. I  
>see very strong arguments for the 'other' hypothesis, and if any  
>certainty be possible, I think saying they are not us is pretty  
>close.

>Bob Shell

I see a very strong argument (i.e., body of data suggesting) the ET hypothesis. But it remains only an hypothesis, and of course hypotheses are only suggested answers still in need of thorough investigation and study.

Science as a discipline doesn't deal with certainty in the first place. (I'm not referring here to definitive proofs of a highly specific and relatively insignificant nature, such as the certainty that these words I am typing are real and others will be/are reading them.)

- Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 17:30:11 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:49:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 21:49:40 +0100  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:55:23 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>His name is given as Dr Stephen Black. I wrote the review of the  
>>programme (but I had forgotten about it, as it was a long time  
>>ago). I will post a copy of it (I am waiting for someone to scan  
>>it for me).

>Here it is, from MUF0B Volume 1, Number 3, May-June 1968:

>On May 9th, (1968) BBC Television presented a documentary  
>programme on UFOs narrated by Dr Stephen Black, a researcher in  
>neuro-physiology. For this programme Dr Black chose only UFO  
>witnesses he believed to be sincere.

<snip>

>Rex Heflin revealed that he  
>was a been model maker and Dr Black commented that it was quite  
>possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it.

OK, so pending Dick's viewing of the actual tape it reads here  
as though Heflin himself is saying something about his model  
making, though it's a bit confusing as I don't know what "a been  
model maker" is. Presumably not someone who makes models from,  
or even of, be[al]ns? <g>Should this read "Heflin revealed that  
he was a keen model maker" or "Heflin revealed that he had been a  
[keen?] model maker"?

Either way such a spontaneous (apparently) remark is intriguing,  
especially for being placed in context with Black's apparent  
belief that Heflin was sincere and for the suggestion that  
Heflin was at ease with himself and not defensive.

Black seems (again pending info from the actual tape) to be  
implying here that Heflin could have been unconsciously both the  
perpetrator and victim of a hoax on himself, playing out some  
remarkably complicated kind of self-delusion. I suppose the idea  
is that the infamous "NORAD visitors" etc must also have been  
part of a delusory episode lasting months, years even, in which  
Heflin remained unable to tell the difference between fantasy  
and reality.

This is obviously a much, much bigger claim than the simple (in  
psychiatric terms) theory that Heflin just faked the whole  
thing. I find it very interesting indeed that Dr. Black  
apparently felt the need to suggest such a thing. It indicates  
that his judgment of Heflin's "sincerity" was not a cheap and  
easy judgment but one he was prepared to pay some theoretical  
cost to justify.

Has anyone got an example of a similar kind of behaviour? And

how does this sit with those who knew Heflin, I wonder?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Karl Pflock

From: **Kevin Randle** <[KRandle993.nul](mailto:KRandle993.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:38:32 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:53:45 -0400  
Subject: Karl Pflock

First, let me say that my latest military assignment has been cancelled and I have now returned home. Frankly, I had no real desire to see Afghanistan. However, the situation changed, at least for me, and I am home.

Second, I was sorry to see that Karl Pflock has died. I knew that he was very sick and that the end was near. I had been asked to send him an email because he still liked receiving them, so I filled it with stuff about the Army and the like, expecting no response. Just a note to sort of cheer him up.

Karl and I had clashed a couple of times over Roswell and the UFO experience, but we saw eye-to-eye on many things. I believe he was a good researcher and he aspired to be a good writer as many of us do. Once I got away from the shadow of Don Schmitt, my relationship with Karl became much more cordial. (I found that to be true with a number of other researchers with the exception of Tom Carey).

Karl, I think, had a bit of the flair for the dramatic, which explains to some extent, the Kurt Peters episode. I was never convinced by his explanation for it, but heck, we've all done dumb stuff at younger ages.

I'm reminded too of a trip that he and I took in a limousine in LA nine years ago. We were going to do the Sci Fi Channel's SF Vortex and argue about Roswell and UFOs. Also in the car was Russ Estes and I realized that all three of us had been part of the intelligence community at some point. I wondered then what the conspiracy theorists would make of that... but now, two of those people are gone and given our ages, I wouldn't have expected it quite that quickly.

Karl liked to twist the tail of those in the UFO community, and sometimes we need it. I believe he was honest in most of what he did and said just as most of us are honest... I keep thinking of things to put here... things that many of us hold as self evident truths but that might not be quite as solid as we'd like them to be.

Anyway, I always enjoyed the exchanges with Karl, learned things during them, and kept in touch with him during my service in Iraq. I'm sorry that he was taken from us at this point because I think he could have added something to our research.

Kevin D. Randle

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:55:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Tim

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>It takes a substantial manufacturing effort to produce such high  
>performance vehicles often observed both visually and by radar  
>and various cameras. If they were manufactured on Earth, they  
>would play a role in the military activities of the planet. They  
>certainly don't seem to. They were therefore made somewhere else  
>and are by definition of ET origin.

<snip>

>I can find no reason to say that objects that look like that and  
>act like that originate on Earth.

Not to barge in here, but I just wanted to comment that reaching a conclusion that the things, flying saucers or whatever, are ET based on the above, is simply not logical.

True, it would appear that manufacturing these things would be costly and technically challenging. But there are literally uncounted billions of dollars thrown into military research programs every year. Plenty to do the job.

As for them not being used in wars, there are a lot of experimental craft developed that are never used in active conflicts for one reason or another. They're too expensive, or the technology is too unstable or dangerous - we're still not keen about sending nuclear-powered stuff into combat.

And I can think of several positive reasons to believe the things are manufactured on Earth. They are apparently made of the same materials and elements found on Earth. If someone has some Element 115 at home in their sock drawer, I'm sure we'd all like to see it. They are usually proportioned to accommodate human-sized creatures. Even if they exist in some kind of quasi-realistic, transdimensional state, they apparently exist enough within our own reality and limits of physical perception that we can see them, occasionally take pictures of them, and find dents in the ground or burned plants where they've been.

A saucer shape isn't particularly aerodynamically stable, but a parabolic reflector created by the inside curve of a saucer is a pretty good way to focus EM energy. And maybe that's why the saucer is usually "upside-down," with the focal point pointed toward the ground.

But regardless of the various reasons why these odd things might or might not originate on Earth, they still can't be attributed to ETs because we have no single, solitary bit of incontrovertible evidence that intelligent life (or life of any kind, for that matter) exists anywhere but here on Earth. That fact alone is a pretty good reason to think these things originate here.

So the most we can logically say is that we just don't know where these come from. We just don't know. Sure, they might be

ET craft. If ET exist. Which there's no definitive proof they do, any more (and maybe even less) than leprechauns.

On the other hand, I think most of us would agree that we exist. So unless you're privy to some Ultra-Majic Tip-Top Secret info that aliens are really real, given to you by some shiny-shouldered military type who threatened you with death if you spill the beans, I think it's better to speculate starting from a point we all agree is a fact.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:06:16 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:56:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 21:49:40 +0100  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:55:23 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>His name is given as Dr Stephen Black. I wrote the review of the  
>>programme (but I had forgotten about it, as it was a long time  
>>ago). I will post a copy of it (I am waiting for someone to scan  
>>it for me).

>Here it is, from MUF0B Volume 1, Number 3, May-June 1968:

>On May 9th, (1968) BBC Television presented a documentary  
>programme on UFOs narrated by Dr Stephen Black, a researcher in  
>neuro-physiology. For this programme Dr Black chose only UFO  
>witnesses he believed to be sincere.

>He soon revealed the peculiar subjective aspects of UFO  
>sightings. First was Captain Howard concerning the famous  
>sighting made by himself, his crew and passengers from a BOAC  
>airliner on June 29th 1954. When Howard had told his story, Dr  
>Black asked him how he felt at the time. Howard said that he  
>felt "kindly disposed towards them," He said he discussed it  
>with other members of his crew afterwards and they agreed that  
>they felt "some sort of bond of affection between us and  
>'them'." Captain Howard described it as a "very strange and  
>powerful feeling."

>Another fascinating interview was with Lonnie Zamora of Socorro,  
>followed by a conversation between Dr Black and Dr Hynek. Both  
>agreed that Zamora saw what he said he saw, Dr Hynek said that  
>it was one of the most interesting cases he had come across.

>There followed an interview with Joe Simonton (the Eagle River  
>case) who claimed to have received four pancakes from spacemen  
>in a flying saucer in exchange for a jug of water. Dr Black said  
>that Simonton was "not lying,"

>Then we were shown engineer Brian Winder lecturing to a joint  
>meeting of the British Interplanetary Society and Royal  
>Aeronautical Society, at Bristol, on the subject of his flying  
>saucer model based on an atomic power source. The camera, also  
>showed us his audience, some listening attentively, others  
>smirking.

>We were shown Dr William Hartman, an astronomer who is  
>responsible for the investigation of all photographic evidence  
>for the Condon Committee, attempting to duplicate the famous  
>Heflin photographs. Hartman pointed out the difficulty of  
>obtaining acceptable photographic evidence, if any particular  
>photograph could be duplicated by faking, then this weakened the  
>arguments in favour of the genuineness of that photograph. He  
>compared the situation to the assassination of President  
>Kennedy, for which event there were many eyewitnesses,

>photographs and physical evidence, such as bullets. In spite of  
>all this people still argue as to exactly what happened, and who  
>really fired the shots and a number of books have been written  
>expounding contradictory theories. Rex Heflin revealed that he  
>was a been model maker and Dr Black commented that it was quite  
>possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it.

>The most significant part of the programme was the discussion of  
>the Betty and Barney Hill "abduction" story Dr Benjamin Simon,  
>the Boston psychiatrist who examined the Hills said that he was  
>at first very puzzled by the story, Both gave the same story  
>under hypnosis and Betty described the alleged abduction in  
>great detail. Dr Simon was baffled until he recognised the  
>dreamlike quality of the story. In dreams such things can exist,  
>be acceptable and not require a diagnose of mental disorder.  
>This led him to recall that Betty's original problem had been  
>nightmarish dreams. It turned out that these dreams and the  
>dreams which she had written down in 1961 (just after their UFO  
>experience) were all the same. Dr Simon felt pretty convinced  
>that the abduction part of the story, at least, was merely a  
>dream.

>Betty denied telling these dreams to Barney and Barney denied  
>being told about them. However, Betty admitted telling the  
>dreams to her supervisor and her sister and it finally emerged  
>that Barney had been at home at the time she was talking about  
>the dreams so that he could have absorbed some of the details  
>without realising it. A suggestion by Betty's supervisor that  
>they might not be dreams but reality led to the complete  
>repression of the whole thing, leading to the gap in memory. Dr  
>Simon said, in answer to a question from Dr Black, that both of  
>the Hills were deep trance hypnotic subjects.

>Summing up, Dr Black said that a lot of apparent movement of  
>lights in the sky might be due to a well-known mechanism in the  
>brain which makes a flickering light in a darkened room appear  
>to move. The eyeballs remain still; movement is "all in the  
>mind". Some scientists believe the rate of flicker to be  
>critical and this rate has to be the same as an important brain-  
>wave rhythm about 10 times a second. Stars sometimes twinkle at  
>the rate of 10 times a second, and the Hills' experience began  
>with their attention being drawn to what appeared to be a star.  
>However, stars never seem to move as much as UFOs are said to  
>move.

>Barney Hill had said that he did not believe in flying saucers,  
>but Betty did, so to some extent suggestion was going on in  
>their home, Both Hill's are deep hypnotic subjects, and such  
>people are only 5% of the general population. Dr Black said that  
>he wished to test as many convincing UFO witnesses as possible  
>for hypnotisability This was somewhat difficult to arrange, but  
>only six deep-trance witnesses in a row would be necessary to  
>prove statistically a connection. So far he had had five such  
>subjects and the odds against this being due to chance were 3  
>million to one against. Dr Hynek agreed that this discovery was  
>very interesting and required following up.

>He said that deep trance subjects, so far as we know, do not  
>hallucinate spontaneously. They need a hypnotist to suggest at  
>least the beginnings of the delusion. He then asked "Could a  
>flickering light, the way people react in groups and hypnosis  
>all combine to explain UFOs?" He concluded that perhaps some,  
>though certainly not all sightings could be explained in this  
>way. the Captain Howard sighting could not be explained as a  
>delusion as such an explanation in this case would surely  
>involve telepathy!

>John Rimmer

Having just reviewed the tape, I confirm that this is a fair and  
reasonable summary of the program (except perhaps for some value  
judgments).

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

### The Black, Hartmann & Heflin Video

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:34:37 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 16:05:04 -0400  
Subject: The Black, Hartmann & Heflin Video

I have now reviewed the tape and can clarify the situation.

First, by way of background, I don't recall where this tape came from; probably from BBC to someone at NICAP (several NICAP people were involved in the program). It does not appear to be an as-aired version, but then I am not familiar with BBC-TV style of that period. The title, Flying Saucers & The People Who See Them, appears across the top of the frames. And this is one of those videotapes where a counter is visible at the bottom. constantly counting away the time.

Early on, a sub-title appears on the screen: Flying Saucers: An Investigation by Dr. Stephen Black, who serves as narrator and states that the only witnesses who appear in the film are those whom he judged to be sincere. Rather late in the program he interviews Hartmann in a van at the scene of the sighting, in the process of stringing a tiny model in front of the windshield and then photographing it from within using a Polaroid camera (presumably of the same camera model that Heflin used). Then Hartmann shows the result and they compare it to the comparable original photo as an (allegedly) very similar picture.

No other witnesses or interviewees appear in those scenes, and you can't tell from this whether Heflin was present when it was being done. However, he is interviewed next obviously at the same location and approximate time. It is a good and fairly long interview. Black asks Heflin how he feels about having scientific investigators critically examining his photos. He says that he has no problem with it at all, and fully understands it; he is an investigator himself for the county. He understands the need to check for possible fakery.

Next Black asks him if he has ever built models. Heflin very quickly and forthrightly responds, "Oh, yes. I started when I was about 10 years old." Then words to the effect that it was great fun and he wishes he still had time for it but he was far too busy to do that sort of thing anymore. His demeanor throughout the interview, which I watched very carefully more than once, was not ironic or joking at all. He was being totally candid.

Editorial comment: I doubt seriously that someone who faked the photos with a model would have responded to the question in that way. Further, Black stated explicitly that he only included witnesses whom he deemed to be sincere. Yet, Black indulged in a lot of implicit psychoanalyzing of many witnesses, and in this case even raised the question of whether someone could fake a photo with a model and forget that he had done so! That I found quite amusing.

Despite some poor quality film footage, irrelevant paddings that all producers seem to engage in, and Black's obvious skeptical bias, I think overall that he and BBC did a very good job. Some of the segments are priceless, including rare and unusual film footage of important people and witnesses.

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:55:29 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 15:46:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 20:56:55 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 20:33:19 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>>>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>>>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

>>>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>>>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>>>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

>>I've spent a lot of time re-examining Trindade critically, and  
>>by "Trindade" one obviously means the historical corpus of  
>>accounts and evidence and interpretations from people of all  
>>shades of opinion that constitute the half-century long "case  
>>file". I've found quite a bit of nonsense and illogic in there  
>>which I certainly would not defend at any cost. Some of it has  
>>been yours.

>I'd be interested to know which parts of the nonsense about  
>Trindade were mine.

John

Sadly this faux-innocent strategem just adds to the nonsense.  
Anyone else who needs reminding what "sense" means to John, and  
has the stomach for it, can recap his most recent "critical  
assault" on Trindade:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m05-009.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m08-010.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m09-006.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m10-013.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m12-003.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m16-001.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m16-012.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m17-007.shtml>

>>I have never called anyone a pelicanist. Far from not tolerating  
>>discussion I have actively sought it with a number of well-known  
>>doubtters and tried to engage in debate about various unresolved  
>>aspects of the case. Some - for example Tim Printy, Martin  
>>Powell and especially Kentaro Mori - were open to useful  
>>exchanges of ideas, information and constructive criticism. I'm  
>>afraid I can't say the same for John Harney. And if you want to  
>>claim that I've ever shrunk from "challenging" your own  
>>"critical assault" then you're going to have to go back and

>>refresh your memory from the archive.

>As you have never called anyone a 'pelicanist' it is clear that  
>you were not one of the people I was referring to. I have also  
>never suggested that you do not tolerate discussion. I'm not  
>quite sure why you thought my generalised comments were a  
>personal attack,

I thought no such thing, in fact quite the opposite. Your  
"generalised comments" clearly had nothing at all to do with me  
or with anyone else who has been keen to engage in reasoned  
debate about this case, and that's what I was determined not to  
let you get away with. You said, "they regard any attempt to re-  
examine [cases like Trindade] critically as a form of heresy."  
If you meant "they" to refer only to a specific subset of  
ufologists, then you should have aimed specific remarks to that  
subset and been careful not to not make scatter-gun  
generalisations about ufologists in general.

>>It's true that some "believers" in Trindade also proved  
>>uncooperative, truculent, even abusive. You're right that for  
>>some people the idea of questioning a case like this is a sort  
>>of sacrilege. I've had the same thing over Santa Ana just  
>>recently from correspondents accusing me of being a traitorous  
>>debunker for even thinking about it on-List! Really.

>So you do agree with me after all!

This is like someone getting the wrong answer to a math problem  
then arguing that because they'd got one of the factors right  
they must really have got the right answer after all.

>>But on  
>>the other side, it appears to me that your complaint about this  
>>inviolable "canon of ufology" is a kind of projection of your  
>>own fixations, as though there is a syndrome of compulsive  
>>denial that is a mirror of these others' compulsive belief. All  
>>of you seem engaged in some conflicted folie a deux and perhaps  
>>need each other.

>I do not think there is an 'inviolable canon of ufology',

Of course you do! You just told us so: "Cases such as  
McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the canon of ufology  
and must be defended at all costs, and beyond logic . . ."

>but  
>there seem to be many people, some of whom are contributors to  
>this list, who are unwilling to debate cases openly (you  
>describe such a situation above) and who seem to have the  
>attitude that any form of critical analysis of a well-known UFO  
>case is a personal affront.

Yes there are such unreasonable people, who as you put it will  
entertain no change of mind "no matter how often the  
metaphorical 'fishing line' has been revealed". For some people  
believing in a UFO case seems to be a settled life-decision,  
like choosing a church or deciding a political affiliation - you  
by god make your choice and stick to it because so much of the  
network of social and emotional support on which you rely and so  
much of your self-image is bound up with that commitment. But  
nature delights in symmetries, and I suspect analogous forces  
working on another group with oppositely charged opinions who (I  
would bet substantially) will never change their minds about a  
case like Trindade no matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing  
line' is proven to be a scratch on the emulsion.

I don't have any affiliation, I am neither a Magonian nor a  
Mufonian, neither a member of any Sceptics Club (though I might  
be tempted by that if there were one worthy of the name,  
especially if it met in a pub) nor a bug-eyed frequenter of UFO  
conferences. Hmmm, maybe I should get out more - sounds like fun  
at both ends of town!

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:34:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>It takes a substantial manufacturing effort to produce such high  
>>performance vehicles often observed both visually and by radar  
>>and various cameras. If they were manufactured on Earth, they  
>>would play a role in the military activities of the planet. They  
>>certainly don't seem to. They were therefore made somewhere else  
>>and are by definition of ET origin.

><snip>

>>I can find no reason to say that objects that look like that and  
>>act like that originate on Earth.

>Not to barge in here, but I just wanted to comment that  
>reaching a conclusion that the things, flying saucers  
>or whatever, >are ET based on the above, is simply not logical.

I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
origin.

Why is that a problem? I said nothing about knowing where they  
come from or how they operate or why they are here and don't  
talk to the SETI cultists or me. Yes, I think some originated at  
some point from a planet around Zeta 1 or Zeta 2 Reticuli. But  
that is beside the point. Behaviour that we cannot duplicate  
such as passing through walls, disappearing in an instant,  
making right angle turns at very high speed in silence etc etc.  
means they weren't made here. Are you really suggesting that any  
group on this planet would be able to land, abduct, cavort all  
over the planet and yet not be involved in military activities?  
That they could create beings not like us? I can't find the  
logic. This is not even good science fiction and no evidence has  
been put forth to support this.

I can safely say that the car across the street in front of my  
house is not mine. That doesn't mean I know whose it is or where  
it came from..

>True, it would appear that manufacturing these things would be  
>costly and technically challenging. But there are literally  
>uncounted billions of dollars thrown into military research  
>programs every year. Plenty to do the job.

"Technically challenging" is the understatement of the year. I  
have long said secrets can be kept and have given examples, in  
other words, provided evidence . You have provided none, nil,

zilch, nada. Remember worldwide observations. Huge flying motherships able to carry dozens of small vehicles... as I have said I am not into science fiction. Of course there is a huge black budget.. B 2 bombers cost over a billion each but can't match the capability.

And they would risk being operated all over the planet? And they would be crewed by strange beings? But not used in Korea, or Vietnam, or the Gulf War, or in Iraq???

>As for them not being used in wars, there are a lot of  
>experimental craft developed that are never used in active  
>conflicts for one reason or another. They're too expensive, or  
>the technology is too unstable or dangerous - we're still not  
>keen about sending nuclear-powered stuff into combat.

>And I can think of several positive reasons to believe the  
>things are manufactured on Earth. They are apparently made of  
>the same materials and elements found on Earth. If someone has  
>some Element 115 at home in their sock drawer, I'm sure we'd all  
>like to see it. They are usually proportioned to accommodate  
>human-sized creatures. Even if they exist in some kind of quasi-  
>realistic, transdimensional state, they apparently exist enough  
>within our own reality and limits of physical perception that we  
>can see them, occasionally take pictures of them, and find dents  
>in the ground or burned plants where they've been.

What makes you say they are made from the same materials found on Earth? Same elements maybe. But there are, for example, many materials presently made on earth that couldn't have been made 50 years ago. Ask Intel . Do you have some such material from a flying saucer? Have you seen analysis thereof ? The Roswell witnesses indicate materials with extraordinary light weight, high strength, great resistance to being cut, burned... Are these more of the hypothetical, theoretical ,science fiction devices of which you are speaking?

>A saucer shape isn't particularly aerodynamically stable, but a  
>parabolic reflector created by the inside curve of a saucer is a  
>pretty good way to focus EM energy. And maybe that's why the  
>saucer is usually "upside-down," with the focal point pointed  
>toward the ground.

Are you talking of a saucer shaped craft powered by a jet engine or propeller driven engine? It seems to me the witness descriptions do indicate stability, but don't indicate jets or props and usually no noise. Have you run stability tests on a saucer? There are many reports of flatbottomed craft.

>But regardless of the various reasons why these odd things might  
>or might not originate on Earth, they still can't be attributed  
>to ETs because we have no single, solitary bit of  
>incontrovertible evidence that intelligent life (or life of any  
>kind, for that matter) exists anywhere but here on Earth. That  
>fact alone is a pretty good reason to think these things  
>originate here.

Here we go again with absence of evidence is evidence of absence. I don't have an alien driving license or license plate. True but irrelevant . Visits by strange beings in strange craft provide many solid reasons for saying the craft originate some place else. Deduction is still a very important part of the scientific method.

>So the most we can logically say is that we just don't know  
>where these come from. We just don't know. Sure, they might  
>be ET craft. If ET exist. Which there's no definitive proof they  
>do, any more (and maybe even less) than leprechauns.

Their presence is the proof. We know they aren't from here so they are of ET origin. that is the logic.

>On the other hand, I think most of us would agree that we exist.  
>So unless you're privy to some Ultra-Majic Tip-Top Secret info  
>that aliens are really real, given to you by some shiny-  
>shouldered military type who threatened you with death if you  
>spill the beans, I think it's better to speculate starting from  
>a point we all agree is a fact.

Yes, the fact is the observations indicate beings and craft not from here, therefore from off the earth, which by definition



means ET.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White

From: Eleanor White [eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:29:56 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 19:13:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>A saucer shape isn't particularly aerodynamically stable, but a  
>parabolic reflector created by the inside curve of a saucer is a  
>pretty good way to focus EM energy. And maybe that's why the  
>saucer is usually "upside-down," with the focal point pointed  
>toward the ground.

Just daydreaming here... I'm thinking back to the claims of  
(later) professor Charles Hall, who as a young man worked as a  
USAF weather observer at Nellis AFB, Nevada. Charles Hall claims  
"tall white" aliens, roughly our height and not that different  
in appearance, have a sort of "way station" base on the  
restricted area north of Indian Springs AFB. They use it, he  
says, just as American armed forces sometimes use bases in  
friendly countries. I.e. simply as a stop-off point for  
maintenance.

He claimed to have considerable interaction with these aliens,  
which was in fact unavoidable because these aliens wandered  
around the desert and were curious about Charles Hall's  
activities.

One thing that caught my attention during an interview was that  
Charles Hall claimed he got just a hint of the anti-gravity  
drive on their craft, saying that he was told they circulate  
"subatomic particles" through circular tubing to generate  
thrust. No further details were revealed to him.

I guess trying that out awaits our (humanity's) ability to cause  
subatomic particles to remain stable and in existence at least  
long enough to make the circuit inside some sort of tubing  
within a craft.

One thing I've wondered about is that I imagine if one could  
physically move charged particles in a rotary path, say along  
the rim of a 30-foot 'saucer', whether that could create an as  
yet not demonstrated but huge magnetic field? The idea is that  
current (i.e. electrons jumping from atom to atom) in a wire are  
moving very slowly. I saw a calculation in university (back in  
'63) however I don't remember what the speed range was in wire,  
but it was surprisingly slow.

Changes in current are propagated at the speed of light, but  
the electrons' actual motion in wire is slow for workaday  
current levels. (The calculation took into account normal  
current in a wire, and the quantity of charge necessary to pass  
a point on the wire, against the cross sectional area of the  
wire.)

I wondered what would happen if a batch of charged particles  
were confined to a sector of a disk, and the disk was spun at,  
say, hundreds of rpm. I wondered if by radically increasing the  
speed over that in a wire, and these charged particles move in a

circle, if that wouldn't be like a huge current, effectively, in a circular path, which should cause a huge magnetic field? (Maybe huge enough to fly with?)

No iron core, just lumps of charge around the edge of a spinning disk.

Next, the Wimshurst machine came to mind - which is a pair of counter-rotating glass/plastic disks with metal sectors glued on.

If brushes supplied high voltage DC to the segments, one side of negative polarity, and the other side positive, and the charges were not able to leak off the segments as the disks spin in opposite directions, would not both disks create a magnetic field in the same direction, as their net charges are opposite?

Next, how about a piece of round section tubing, with a baffle passing through the diameter perpendicular to the radius and to the plane of the circle, creating two separate channels. Say two pumps were pumping ion-rich fluid around a circular path, one half-tube carrying positive-ion-rich fluid, the other carrying negative-ion-rich fluid, fluids circulating in opposite directions?

High voltage DC could be applied to the two counter-rotating fluid streams, perhaps by a wire running through each tubing half, again causing each half to maintain its ionized state. Would this setup create a huge magnetic field as a result of the effective current?

So, when I heard Charles Hall mention circulating subatomic particles to create thrust, it rang a bell.

Does Stan Friedman or others know if anything like these experiments have been tried?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White

From: Eleanor White [eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:29:56 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 19:14:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>A saucer shape isn't particularly aerodynamically stable, but a  
>parabolic reflector created by the inside curve of a saucer is a  
>pretty good way to focus EM energy. And maybe that's why the  
>saucer is usually "upside-down," with the focal point pointed  
>toward the ground.

Just daydreaming here... I'm thinking back to the claims of  
(later) professor Charles Hall, who as a young man worked as a  
USAF weather observer at Nellis AFB, Nevada. Charles Hall claims  
"tall white" aliens, roughly our height and not that different  
in appearance, have a sort of "way station" base on the  
restricted area north of Indian Springs AFB. They use it, he  
says, just as American armed forces sometimes use bases in  
friendly countries. I.e. simply as a stop-off point for  
maintenance.

He claimed to have considerable interaction with these aliens,  
which was in fact unavoidable because these aliens wandered  
around the desert and were curious about Charles Hall's  
activities.

One thing that caught my attention during an interview was that  
Charles Hall claimed he got just a hint of the anti-gravity  
drive on their craft, saying that he was told they circulate  
"subatomic particles" through circular tubing to generate  
thrust. No further details were revealed to him.

I guess trying that out awaits our (humanity's) ability to cause  
subatomic particles to remain stable and in existence at least  
long enough to make the circuit inside some sort of tubing  
within a craft.

One thing I've wondered about is that I imagine if one could  
physically move charged particles in a rotary path, say along  
the rim of a 30-foot 'saucer', whether that could create an as  
yet not demonstrated but huge magnetic field? The idea is that  
current (i.e. electrons jumping from atom to atom) in a wire are  
moving very slowly. I saw a calculation in university (back in  
'63) however I don't remember what the speed range was in wire,  
but it was surprisingly slow.

Changes in current are propagated at the speed of light, but  
the electrons' actual motion in wire is slow for workaday  
current levels. (The calculation took into account normal  
current in a wire, and the quantity of charge necessary to pass  
a point on the wire, against the cross sectional area of the  
wire.)

I wondered what would happen if a batch of charged particles  
were confined to a sector of a disk, and the disk was spun at,  
say, hundreds of rpm. I wondered if by radically increasing the  
speed over that in a wire, and these charged particles move in a

circle, if that wouldn't be like a huge current, effectively, in a circular path, which should cause a huge magnetic field? (Maybe huge enough to fly with?)

No iron core, just lumps of charge around the edge of a spinning disk.

Next, the Wimshurst machine came to mind - which is a pair of counter-rotating glass/plastic disks with metal sectors glued on.

If brushes supplied high voltage DC to the segments, one side of negative polarity, and the other side positive, and the charges were not able to leak off the segments as the disks spin in opposite directions, would not both disks create a magnetic field in the same direction, as their net charges are opposite?

Next, how about a piece of round section tubing, with a baffle passing through the diameter perpendicular to the radius and to the plane of the circle, creating two separate channels. Say two pumps were pumping ion-rich fluid around a circular path, one half-tube carrying positive-ion-rich fluid, the other carrying negative-ion-rich fluid, fluids circulating in opposite directions?

High voltage DC could be applied to the two counter-rotating fluid streams, perhaps by a wire running through each tubing half, again causing each half to maintain its ionized state. Would this setup create a huge magnetic field as a result of the effective current?

So, when I heard Charles Hall mention circulating subatomic particles to create thrust, it rang a bell.

Does Stan Friedman or others know if anything like these experiments have been tried?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - White

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:33:42 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 19:18:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - White

>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

<snip>

>One of the long forgotten men of Ufology, Matthew Williams is  
>still alive and well and living down in Devizes. These days a  
>much overlooked figure, he was the man who busted the crop  
>circle myth wide open, made one or two researchers look a little  
>stupid in the process, and who's evidence has been ignored ever  
>since.

"... busted the crop circle myth wide open ..." ?

I'd like to see Mr. Williams re-do the Crabwood glyph in a single  
night, with or without a GPS unit.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 23:45:08 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 19:20:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:06:16 +0000  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 21:49:40 +0100  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>>Rex Heflin revealed that he  
>>was a been model maker and Dr Black commented that it was quite  
>>possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it.

Sorry about that - it was a result of scanning the text from the  
faded, stencil duplicated, typewritten pages of a prehistoric  
copy of MUFOB. The word is 'keen'.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 23:41:03 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 19:45:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Rimmer

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:55:29 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 20:56:55 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 20:33:19 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 19:42:57 +0100  
>>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>>Cases such as McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the  
>>>>canon of ufology and must be defended at all costs, and beyond  
>>>>logic, from the pecking of the pelicanists.

>>>>Of course, the best way to challenge any critical assault on one  
>>>>of these cases is simply to call the person making the criticism  
>>>>a pelicanist. No further discussion is needed or tolerated.

>>>>I've spent a lot of time re-examining Trindade critically, and  
>>>>by "Trindade" one obviously means the historical corpus of  
>>>>accounts and evidence and interpretations from people of all  
>>>>shades of opinion that constitute the half-century long "case  
>>>>file". I've found quite a bit of nonsense and illogic in there  
>>>>which I certainly would not defend at any cost. Some of it has  
>>>>been yours.

>>I'd be interested to know which parts of the nonsense about  
>>Trindade were mine.

>John

>Sadly this faux-innocent strategem just adds to the nonsense.  
>Anyone else who needs reminding what "sense" means to John, and  
>has the stomach for it, can recap his most recent "critical  
>assault" on Trindade:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m05-009.shtml>  
><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m08-010.shtml>  
><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m09-006.shtml>  
><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m10-013.shtml>  
><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m12-003.shtml>  
><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m16-001.shtml>  
><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m16-012.shtml>  
><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m17-007.shtml>

I have taken the trouble to look at these links. They are relating to my questions about radically different versions of Barauna's testimony as reported by two different researchers. I can see nothing 'nonsensical' about them, others, however, may



have keener eyesight.

>>>I have never called anyone a pelicanist. Far from not tolerating  
>>>discussion I have actively sought it with a number of well-known  
>>>doubtters and tried to engage in debate about various unresolved  
>>>aspects of the case. Some - for example Tim Printy, Martin  
>>>Powell and especially Kentaro Mori - were open to useful  
>>>exchanges of ideas, information and constructive criticism. I'm  
>>>afraid I can't say the same for John Harney. And if you want to  
>>>claim that I've ever shrunk from "challenging" your own  
>>>"critical assault" then you're going to have to go back and  
>>>refresh your memory from the archive.

>>As you have never called anyone a 'pelicanist' it is clear that  
>>you were not one of the people I was referring to. I have also  
>>never suggested that you do not tolerate discussion. I'm not  
>>quite sure why you thought my generalised comments were a  
>>personal attack,

>I thought no such thing, in fact quite the opposite.

Your reaction seemed to suggest otherwise, why else would you suggest that I claimed you had shrunk from challenging me?

>Your  
>"generalised comments" clearly had nothing at all to do with me  
>or with anyone else who has been keen to engage in reasoned  
>debate about this case, and that's what I was determined not to  
>let you get away with.

What am I supposed to be 'getting away with'?

>You said, "they regard any attempt to re-  
>examine [cases like Trindade] critically as a form of heresy."  
>If you meant "they" to refer only to a specific subset of  
>ufologists, then you should have aimed specific remarks to that  
>subset and been careful not to not make scatter-gun  
>generalisations about ufologists in general.

From the context of my post I'd have thought it was clear that I was addressing those ufologists who, rather than debate, simply shout 'pelicanist'. I repeat, as you are self-evidently not one of those ufologists the remarks cannot have applied to you, and I'm puzzled why you're getting quite so aerated about them.

>>>It's true that some "believers" in Trindade also proved  
>>>uncooperative, truculent, even abusive. You're right that for  
>>>some people the idea of questioning a case like this is a sort  
>>>of sacrilege. I've had the same thing over Santa Ana just  
>>>recently from correspondents accusing me of being a traitorous  
>>>debunker for even thinking about it on-List! Really.

>>So you do agree with me after all!

>This is like someone getting the wrong answer to a math problem  
>then arguing that because they'd got one of the factors right  
>they must really have got the right answer after all.

I say that some ufologists are unwilling to indulge in reasonable debate about cases which they regard as inviolable, and resort to abuse and name calling.

You say that some ufologists when talking about Trindade and other cases are truculent and abusive and regard questioning the case as 'sacrilegious'. That looks like a fair degree of agreement to me.

>>>But on  
>>>the other side, it appears to me that your complaint about this  
>>>inviolable "canon of ufology" is a kind of projection of your  
>>>own fixations, as though there is a syndrome of compulsive  
>>>denial that is a mirror of these others' compulsive belief. All  
>>>of you seem engaged in some conflicted folie a deux and perhaps  
>>>need each other.

>>I do not think there is an 'inviolable canon of ufology',

>Of course you do! You just told us so: "Cases such as  
>McMinville, Trindade, etc, are now part of the canon of ufology  
>and must be defended at all costs, and beyond logic..."

I think you are now adopting a 'faux-naive' stratagem. How can you possibly think that that sentence implies that I believe in a 'canon of ufology', when I am clearly describing the attitude of those ufologists I am criticising, or do you really think that I would describe my own position as 'beyond logic'?

>>but  
>>there seem to be many people, some of whom are contributors to  
>>this list, who are unwilling to debate cases openly (you  
>>describe such a situation above) and who seem to have the  
>>attitude that any form of critical analysis of a well-known UFO  
>>case is a personal affront.

>Yes there are such unreasonable people, who as you put it will  
>entertain no change of mind "no matter how often the  
>metaphorical 'fishing line' has been revealed". For some people  
>believing in a UFO case seems to be a settled life-decision,  
>like choosing a church or deciding a political affiliation - you  
>by god make your choice and stick to it because so much of the  
>network of social and emotional support on which you rely and so  
>much of your self-image is bound up with that commitment.

I could not have put it better myself. I really don't see why we are arguing.

>But  
>nature delights in symmetries, and I suspect analogous forces  
>working on another group with oppositely charged opinions who (I  
>would bet substantially) will never change their minds about a  
>case like Trindade no matter how often the metaphorical 'fishing  
>line' is proven to be a scratch on the emulsion.

This may be the case. However, I have said on a number of occasions that all it will take for me to change my mind on Trindade is for someone to discover a contemporary report of the incident, confirming Barauna's account, by an eyewitness who was not one of Barauna's diving buddies.

>I don't have any affiliation, I am neither a Magonian nor a  
>Mufonian, neither a member of any Sceptics Club (though I might  
>be tempted by that if there were one worthy of the name,  
>especially if it met in a pub)

There is a Sceptics in the Pub group which meets regularly near London Bridge Station. The problem is that everyone seems to have their own definition of a sceptic.

>nor a bug-eyed frequenter of UFO  
>conferences. Hmmm, maybe I should get out more - sounds like fun  
>at both ends of town!

Depends what sort of conferences you go to. The forthcoming LAPIS conference in Blackpool will, I am sure, be totally non-bug-eyed:

[www.lapis.org.uk](http://www.lapis.org.uk)

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Another Tactical Blunder For Bush?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:11:19 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:11:19 -0400  
Subject: Another Tactical Blunder For Bush?

Source: Florida Today - Melbourne, Florida, USA

<http://www.flatoday.com/blogs/billyblog/>

June 06, 2006

The Billy Blog

Billy Cox takes on cyberspace, sharing his views on Brevard County, the world and beyond.

Another Tactical Blunder For Bush?

In 2001, a flawed but intriguing book called *The Hunt For Zero Point* took a peek at America's longstanding efforts to harness antigravity propulsion. No shortage of material on that subject, but British author Nick Cook's credentials are impressive. Cook is the award-winning aviation editor for *Jane's Defence Weekly*, one of the world's top military-industry magazines.

Cook was mystified over what happened to the antigravity research conducted by Martin Aircraft, Bell Aircraft, avionics designer Bill Lear, General Electric, and Sperry-Rand -- among others -- after 1956. That's when subsequent progress reports in the public domain went completely black. Cook's 10-year investigation unearthed, among other things, disturbing patterns of research scientists being bullied and intimidated into silence by authorities; however, Cook couldn't nail down proof of the hardware.

The reason this matters today -- aside from the obvious fact that whomever controls renewable free energy rules the frickin' world -- is that the Bush administration is on the brink of making yet another tactical blunder.

The Justice Department wants to extradite a 40-year-old, confessed British hacker named Gary McKinnon to the United States for breaking into and damaging NASA and military computer systems. Among other things, he allegedly deleted 1,300 user files in seven states and wreaked \$1 million worth of havoc. Federal prosecutor Paul McNulty calls McKinnon "the biggest military computer hacker of all time."

But here's the twist:

McKinnon, who scoured American databases in 2001-02, claims he was looking for classified information on antigravity and UFO technology. Based on his disclosures in recent media interviews, the guy didn't get far. Most of what he discovered has been in the public arena for years.

Last month, British courts cleared the way for extradition to the U.S., where McKinnon could face more than 50 years in prison if convicted. A secret "enemy combatant"-like trial probably won't work in this case, because McKinnon is something of an

underground cause celebre in the UK, and you can check out the buzz at <http://freegary.org.uk/>.

In 1996, another British citizen named Matthew Bevan found himself in a similar jam. Then a teenaged computer geek, Bevan got busted for trying to extract classified UFO data from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base files. The Justice Department wanted to extradite Bevan to the States, but he was acquitted in England, where continued pursuit through the courts was ruled "not in the public interest."

Bevan told the BBC last month that America was hot for McKinnon because, despite who-knows-how-much-\$\$\$ the Yanks invested in beefed-up computer security since his own escapade, "It just shows that in 10 years, nothing has changed."

Glandular and punitive responses are hallmarks of the current administration, but this is a fight officialdom isn't smart enough (yet) to realize it doesn't want.

Ten years after the Bevan affair, the Brits are our most reliable partners in the "war on terror." Give McKinnon his day in the UK courts and let it go; they're capable. Otherwise, a sharp American defense lawyer could turn it around and put the classification of our antigravity assets on trial -- definitely not a discussion this most secretive presidency wants to conduct in the light. After all, dark-project technology research conducted without accountability for 50 years could be misinterpreted for taxation without representation.

[Thanks to 'The Norm' 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:20:48 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:18:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:14:45 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>I suggested some time ago that if you rescale the distant  
>>>landscapes, which means reducing #3 by about 6% in relation to  
>>>#2, the UFO in #3 (flange diameter estimated by reference to  
>>>proportionality of #1) still appears to be about 7% larger  
>>>than in #2. On the face of it this seems inconsistent with the  
>>>sequence as reported. It could be consistent with the camera  
>>>moving closer to a small model just beyond the window, since  
>>>the window width has enlarged at the same time by almost 5%  
>>>between #2 and #3. This should be taken as a minimum value for  
>>>the difference in range between lens and window since, as I  
>>>pointed out, there is a very small perspective foreshortening of  
>>>the window width in #3. Allowing for this, it isn't ruled out that  
>>>the proportion change in angular width of the UFO and of the  
>>>window frame have not only the same sign but the same exact  
>>>value.

>I get the exact opposite result from Martin. Once #3 has been  
>rescaled so that the distant features match up in size, I end up  
>with the object in #3 being about 4-5% smaller than in #2.  
>This would place #3 further away from the camera, which is  
>consistent with Heflin's account.

Very strange. This was the result I first got then revised, as  
you know. See below.

>>>This needs to be investigated with more care on high-resolution  
>>>images, which we (or I at any rate) do not possess. Possibly  
>>>this issue, and a number of other issues that have been raised  
>>>recently, by several people, on this List and in off-List  
>>>exchanges with Ann Druffel and Bob Wood, will be addressed in  
>>>their and Ed Kelson's forthcoming JSE paper this summer. Or if  
>>>not then hopefully the images can then be made available for  
>>>wider study. Meanwhile, all one can say is that the above  
>>>result - considered alone - would be consistent with a model  
>>>just beyond the window. As I also pointed out the direction of  
>>>displacement of the images against the landscape is also  
>>>consistent with a stationary model just beyond the window,  
>>>close to the range of the mirror, but not a stationary model  
>>>beyond the mirror. This is in turn consistent with Tim  
>>>Shell's original idea about the stereo coincidence. But...

>If the model is too close to the car window, we would very  
>definitely be seeing its shadow cast on the window.

Good thinking.

>The sun was  
>high in the sky (about 77 deg. elevation at 12:30 PDT) and about  
>30 deg. right of the view (or at 160 deg azimuth). More of the  
>lower window is visible in photo 2 (where a model would have  
>been 4-5 inches closer in). This works out to about 4 inches as  
>the nearest any model could be without its shadow being visible  
>in the lower part of the window of photo 2, or roughly out at  
>mirror distance.

OK. Just beyond the window, close to the mirror distance, is consistent with the parallax.

>Now if the model was stationary, then this distance would also  
>about account for the small sideways image shift of the object  
>between 2 and 3. BUT, this wouldn't account for what I measure  
>as 3 being smaller by 2, which means 3 is further away than 2.

Correct, this was exactly my own original conclusion. But I stand by my more recent measurement. I don't understand why we're getting different results here unless it is because we are using different measurement methods. I originally got about the same result as you when attempting to judge the disc diameter on #3 direct from the (rescaled) photo. But there is some subjective uncertainty about the gross disc width of #3 because of the limited pixel resolution and the indistinct edge of the flange where it blends into the sky tone. (Using the scans in the JSE paper which are the best I have.) On the other hand the dome is not clearly shown in #2, so we have to try to compare unlike quantities. To get around this I used #1 to find the relative width of dome and flange and used this to generate an overall disc diameter of #3 from the more accurate dome measurement. By this method I still get about a 7% increase, which I feel sure is larger than the error bars due to the uncertainty in the poorly-resolved edge positions.

>Any simple stationary model hoax scenario isn't going to work.

For me that remains to be seen unless we can find out where our measurement disagreement comes from.

>>>>My point was that an actual experiment with that camera has  
>>>>to be entertained not a digital one).

>>>>I agree. That doesn't mean David's experiment has no value  
>>>>though, especially if the hypothetical model needs to have  
>>>>been within only a few tens of inches of the lens, which is what  
>>>>I said the evidence suggests (and I think David now agrees?).

>I don't recall ever disagreeing that a model would have been a  
>short distance outside the window.

Well you said initially that the parallax was not consistent with a stationary model nearer than the mirror, but it isn't important. See

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/may/m27-011.shtml>

>I just think the  
>preponderance of evidence now points to the photos being genuine  
>and not a model. I find the apparent "smoke trail" now found by  
>photo enhancement in #3 and other similar "steaming" coming off  
>the object in #2 to be particularly convincing.

I'm glad to see that my mention of the fluffy/filamentary detail on top of #2 has been of some use. :-)

>>>>I didn't say it had no value, I've only been saying that  
>>>>experiments with the actual film and setting have to be  
>>>>done... oversaturation conditions need to be explored real  
>>>>settings real film real camera.... I've been saying that since  
>>>>the beginning.

>Well, go to it Victor. I suspect such experiments with identical  
>film and camera were already carried out multiple times when  
>this case was first investigated 40 years ago, but maybe without  
>using test threads of various thickness and color.

Yes, and nobody 40 years ago used household computer photo software to do quite fancy digital experiments (that anybody can replicate) to investigate the Polaroid results. And of course the reconstruction isn't just about the camera settings. We could do with an accurate photogrammetric reconstruction of the whole truck interior, camera positions and lines of sight. I'm sure some of this was done by NICAP and others but we don't seem to have any detailed information. For example we know that the NICAP reconstruction (I think it was) showed that the object in photo #1, if far beyond the window, could not have been seen in the camera viewfinder when it was taken. Heflin responded to this by saying that he "shot from the hip". So is this just a hoaxer's quick extemporisation, or does it make sense? At what

height relative to Heflin's eye-level was the camera in #1,  
\_exactly\_?

>I do remember Hartmann generated some hoax photos using a  
>suspension thread, but Heflin pointed that he could easily see  
>Hartmann's thread in the resulting photos. Hartmann's thread  
>thickness and photo distances weren't specified.

>Martin Shough has already pointed out in a previous post that  
>the power lines in the original photos are already a rough  
>indication of photo resolution of dark, being isolated linear  
>objects like suspension threads.

Note too David that the lines on the highway at 1500 ft range  
are visible, though these are likely bundles rather than  
resolved individual wires. See my other post yesterday.

>Unfortunately we currently don't have access to the best  
>possible digital images to see just what this resolution might  
>be. In the JSE pdf reproduction degraded photos, the power lines  
>in photo 1 fade out just before reaching the first visible power  
>pole, or roughly 200 feet away. (I can't see any power lines in  
>the mirror-reflected image of photo 2.)

>Martin used a 1/4 inch thick power line, but I'll assume 1/2  
>inch, which I think is a little more realistic. This works out  
>to about 0.7 arc min of width when it disappears. In contrast, a  
>200 micron thick thread at 45 inches (114 cm) is about 0.6 arc  
>min of width, or about the same. I'm willing to bet the  
>resolution of the best digital images of the photos is 2 or 3  
>times this. So this would make something like a sewing thread as  
>likely being visible in any near model (unless Heflin used  
>something much thinner or used a suspension filament that  
>blended in very well with the background sky).

<snip>

>>>Alternatively the similarity of relative position is a  
>>>coincidence. This is also possible. Consider that however you  
>>>look at the testimony, this approximate point in the sky is the  
>>>point at which the object, quite slow moving, was reported  
>>>performing a tight course reversal. It stands to reason that  
>>>only a small angular translation is to be expected between #2  
>>>and #3 at this point; it stands to reason that it will be right  
>>>to left; the photographer cannot physically move far and so  
>>>could only possibly introduce a small angular displacement; and  
>>>it also stands to reason (psychologically and physically) that  
>>>any movement of the photographer will be in the direction he did  
>>>demonstrably move, so that any compensation will be in the  
>>>direction of reducing the relative angular displacement. That  
>>>two small quantities which are naturally of opposite sign will  
>>>cancel to a much smaller residual is inherently quite likely.

>Another way of stating this is the photographer tries to keep  
>the object framed near the center of view as the object does a  
>course change. This will also minimize changes in sideways  
>position. So if the object moves left between photos 2 and 3,  
>Heflin moves right to keep the framing about the same in the  
>window.

Yes, succinctly put!

>>The coincidence still stands and I brought that up among my  
>>first postings: That it was unusual to have exactly compensated  
>>for the movement of the object such that it ends up in overlap  
>>when the car frame is used as the reference point.

>First of all, the compensation is not necessarily "exact." The  
>object lies a little bit right in the window frame in photo 3 of  
>where it was in photo 2.

Well yes, but it would do so if it was a few inches beyond the  
window owing to the camera repositioning.

>And second, it isn't so much of a  
>"coincidence" if a distant object is moving and the photographer  
>is trying to keep the framing the same.

True, and as I also said (above) it may be significant that  
according to the witness's description of the flight path these  
2 photos would naturally have been taken at a moment when the

object was close to (or even at) the point of its course-reversal at low speed, meaning that the object angular displacement against the reference frame of the window is naturally small, allowing the also-naturally-small movement of the photographer (constrained within the van) to cancel it out. If he had said the object was flying fast this would be much more unlikely. So it's a further consistent point.

Note that a small angular displacement of a slow-moving object also implies a short interval between photos. Witness estimates of duration and re-enactments at the site indicate that this interval canonically have been a few seconds, which broadly fits the displacement we see. And I think a further test may be possible by estimating the displacement of subtle density patterns in the sky between #2 and #3. This needs very careful work on high resolution scans, but a preliminary comparison I sent off-List to David, the JSE team and others a while ago seems to suggest the likelihood of a displacement in the correct direction consistent with the known wind and the reported photo order, and of a magnitude consistent with known winds and an interval in the order of 10 secs or so. (I've so far received no comment from anyone on this method.)

Have to leave it there for now. Too late to concentrate.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:27:02 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:20:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:14:45 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:13:14 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 20:24:07 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 08:39:57 EDT  
>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700  
>>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

Instead of saying "Note that a small angular displacement of a slow-moving object also implies a short interval between photos" I should have said:

"Note that a small angular displacement even of a slow-moving object also implies a short interval between photos."

Sorry. Eyes closing up.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:35:21 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:26:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 06:05:35 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 06:57:09 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>Is anything certain all the time?

>Yes. The only certainty is that nothing is certain.

>Personally, I see no strong argument for the ET hypothesis. I  
>see very strong arguments for the 'other' hypothesis, and if any  
>certainty be possible, I think saying they are not us is pretty  
>close.

Thanks for the response Bob!

I agree with you that "they are not us", as long as "us" means humanity as we know us, and as long as we're talking about flying saucer reports from the years prior to advanced human techs like magneto-aerodynamics, and all other "black project" leakages.

Some of the recent UFOs sighted could be human-made.

But I would go further. Using a preponderance of evidence argument would yield an ET source over any other source, including lost or otherwise hidden culture sources. At least this works for me now.

Beyond a reasonable doubt these have to be reserved for things like the personal experiences of abductees, including their interpretations and physical evidence, as well as the physical evidence of the 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Pope

From: Nick Pope <[nick.nul](mailto:nick.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:53:23 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:28:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Pope

>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

>The latest issue of UFO Review, issue 16, is now available at:

><http://www.uforeview.net>

>And in this issue we have:

<snip>

>2. "I'm A Bastard Crop Circle Faker Maker, A Government Agent,  
>And A Serious Pain In The Ass (for Special Branch)"

>One of the long forgotten men of Ufology, Matthew Williams is  
>still alive and well and living down in Devizes.

<snip>

I'm concerned about a comment Matthew Williams made about a woman he alleges is stalking him. Matthew names this woman and says he's tempted to "smash her in the face".

I don't know if you checked his allegation, and perhaps his comment was 'tongue in cheek', but I don't believe you should have published this cowardly and distasteful remark.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Stuart

From: Chaz Stuart <[Daydisk2.nul](mailto:Daydisk2.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 19:57:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:31:40 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Stuart

>From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tues. 06June, 2006 18:33  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>"... busted the crop circle myth wide open ..."?  
>I'd like to see Mr. Williams re-do the Crabwood  
>glyph in a single night, with or without a GPS  
>unit.

The Crabwood glyph at:

<http://www.raven1.net/crabwood.jpg>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 19:08:37 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 20:35:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Lehmborg

>From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:33:42 -0400  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

><snip>

>>One of the long forgotten men of Ufology, Matthew Williams is  
>>still alive and well and living down in Devizes. These days a  
>>much overlooked figure, he was the man who busted the crop  
>>circle myth wide open, made one or two researchers look a little  
>>stupid in the process, and who's evidence has been ignored ever  
>>since.

>"... busted the crop circle myth wide open ..." ?

>I'd like to see Mr. Williams re-do the Crabwood glyph in a single  
>night, with or without a GPS unit.

Really - I was all set to be 'cerealized' and have the CC  
phenomenon go the way of the dodo... but I was singularly  
unimpressed with Mr. Williams in toto, and only reminded of what  
I wrote regarding Robert Nichol's doc:

"...And Crop Circles get faked. Sure. But, when those 'fakes'  
occur... don't we, generally, know who the fakers are? Don't  
they tell us who they are? Don't they strut and crow and smirk  
and patronize?"

"Spin me a Catherine-Wheel, again - 'Doug'!"  
Stomp out an additional Adams Grave, for me - 'Dave'."

<http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/2005/09/letters-under-our-door.html>

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)

[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White

From: Eleanor White [eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:29:56 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:12:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - White

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>A saucer shape isn't particularly aerodynamically stable, but a  
>parabolic reflector created by the inside curve of a saucer is a  
>pretty good way to focus EM energy. And maybe that's why the  
>saucer is usually "upside-down," with the focal point pointed  
>toward the ground.

Just daydreaming here... I'm thinking back to the claims of  
(later) professor Charles Hall, who as a young man worked as a  
USAF weather observer at Nellis AFB, Nevada. Charles Hall claims  
"tall white" aliens, roughly our height and not that different  
in appearance, have a sort of "way station" base on the  
restricted area north of Indian Springs AFB. They use it, he  
says, just as American armed forces sometimes use bases in  
friendly countries. I.e. simply as a stop-off point for  
maintenance.

He claimed to have considerable interaction with these aliens,  
which was in fact unavoidable because these aliens wandered  
around the desert and were curious about Charles Hall's  
activities.

One thing that caught my attention during an interview was that  
Charles Hall claimed he got just a hint of the anti-gravity  
drive on their craft, saying that he was told they circulate  
"subatomic particles" through circular tubing to generate  
thrust. No further details were revealed to him.

I guess trying that out awaits our (humanity's) ability to cause  
subatomic particles to remain stable and in existence at least  
long enough to make the circuit inside some sort of tubing  
within a craft.

One thing I've wondered about is that I imagine if one could  
physically move charged particles in a rotary path, say along  
the rim of a 30-foot 'saucer', whether that could create an as  
yet not demonstrated but huge magnetic field? The idea is that  
current (i.e. electrons jumping from atom to atom) in a wire are  
moving very slowly. I saw a calculation in university (back in  
'63) however I don't remember what the speed range was in wire,  
but it was surprisingly slow.

Changes in current are propagated at the speed of light, but  
the electrons' actual motion in wire is slow for workaday  
current levels. (The calculation took into account normal  
current in a wire, and the quantity of charge necessary to pass  
a point on the wire, against the cross sectional area of the  
wire.)

I wondered what would happen if a batch of charged particles  
were confined to a sector of a disk, and the disk was spun at,  
say, hundreds of rpm. I wondered if by radically increasing the  
speed over that in a wire, and these charged particles move in a

circle, if that wouldn't be like a huge current, effectively, in a circular path, which should cause a huge magnetic field? (Maybe huge enough to fly with?)

No iron core, just lumps of charge around the edge of a spinning disk.

Next, the Wimshurst machine came to mind - which is a pair of counter-rotating glass/plastic disks with metal sectors glued on.

If brushes supplied high voltage DC to the segments, one side of negative polarity, and the other side positive, and the charges were not able to leak off the segments as the disks spin in opposite directions, would not both disks create a magnetic field in the same direction, as their net charges are opposite?

Next, how about a piece of round section tubing, with a baffle passing through the diameter perpendicular to the radius and to the plane of the circle, creating two separate channels. Say two pumps were pumping ion-rich fluid around a circular path, one half-tube carrying positive-ion-rich fluid, the other carrying negative-ion-rich fluid, fluids circulating in opposite directions?

High voltage DC could be applied to the two counter-rotating fluid streams, perhaps by a wire running through each tubing half, again causing each half to maintain its ionized state. Would this setup create a huge magnetic field as a result of the effective current?

So, when I heard Charles Hall mention circulating subatomic particles to create thrust, it rang a bell.

Does Stan Friedman or others know if anything like these experiments have been tried?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <[jlolson.nul](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 17:12:22 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:22:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Olson

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2006 13:54:31 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel Jr. On & Off The Record

<snip>

>Deduction is still part of the scientific method. If it looks  
>like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it is  
>most likely a duck.

<snip>

>You have certainly provided no reason. I have no idea why you  
>are averse to the notion of ET spacecraft.

Because magical thinking is more fun? And besides, what if one  
doesn't like ducks?

Best,

Jeff O.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:22:49 -0300  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:32:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>origin.

They don't "look and act like known Earthling produced vehicles,  
therefore they were produced somewhere other than Earth which  
means they are of ET origin"? Did you really just say that,  
Stan? I can't believe you are trying to present this as logic.  
You base all of your arguments here on bogus logic like this  
which means it is absolutely pointless in trying to have a  
logical debate with you.

>Their presence is the proof. We know they aren't from here so  
>they are of ET origin. that is the logic.

If there were only two possibilities - them (assuming, first, of  
course, that 'them' really are flesh and blood entities and real  
spaceships) being from here (Earth) or there (outer space) then  
you might be able to use this logic.

But there are more possibilities than these two and so you have  
no logic. It's just that you don't want to acknowledge the  
other possibilities - your reasons for dismissing them are weak,  
at best and, for the most part, don't even exist as valid  
objections. Your logic stands if only the two possibilities  
exist. But tons of blur zone cases, other categories of  
genuinely anomalous UFOs, and valid research results  
suggest other possibilities. Thus, your logic is not logic.

>Yes, the fact is the observations indicate beings and craft not  
>from here, therefore from off the earth, which by definition  
>means ET.

This is so ridiculous, it isn't even funny! I'm losing all  
respect for you as a scientist. None of these are 'givens'.  
There is absolutely no logic in what you are saying - only the  
very thin appearance of logic. You start off with pure  
assumptions. Ignore valid research. Then jump to totally  
unfounded conclusions.

The things you assume as starting points can only be gotten to  
by roping off a very tiny portion of the UFO picture - ignoring  
those nuts and bolts flying saucers types that have unusual  
bizarre characteristics and that don't fit into your perfectly  
defined spaceship category (the hugh amount of cases in the blur  
zone) and ignoring all other categories of UFOs - and I'm not  
talking about IFOs or misperceived mundanes when I mention these  
other categories. You then also - without any proper  
justification for doing so - dismiss and/or ignore research that  
shows other possible explanations may exist for the phenomenon  
you're focussing on. Finally, you jump to unfounded conclusions

without any evidence whatsoever (other than the 'givens' which you can't even properly get to) and call this leap of faith 'scientific deduction'.

>I can't find the logic.This is not even good science fiction and no  
>evidence has been put forth to support this.

No evidence? Do you mean evidence like this (the kind you offer): "Thousands of abductees and physical trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET origin."?

Because this is all you have been offering to support your premature (unfounded) conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships. You're just guessing!

I'm not advocating any explanation for the UFO phenomenon so I don't need evidence to support or prove any particular explanation. All along I've simply been saying the ET hypothesis should be questioned as the only answer and there are plenty of both cases and research results to justify questioning it.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 19:36:08 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:34:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>origin.

I beg to differ. There's no "therefore" anything. I understand the difference between the weight of evidence and the quality of evidence. One of the reasons that I think UFOs are worth investigating at all is the sheer number of sightings and reports by competent observers worldwide. That being said... I am not aware of a single case or piece of evidence that has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that the UFO phenomenon is in fact an ET phenomenon.

>Why is that a problem?

Because you can't use a mystery to provide an answer to itself.

Let me ask you this. Has the existence of life anywhere other than Earth been unequivocally proven? Has it been shown to exist in the same way that, say, the Hoover Dam exists? If it has been, I guess I missed that news report.

>Behaviour that we cannot duplicate  
>such as passing through walls, disappearing in an instant,  
>making right angle turns at very high speed in silence etc etc.  
>means they weren't made here. Are you really suggesting that any  
>group on this planet would be able to land, abduct, cavort all  
>over the planet and yet not be involved in military activities?

I'm not suggesting. I'm saying outright that I don't know.

>That they could create beings not like us? I can't find the  
>logic. This is not even good science fiction and no evidence  
>has been put forth to support this.

Show me the beings. That would really help. Oh, you're just relying on what somebody else told you, so you don't actually have them. Okay...

>I can safely say that the car across the street in front of my  
>house is not mine. That doesn't mean I know whose it is or where  
>it came from.

Not the same thing at all. You're not just saying that the car isn't yours. You're saying that the car is so strange that it must not be from this planet. And that's an illogical jump.

>"Technically challenging" is the understatement of the year. I  
>have long said secrets can be kept and have given examples, in  
>other words, provided evidence . You have provided none, nil,  
>zilch, nada. Remember worldwide observations. Huge flying

>motherships able to carry dozens of small vehicles.... as I  
>have said I am not into science fiction.

Fine. Walk me over to one of these huge ships that fly so  
strangely. Oh, they flew away. And after all these years,  
nobody's managed to ever, ever get one close enough for me to  
examine. Okay...

>And they would risk being operated all over the planet? And they  
>would be crewed by strange beings? But not used in Korea, or  
>Vietnam, or the Gulf War, or in Iraq???

I'm still not understanding the jump from "I don't know," to  
"Extraterrestrials."

>What makes you say they are made from the same materials found  
>on Earth? Same elements maybe. But there are, for example, many  
>materials presently made on earth that couldn't have been made  
>50 years ago. Ask Intel . Do you have some such material from a  
>flying saucer? Have you seen analysis thereof ? The Roswell  
>witnesses indicate materials with extraordinary light weight,  
>high strength, great resistance to being cut, burned... Are  
>these more of the hypothetical, theoretical ,science fiction  
>devices of which you are speaking?

I don't know what materials these things are made of. Usually  
they're described as "dull metallic" or "translucent." They  
appear to be primarily physical, since they can be photographed,  
so I assume they're made of some kind of material that can be  
found on Earth, since we do have materials on Earth that are  
metallic and/or translucent (as you said in your earlier post  
"if it looks like a duck..."). Not having even one of these  
things to put my tongue on, I will admit I could be completely  
wrong in that assumption. Even if these things appear to  
interact with our physical existence, they could be something  
else. Exactly what, I don't know. But moving into Jacques Vallee  
or Rupert Sheldrake territory with conjecture still doesn't  
bring ET any closer to being the only logical "explanation."

>Are you talking of a saucer shaped craft powered by a jet engine  
>or propeller driven engine? It seems to me the witness  
>descriptions do indicate stability, but don't indicate jets or  
>props and usually no noise. Have you run stability tests on a  
>saucer? There are many reports of flatbottomed craft.

I've certainly played my share of Frisbee golf, where even a  
concave-bottom flying disk requires high revolutions to fly and  
still flips over at slow speeds. Most disk-shaped craft,  
including Project Silverbug, which evolved into the AVRO saucer,  
never make it above the boundary layer. The only thing that  
might work would be a gyro-stabilized radial wing design that  
allows for changing the blade attack angles during rotation  
(like a helicopter blade), but that doesn't fit the  
descriptions. But I'm not even suggesting a jet or propeller  
drive. Hey, I'll go for anti-gravity or antimatter-plasma-  
fusion-magnetic propulsion. But I can't and won't assume those  
things were built by aliens, either. People can be mighty clever  
all on their own.

>Here we go again with absence of evidence is evidence of  
>absence.

I'm not saying that at all. I agree with you that there's plenty  
of evidence. In fact, there's an embarrassing overabundance of  
evidence. Brian Vike's website alone is chock full of evidence.  
But we disagree as to what that evidence points to. You say ET,  
I say that because ET is speculative and unproven, I don't know.

>Visits by strange beings in strange craft provide many solid  
>reasons for saying the craft originate some place else.

"Solid," but not solid like the Hoover Dam?

>Deduction is still a very important part of the scientific method.

I agree. But just because it looks, swims and quacks like a duck  
doesn't mean it couldn't also be a decoy.

>We know they aren't from here so they are of ET origin.  
>That is the logic.

I would say that from the descriptions, it sure doesn't sound like they are from Earth. Of course, not all of the descriptions are accurate. But I'm perfectly willing to assume that at least some of the observations and descriptions are 100% accurate, so it does create quite a puzzle. As for concluding that they are ET, that just doesn't necessarily follow.

>Yes, the fact is the observations indicate beings and craft not  
>from here, therefore from off the earth, which by definition  
>means ET.

If I was completely knowledgeable about the appearance and capabilities of every Earth-made craft, including those experimental jobbies tucked away in the desert, it might help me decide whether or not they originated somewhere besides Earth. But I'm not. And if I could maybe see one of these beings laid out on a slab so that I knew for sure they weren't from around here, then maybe I might be a little more confident about saying they were ET. But at the moment, I'm still at "I don't know."

The thing is, even if a flying saucer landed on my lawn and a strange-looking being walked out and told me to my face he was from another planet or dimension or both, he'd still have to prove he wasn't lying to me. There are plenty of liars around. Witnesses, the government, my own lousy senses and reasoning. I've also read contact cases where the aliens really sound like they're not being completely honest. Alien liars. They could all lead me astray.

But you know the funny thing? I want it to be true. Want it bad. It would be the coolest thing ever. The culmination of nearly 4 decades of interest in the subject, ever since I was a little kid. I want it to be true so bad that I have become the harshest debunker of them all. Because I don't want it just to be wishful thinking or skewed logic.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:28:48 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:40:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:35:21 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 06:05:35 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 06:57:09 -0700 (PDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

<snip>

>Beyond a reasonable doubt these have to be reserved for things  
>like the personal experiences of abductees, including their  
>interpretations and physical evidence, as well as the physical  
>evidence of the UFOs.

That should have been:

"Beyond a reasonable doubt theses (plural of thesis) . . ."

Thanks

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Burns

From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 02:29:33 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:52:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Burns

>From: Nick Pope <[nick.nul](mailto:nick.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:53:23 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

>>The latest issue of UFO Review, issue 16, is now available at:

>><http://www.uforeview.net>

>>And in this issue we have:

><snip>

>>2. "I'm A Bastard Crop Circle Faker Maker, A Government Agent,  
>>And A Serious Pain In The Ass (for Special Branch)"

>>One of the long forgotten men of Ufology, Matthew Williams is  
>>still alive and well and living down in Devizes.

><snip>

>I'm concerned about a comment Matthew Williams made about a  
>woman he alleges is stalking him. Matthew names this woman and  
>says he's tempted to "smash her in the face".

>I don't know if you checked his allegation, and perhaps his  
>comment was 'tongue in cheek', but I don't believe you should  
>have published this cowardly and distasteful remark.

Nick, Stuart, EBK, Listers,

First, in Matt Williams defence, he does have a stalker, a bad  
one. It is a lot more serious than just sitting in a car  
watching him or just hanging around you at every conference.

One example in Matt's defence. He came home to find that this  
women had forced her way past a friend who happened to be over  
visiting his home. She had waited in the bushes until Matt  
nipped out the house. He was now outside the house and so was  
his friend when Matt arrived home the police were called. She  
was in the house laying on a spare bed with the biggest knife  
you have ever seen. She commented on police entry. I'm supposed  
to be here.

The rest of you have no idea what Matt has had to put up with  
from this women and for a long time to my knowledge - over 5  
years.

May I also add, that nothing has occurred in the past between  
them that would suggest that she and Matt and had something  
going on.



She is a seriously disturbed individual. The police could not do much after she was released from the sanitarium. Not cured I might add.

I mentioned to Stuart Miller that someone in ufology was stalking Matt a while ago, although I did not reveal who it was.

I have met her. Set your crazy phaser to stun. This girl truly needs a good check-up from the neck up She is a danger to Williams, you me or anyone else in the field who takes a shining to her wild eyes. "Here's Johnny!"

You should be thanking Matt, if it was not him, it may well have been you who attracted her attention.

I know many of the facts, the kind of behaviour that is best kept in works of fiction. Not in the real world.

As to crop circles, Matt and his team can make any size any shape with enough people. The most men and women I am aware of worked on a big circle a couple of years ago had about 40 working together - a gathering of crop artists for the season's grand finale.

Regards,

Max

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 22:03:30 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:55:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>I received some response about my comment last week about  
>apparent dodging I found in the high-resolution  
>Trent/McMinnville scans I was playing stereo with, so I thought  
>I'd post this link to clarify what I was talking about:

><http://img392.imageshack.us/img392/5507/mcmindodge3sz.jpg>

>One is just a simple brightness/contrast adjustment, the other  
>is a dreaded embossing (what can I say, sometimes it helps).  
>Maybe there's some kind of contrast bleed thing happening I  
>don't understand here. Or hey, maybe it's a force field. I don't  
>know.

I don't know what aspect of the photo you are referring to as a  
"contrast bleed thing"... or "force field".

>Anyway, this is what made me think that perhaps the photo  
>showing the saucer underside (#1) was a contact print of some  
>kind. Or maybe that maybe Trent didn't get the original  
>negatives back from the Men In Black.

At my web site you can find - or perhaps have found - the 40x  
(If I recall correctly) blowup by Hartmann during the heydays of  
the Condon study. There are also scans of 8 x 10 prints showing  
the whole scene.

[www.brumac.8k.com](http://www.brumac.8k.com)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 08:56:33 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 05:58:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shough

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 23:41:03 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:55:29 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 20:56:55 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

<snip>

>>>I'd be interested to know which parts of the nonsense about  
>>>Trindade were mine.

>>John

>>Sadly this faux-innocent strategem just adds to the nonsense.  
>>Anyone else who needs reminding what "sense" means to John, and  
>>has the stomach for it, can recap his most recent "critical  
>>assault" on Trindade:

>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m05-009.shtml>  
>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m08-010.shtml>  
>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m09-006.shtml>  
>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m10-013.shtml>  
>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m12-003.shtml>  
>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m16-001.shtml>  
>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m16-012.shtml>  
>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2006/jan/m17-007.shtml>

>I have taken the trouble to look at these links. They are  
>relating to my questions about radically different versions of  
>Barauna's testimony as reported by two different researchers. I  
>can see nothing 'nonsensical' about them, others, however, may  
>have keener eyesight.

Astounding. I rest my 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Karl Pflock Tributes

From: Fred Whiting <[whtngrfd.nul](mailto:whtngrfd.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 04:18:05 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:03:41 -0400  
Subject: Karl Pflock Tributes

[Non-Subscriber Post]

I read Herb Taylor's moving appreciation of Karl Pflock. I'm trying to channel my grief into productive ways by contacting all of Karl's colleagues and friends possible and asking them to answer the following question in one paragraph: What will be Karl Pflock's legacy?

I plan to compile the quotes, edit them and send them to his wife, Mary, to share with family and friends when they have a party to celebrate Karl's life a week from this Saturday.

Please send your response to Fred Whiting at [whtngrfd.nul](mailto:whtngrfd.nul) by the end of this week, so I can include your thoughts.

Thanks.

Fred Whiting - APR  
E-mail: <<mailto:whtngrfd.nul>>whtngrfd.nul<<mailto:whtngrfd.nul>>com

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpDatesList.Com](http://UFOUpDatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Object In Manitoba Sky Nets 100 Calls

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:10 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:10 -0400  
Subject: Object In Manitoba Sky Nets 100 Calls

Source: The Winnipeg Sun - Manitoba, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/gsbo5>

June 7, 2006

Object In Sky Nets 100 Calls

By Adam Clayton, Staff Reporter

The Manitoba Museum has been flooded with phone calls from people who spotted a strange object in the sky.

Resident astronomer Scott Young said the museum has received at least 100 calls about an eerie green light that appeared in the sky on Friday night. Young believes the object was either a small asteroid or a chunk of comet that shattered into several pieces after burning up in the Earth's atmosphere.

"The receptionist is doing nothing but answering calls and taking numbers right now and I think I'm up to 180 e-mails," he said. "Lots of people saw it."

Eyewitnesses from Dryden to Brandon and as far south as Duluth, Minn., have reported seeing the object.

Eyewitness Accounts Sought

Ufology Research of Manitoba, a Winnipeg-based independent centre that collects data on Canadian UFO reports, is assisting the museum in gathering eyewitness accounts to determine the object's flight path. Spokesman Chris Rutkowski said he's received more than a dozen calls so far.

"They all report seeing a brilliant blue or green light moving through the sky with a long tail," he said. "There may have been somebody who captured it on a cellphone camera."

Young said the end point of the object's flight path is somewhere in northwestern Ontario. It's not known whether any pieces reached the ground.

"The first step is to figure out the trajectory and where pieces might come down," he said. "If it's a reasonable place to go looking, then we'll look for pieces," he said.

People can send an e-mail to [skyinfo.nul](mailto:skyinfo.nul) or call 956-2830.

[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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:55:00 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:55:00 -0400  
Subject: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

Source: Grand Forks Herald - Minnesota, USA

<http://www.grandforks.com/mld/grandforks/news/14757502.htm>

Wed, Jun. 07, 2006

Marshall County, Minn.:

'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

Producers from History Channel to visit historical museum today

By Susanne Nadeau  
Herald Staff Writer

Late one August night, almost 30 years ago, a mysterious flash of light bore down on a Marshall County deputy as he was patrolling the western edge of the county.

The light lasted only a few minutes, before Sheriff Deputy Val Johnson, who was driving along Minnesota Highway 220, lost consciousness of time.

A few minutes grew into half an hour - 40 minutes, before Johnson became aware of the night again, and when that happened, damage had been done to his eyes and his squad car.

The cause of the light has remained a mystery since August 1979. And it's been the subject of much speculation. Enough speculation to draw the occasional interest of publications and television producers, according to Ethel Thorlacius, the director of the Marshall County Historical Museum.

Today, Thorlacius said, producers from the History Channel will be visiting the museum, which houses the squad car Johnson was driving that night.

The car retains unusual damage, she said, from a broken headlight to a long dent in the hood, a hole in the windshield and an antenna bent at a 45-degree angle.

It's become the county "UFO car", though Thorlacius said there's no way to know what caused the damage.

"I believe that there was something outside that car that was responsible for the damage", Thorlacius said.

A UFO, a ball of lightning, St. Elmo's fire, all come up on Thorlacius' conjecture list.

"You would have to see the damages to understand how unusual they are", Thorlacius said. "It's, well, it's like something went right over it, rolled over it."

Maybe she'll never know how the damage occurred, but she will have many more opportunities to discuss it as interested parties



come through to talk about it.

"I know there are a lot of people who believe that nothing really different happened", she said. "It's controversial, just like anything about the unknown."

Nadeau can be reached at:

[snadeau.nul](mailto:snadeau.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## The Return Of The 4400

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 07:04:02 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 07:04:02 -0400  
Subject: The Return Of The 4400

Source: Blog Critcs.Org

<http://blogcritics.org/archives/2006/06/07/022633.php>

June 07, 2006

The Return Of The 4400: An Interview With Show Creator Scott Peters  
Diane Kristine

For a man who has assembled a fictional reality full of political and religious intrigue, bias and bigotry, The 4400 creator and executive producer Scott Peters is remarkably happy to be kept too busy by that world to be consumed with the weight of this one.

"I'm completely and utterly disconnected from the world. I have no idea what's going on, I don't watch the news, I have no concept of what's going on outside our little backlot here," he explained with a laugh during a hurried on-set lunch break, when asked about his own television habits. "It's not like I'm some crazy hermit running away from the real world, but it's certainly a relief not to have the morning shows and the nightly news and whatever else is going on. The hubbub of regular life interrupts, so it's great."

Though he may think of the North Vancouver studio where The 4400 is filmed as something of a haven, he isn't entirely convincing in the role of sheltered naif. The native of Windsor, Ontario, who has made Los Angeles his home for many years, has said the events of 9/11 helped inspire the premise =96 how people react to a catastrophic event that disrupts not only their lives, but changes their world view.

In Peters' supernatural world, that event was the return of 4400 people who had been abducted over the years, and whose displacement in time and paranormal abilities cause havoc not only with their lives, but with a frightened and mystified public. An agency of the Department of Homeland Security is assigned to investigate, entangling the agents' lives with those of the 4400.

With its third season premiering June 11 on the USA network, The 4400 continues to draw inspiration from current events. "It's not just a simple cut and dried, yes or no, right or wrong all the time, same with everything that's going on with the war on terror, with the war in Iraq, with all the things we struggle with on a day-to-day basis," Peters said. "We hold a mirror up to that in this world, and have it be as sophisticated and complex and difficult, with issues that are as difficult to struggle with, as in the world we face every day."

The show touches on themes such as government control in our lives, an eroded right to privacy, plus more personal, family stories, and Peters downplays the science fiction elements, at least as much as possible given its premise. "I think any time you have a world where 4400 people appear out of a ball of

light, you've already got a pretty strong sci-fi convention," he deadpanned. "So I don't think you have to keep pounding it into everybody's head, and having it be spaceships flying around, and aliens running back and forth, and all that kind of stuff. Once you've signed off on that one big sci-fi premise, if it settles into more of a drama, that's better for me."

"We're moving away from the 4400 freak of the week."

The cable series' short seasons =96 13 episodes this time =96 mean nearly a year has passed between the season two finale and the season three premiere. Canadians have a few more months to wait, likely until September, for the Space channel to begin airing the new episodes.

That second season finale presented several tantalizing glimpses of future storylines, including the idea of an impending war, the apparent resurrection of an assassinated character, and a suddenly grown-up baby, among others. Peters promises some resolutions... sort of. "We like to answer some big questions, and in the answering of those questions, create bigger questions."

He also reveals a slight change in focus. "We're trying to build the mythology a lot more, trying to stick with our core characters throughout their travels this season. We found last year that we liked meeting new characters and having them interact, but we didn't want the show to just become that. There's still an element of that, it's just we've pulled back on it a lot and really focused on the main characters, the main cast, and how their lives interconnect."

That mythology includes the story of how humans of the distant future abducted then returned the 4400 in order to prevent humanity's destruction, in part of an elaborate but so far vague plan. "We know who did this, but we don't know specifically who did this. We know why they did it, but we don't know specifically why," said Peters. "So we're trying to give the audience more of a peek of that behind-the-curtain aspect of the show."

The fact that aliens were not behind the abductions took the show in a surprising direction at the end of the first season, and Peters hints at more twists to come. "We love to take an audience down one path and have it be clear and obvious that it must be A, and then suddenly we turn a corner and it's actually B."

Though known now more as a writer, Peters got his start in directing, and has returned to his first love. He's currently directing the ninth episode of the coming season. "This is really a different creative muscle to flex, plus it's just a bonus and a huge treat to get to do it on a show I created," he said. "There's just this enormous trust from the moment we set foot on the soundstage, and they're willing to let themselves go to places I think for me that they're not necessarily willing to go with a director they don't know."

"It's a definite steering through shark-infested waters."

Adding yet another activity to keep him away from his television set, Peters has been invited to lead a Master Class at the upcoming Banff World Television Festival, a gathering of industry professionals. "I'm really looking forward to interacting with everybody up there and sharing my experiences and learning about other people, of their trials and tribulations in this great, terrific, wonderful, fun business."

He intimates that he will share the possibly not-so-fun intrigues of getting The 4400 on the air and preserving his creative vision. "We've been through many hurdles, we had to avoid many landmines, we had to protect the show at times, we had to let the show go in a certain direction that maybe wasn't intended another time."

"I think the biggest obstacle all the way through is just to protect the original vision," he continued. "There are a lot of elements that come at you as you're trying do that, and you either have to pick up a shield and a sword and try to defend it, or let it go. You have to pick your battles and what you are willing to relinquish and what you're not willing to, in terms

of the original vision. Sometimes you have to pick a battle and fight to the death."

His original vision has evolved over the years, though in a more organic, non-combative way. "Like when you're bringing on an actor to play a character, you start to write to their strengths and stay away from their weaknesses," Peters explained. "So like that, as the series begins to unfold and evolve and take on a life of its own, you get a sense of what really works well and what doesn't work so well, given our time and budget and what we can achieve."

His pride in the show, which earned him an Emmy nomination for co-writing the pilot mini-series, is evident. "I like that it's evolving, and I like that we're deepening the story between all the characters. It's not just a story of plot, but it's a story that really brings these characters to life and keeps them as three-dimensional people and not just cardboard cutouts."

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 07:08:31 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 09:08:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>origin.

I can't follow your logic. ;-)

Abductions and close encounters of all kinds have been going on since before humans started recording history. In every case they have been interpreted through the cultural filters of the place and time. They were gods, demons, angels, whatever as the culture demanded.

Today we're taking our first feeble steps from the surface of this planet, so we interpret things through that cultural filter. But that doesn't mean we're any closer to the truth than people were thousands of years ago.

I view the ET hypothesis as unnecessary. There is certainly enough time in the planet's past for intelligent life to have evolved more than once. But that's only one thought. Some physicists believe that time travel is not only possible, but possibly not that difficult. Maybe traveling through time is easier than traveling vast distances through space. Maybe the hypothesis of parallel universes explains things. Or maybe, and personally I think this most likely, there is an explanation we haven't even thought of yet.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 12:10:04 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 09:11:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller

>From: Nick Pope <[nick.nul](mailto:nick.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:53:23 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

>>The latest issue of UFO Review, issue 16, is now available  
>at:

>><http://www.uforeview.net>

>>And in this issue we have:

><snip>

>>2. "I'm A Bastard Crop Circle Faker Maker, A Government  
>Agent, And A Serious Pain In The Ass (for Special Branch)"

>>One of the long forgotten men of Ufology, Matthew Williams is  
>>still alive and well and living down in Devizes.

><snip>

>I'm concerned about a comment Matthew Williams made about a  
>woman he alleges is stalking him. Matthew names this woman and  
>says he's tempted to "smash her in the face".

>I don't know if you checked his allegation, and perhaps his  
>comment was 'tongue in cheek', but I don't believe you should  
>have published this cowardly and distasteful remark.

Hi Nick,

I don't expect you to respond to this point but I'm beginning to  
suspect that you might be familiar with this lady, possibly  
through your work with abductees?

That's by the by; Let's look at what he said in context:

---

SM: The first thing that intrigues me, if I may ask, is why do  
you still monitor your calls? Are you still getting hassled?

MW: It's not from the security services or anything like that.  
It's unfortunately from a problem I've got with a stalker,  
somebody who saw me on TV once and has become a right pain in  
the ass. She even turned up at my house once and had to be  
arrested and taken away by the police and sectioned. She is a  
mental case called Tabitha Good who has become the bane of my  
bloody life and rings me up at 4 a.m. in the morning and tries  
to get me out of bed to answer telephone calls and stuff like  
that. That's why I monitor my calls. I've had this for about the  
last two years with her ringing me up and that sort of stuff.

I've changed my mobile number three times and she has managed to get the number from people that I know.

SM: That's a nightmare.

MW: It is a bit really, yes. I'm thinking of becoming mentally ill myself so I can smash her in the face next time she turns up on my doorstep.

---

You have to admit that's a fair bit of hassle that this lady has put him through. It is obvious he is expressing anger and frustration and while I can't speak for anyone else, I know I would feel the same if I was in his position.

Have you ever has similar difficulties? If so, how did you deal with it?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Engraved In Stone

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 11:19:03 +0000  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 09:14:25 -0400  
Subject: Engraved In Stone

Forwarded Messages:

From: John B. Carlson <[Tlaloc.nul](mailto:Tlaloc.nul)>  
To: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Subject: Fwd: Engraved in Stone  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:29:28 -0400

From: Dr. E. C. Krupp <[eckrupp.nul](mailto:eckrupp.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:59:29 -0700  
Subject: Engraved in Stone

Uncritical news reaction to the press release promoting a rock art depiction of 1006 A.D. supernova suggests there is actually evidence to support this assertion. A more skeptical analysis is posted at the [\\_Sky & Telescope\\_ homepage](http://www.SkyandTelescope.com), <[www.SkyandTelescope.com](http://www.SkyandTelescope.com)>.

Petroglyph panels like the White Tanks panel are not rare. There is no reason to link it to any supernova event. There is nothing persuasive about the imagery to support the extraordinarily detailed claim. The authors say nothing about all of the other imagery on the boulder and select two details for their discussion. These two details are in themselves dubiously interpreted.

There is no reason to conclude the "supernova" symbol is a star at all. It could be a sun symbol (more likely) or something else.

There is no reason to conclude the "scorpion" petroglyph is a scorpion. This is not an explicit depiction.

Even if the "scorpion" petroglyph is a scorpion, there is no reason to conclude it is a celestial scorpion.

Even if the "scorpion" petroglyph is actually a celestial scorpion, there is no evidence it represents the stars of Scorpion. There is no evidence to suggest the prehistoric Indians of the American Southwest saw a scorpion in the stars of Scorpion.

This 1006 A.D. supernova petroglyph interpretation is assumption and wishful thinking. There is no way to test the interpretation, and the authors' suggestion that chemical dating could strengthen the case is wrong. Even were the date consistent with the beginning of the eleventh century, a consistent date confirms nothing about iconographical meaning.

Stung by supernovae,

E.C. Krupp

\*\*\*\*\*  
Dr. E.C. Krupp, Director [eckrupp.nul](mailto:eckrupp.nul)  
Griffith Observatory phone: (323) 664-1181  
2800 East Observatory Road fax: (323) 663-4323  
Los Angeles, California 90027 <http://www.GriffithObs.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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 12:34:00 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 09:16:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 19:08:37 -0500  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:33:42 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>>>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

>><snip>

>Really - I was all set to be 'cerealized' and have the CC  
>phenomenon go the way of the dodo... but I was singularly  
>unimpressed with Mr. Williams in toto, and only reminded of  
>what I wrote regarding Robert Nichol's doc:

>"...And Crop Circles get faked. Sure. But, when those 'fakes'  
>occur... don't we, generally, know who the fakers are? Don't  
>they tell us who they are? Don't they strut and crow and  
>smirk and patronize?"

>"Spin me a Catherine-Wheel, again - 'Doug'!"  
>Stomp out an additional Adams Grave, for me - 'Dave'."

Hi Alfred,

Sorry if in the end all of my hype was an anti-climax; it wasn't for me.

It is true that Matthew isn't the most sympathetic of people at times and there is undoubtedly an arrogance there. But a liar he isn't.

All that is happening here is what happened when he first stuck his head above the ramparts; "go away you irritating little creep - you're spoiling the fun".

Many months ago Alfred I was pretty much where you are and I'm speaking now about Ufology et al. I took note however of developments, applied a rational approach, and moved on. I am most certainly not a skeptic but just a more grounded 'believer'. No one can force you to open-your-eyes, but there is a danger of isolation. Ufology in my opinion is growing up and maturing; don't get left behind!

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:32 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:28:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:14:45 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 10:13:14 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 2 Jun 2006 20:24:07 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Wed, 31 May 2006 08:39:57 EDT  
>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>>Date: Mon, 29 May 2006 16:57:57 -0700  
>>>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

Hi David, I'm back from my long work week. I'm so glad I've inspired you to delve into this more thoroughly, but... .

> snip

>Now here's a real serious coincidence for the hoax pushers to consider. As discussed further below, the object in #2 and #3 is at virtually the exact same elevation angle compared to the horizon (to within about 1 or 2 percent measurement error). However #3 object is (according to my measurement after rescaling photo 3) about 4-5% smaller. Further, #3 photo is taken about 5% closer to the window, which, if you had a stationary model, would make a model in #3 5% larger, instead of the other way around. Thus a model in #3 has to really be about >9-10% further away than in #2. (Else Heflin has to use two models, not one, with the #3 model being 9+% smaller.)

<snip>

Who said it was stationary model... and now this whole argument falls to pieces. Maybe the pole shifted? The wind was blowing. Your points are not strong separators! The closer an object is to the camera the smaller the real shift of the object (human scales) has to become to account for observed size differences. That's why apparent changes at close range aren't as compelling/significant here. Plus, the long string coming from the proposed fishing line, could deflect 10% either direction in a gentle wind. Two Models? Please? We need to check the weather data too... and this is also in my proposal. And, the wind was blowing, it's in the reports from the time.

<snip>

>To account for the size difference, the length of the swing has  
>to be around 4 inches, so the total swing during the period is 8  
>inches or 20 cm. Average speed is  $20 \text{ cm} / .78 \text{ sec} = 26 \text{ cm/sec}$  and  
>maximum speed (at the very bottom of the swing) is about 40  
>cm/sec.

<snip>

To account for the size difference? How does the swing factor into the size difference. Mine is a dual acting swing too? The bottom acting pendulum has to be small because the height of the suspended UFO is small. The attachment point is on the object!

I chose a small string length on purpose to illustrate the effect of creating mostly upward defection (read below). The opposite of what you would expect when you factor in the shape of the object. And, this is consistent with a string being attached on the object itself. A four inch string is unnecessary and in the wrong direction.

A wide object suspended on a short string, (rapid period): This could simulate the vertical displacement of that seen on the object in question? My string length, so to speak, is contained somewhat within the object itself. If you hang a bell by a 1/8" string it will still rock back and forth... right? It's the overall length of the bell that's being included. Thus my reason for going smaller and shorter on the string length... mystery solved. I'm favoring a light weight object.

<snip>

>No, no, no! If the order of the photos is reversed, the 3D does  
>\_not\_ become inverted. Otherwise the most distant objects would  
>become the closest; the closest objects (like the window and  
>mirror) would be way off in the distance. If you think about it  
>for a moment, this would be absurd.

<snip>

It's not absurd if you've ever looked at free floating 3D images. .. and you miss my point again... if you've ever reversed the left with the right I'm saying it would be obvious to determine this. Reversed 3D images create a concave-like effect. If I used "inverted" it is to convey some of the activity that occurs. If you can't show someone, then we have to come up with some terms that describe or inspire a connection with the effect. It's not absurd... its conveys my point (swap) beautifully!

<snip>

>The Polaroid is using ASA 3000 film, which is VERY fast (which  
>is why the film is also very "grainy"). It is daylight and the  
>camera is going to be using a fast exposure time. Against this,  
>the automatic exposure system is somewhat "confused" by the  
>dark interior of the cab, so it probably selects a somewhat longer  
>exposure time than the very shortest possible to compensate  
>(hence the exterior details are somewhat overexposed). The  
>alternative would be to open up the iris (smaller f-stop) to  
>admit more light, but because the picture has such a large depth  
>of field, I would guess the automatic exposure system in fairly  
>bright lighting conditions (daylight) is at maximum f-stop  
>(smallest iris) and instead "opts" for a longer exposure time.  
>As a wild-ass guess (and to try to further maximize possible  
>movement blur) I'll guess the exposure time is 1/250th of a  
>second (instead of maybe 1/1000th of a sec.).

<snip>

Please...

An ISO 3000 film is about 40 times faster than an ISO 80 Film. So, lets say we have an ISO 100 (only moving this value from 80 to 100) film and lets say it is 20 times slower than ISO 3000 Film. In daylight with a hazy sun with a lens set at f-16/f-22 lens (not bad depth of field and fairly small aperture) it takes about 1/100 of a second to expose the film. Therefore, at 20 times faster, this comes to about 1/2000 sec. Not only is this realistic but it's consistent with the right information and, more importantly, the parameters you've set... except you threw in a big guess in the wrong direction. I merely rounded it down

to even safer values if the shutter was open longer... because of the interior shading... this could lead to oversaturation. In fact, because of the limited speed of the shutter, this would encourage oversaturation of brighter regions in outdoor settings.

How the actual camera automatically works and can be manually manipulated is also an open question. The closest recommended shot with the camera is three feet. The fastest shutter speed 1/1200 sec. I'm not sure on the directional sensitivity of the detector until I play with it. What type of shutter was it... I'll let you know. There is the added property of affecting the exposer by waiting a different length of time before peeling back the opposite half of the film. The impact of this also has to be explored.

> snip

>This leaves side-to-side swing motion blur. However, this would >be limited in the hoax model theory by the fact that the >pictures show only slight sideways shift in object position >between photos 2 & 3. (The fact that there isn't much shift is >what got this whole close model hoax theory stirred up again.).

<snip>

You didn't grasp the complexity of the arrangement: The combination of a two action period/pendulum can create Many Sorts of defelection/velocity pathways... including zero velocity relative to the camera. If one action moves this way and the other that way, the combination could create a stationary state. And, for the same reason, many angles of deflection are possible relative to the camera (especially with a shorter string). It's the upper bound values I'm after... It might be able to separate hoax from real. (read more below)

The point is... The 3D stereo of the object either shows a real effect or an improbable event like the photographer taking two sequential shots of a moving object, such that, he EXACTLY compensates for their movement and keeps them EXACTLY at the same X and Y coordinates within the window... This is a valid observation... and an unfortunate coincidence for Heflin. Again, did the UFO shift, or the person (car shift?)... Also, the 3D at the far horizon point (A trustworthy 3D since we know the horizon didn't shift) shows a much greater shift. So, which is the actual shift and in which direction. If the photographer overcompensated, the ufo could look like it reversed direction. At that time, I was merely trying to get the order of the shots correct (by using one of the other added benefits of stereoscopic vision) so as to cut the number of possibilities in half. That's all I've been saying. Heflin shifted one direction in the car and the object actually shifted only one direction from one photo to the next. What did heflin say the order was and if the stereo indicated the opposite, then and only then, would there be an issue because it would have the opposite compensation impact on the direction of the UFO at distance. I was just thinking on the fly. You see, in reality, by taking that into account, (that reveal), this could ALSO tell you whether the car actually shifted too, from one frame to the, next, despite the fact that he shifted in the other direction. That's why both 3D images tell the complete story.

<snip>

>In the worst-case scenarios, the maximum speed of >the pendulum swing is at the bottom of the swing between >the two end extremes. But the photo details indicate >that a model would have to be near the ends of the >swing when the model would have substantially slowed >down or maybe even stopped.

<snip>

No! Again, a two action pendulum could create many scenarios. That's why I added the worst case velocity scenarios of each. Read, it again. The UFO is deflected as though rotated around it's farthest left corner (not a normal swing defection). More importantly, an object that is wider than it is tall... with a short string and fast period will, upon passing the bottom of the maximum velocity point, have it's farthest out edges immediately start deflecting upwards. That's another reason why

I chose a small string. (the object has a vertical smear... right?)

There are many modes of vibration, depending upon the time and place action of the driving force. The driving force being the whim of a human (the wind!) holding the fishing pole. But the key is this: Despite these many modes of vibration, I'm only seeking the ones that contribute maximally for comparison. The outer umbrella VALUES. That's the beauty if it, I don't have to worry about every LESSER intervening contingency and vector additions that give up smaller values. .. only the maximum added values! The point is, do these fall short of expected values? You made the second pendulum (action) string longer to have the opposite impact. That's OK, but I give very good reasons why it would be shorter not longer. The fact is, the velocity values would be MOST likely to be much smaller than I indicated ANYWAY, since the pendulum spends most of it time away from maximum attainable velocities near the bottom. And, it's the VERTICAL component of the deflection I'm after... AGAIN .. . much smaller velocities are warranted!

<snip>

>The whole point of this very long discourse, is that motion blur >is unlikely to have much effect on detectability of most common >suspension threads. More important variables than motion are >thread thickness and contrast with the background.

<snip>

I stand by everything I've said. Nothing new to me here? Also UFO literature is not that common place and that shouldn't be new to you or anyone.

I've only suggested that we use the actual camera to conduct these experiments and use the alleged ufo on a string, at close range (swinging?), as a means to sort out two competing valid (recorded! ) observations. All the things about detecting strings should be undertaken with the actual camera and conditions. So, I'm not necessarily disagreeing, but waiting for a more believable results that supersede more complex guess work with digital cameras. I do believe a string should be detected, but I'm not willing to throw out experiment in favor of hunches. If I take a shot with a camera and see a string, I'll try another one with a different charactersitic. In fact, a Polaroid camera favors the hoax side of the argument because of it's immediate availability to manipulate the impact of a tested arrangement.

Science is the process of elimination and not a proof of something. What remains, (the residual), is most likely to hold the truth. We must contain all possibilities so as to eliminate them. And, one must explore the extremes to contain the probable. Is this so difficult a concept? And, can a van carry a somewhat bigger sheet of glass? I'll let some active thinkers out there ponder that one. As anyone will notice, I came up with reasons for there not to be a string and still have a hoax. Should I just keep all my thoughts to myself because I want to prove this is SO Real to the exclusion of all else: ignore other factors\_not report other possibilities?

I'm on both sides of the argument. This doesn't make any of these points any less valid. I'm just soaking this up at a deeper level. And, as a result, you'll naturally swing in two different directions to account for each observation made... sorry for the pendulum analogy:)

Best,

viktor golubik

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 10:09:16 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:32:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Balaskas

On Thu, 1 Jun 2006, UFO UpDates - Toronto wrote:

>Source: [Sploid.Com](http://Sploid.Com) - Budapest, Hungary

>[http://www.sploid.com/news/2006/05/drops\\_of\\_alien\\_1.php](http://www.sploid.com/news/2006/05/drops_of_alien_1.php)

>May 31, 2006

>'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>[They call them fingers, but I've never seen them fing!]

>In the summer of 2001, a blood-colored rain fell across India.  
>If that wasn't spooky enough, now some scientists think that the  
>red ooze may in fact be alien life.

<snip>

Hi Everyone!

I am concerned that this discovery of 'alien life' may turn out to be a physics experiment that accidentally escaped from the lab. Now that it can interact and compete with the indigenous life on our planet, the consequences of this accidental (or intentional?) release of this alien life could be a threat to our survival worse than a real alien invasion.

I think it's odd that the university mentioned in the paper happens to be one of the major global centers for research in nanotechnology (self replicating machines that are at least 100th of the size of the particles as mentioned in the paper). The main goal of the research in India is to use nanotechnology for much needed water purification. Could this "alien life" be a prototype? Maybe this connection is just a coincidence but CNN and other news networks picking up this story and attributing it to an ET origin is amazing in itself!

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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:27:14 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:34:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 07:08:31 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>>origin.

>I can't follow your logic. ;-)

>Abductions and close encounters of all kinds have been going on  
>since before humans started recording history. In every case  
>they have been interpreted through the cultural filters of the  
>place and time. They were gods, demons, angels, whatever as the  
>culture demanded.

>Today we're taking our first feeble steps from the surface of  
>this planet, so we interpret things through that cultural  
>filter. But that doesn't mean we're any closer to the truth  
>than people were thousands of years ago.

>I view the ET hypothesis as unnecessary. There is certainly  
>enough time in the planet's past for intelligent life to have  
>evolved more than once. But that's only one thought. Some  
>physicists believe that time travel is not only possible, but  
>possibly not that difficult. Maybe traveling through time is  
>easier than traveling vast distances through space. Maybe the  
>hypothesis of parallel universes explains things. Or maybe, and  
>personally I think this most likely, there is an explanation we  
>haven't even thought of yet.

Our ancestors didn't have spy satellietes, didn't have instant communication that could track high performance craft moving across the skies from point to point.They didn't have high flying aircraft describing craft moving up, up, and away from them. They didn't have motion picture and still cameras. They didn't have the FOIA so one could demonstrate that information was being withheld. I am concerned only with nearby stars , not distant ones, with relativity that shows time slows down with things moving close to the speed of light. History tells us that progress comes from doing things differently. Sure the SETI cultists tell us that our fastest space craft would take 70,000 years to get to the nearest star.. and don't point out that it has been coasting, without a propulsion system since it left earth. They also don't note that certain fusion reactions can eject particles having 10 million times as much energy per particle as in a chemical rocket.

Please show me any evidence for these unknown high tech

civilizations on Earth. I have often said there may have been many different civilizations about which we are totally ignorant that were here. That doesn't change the fact that very high performance craft are here now from somewhere else.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpDatesList.Com](http://UFOUpDatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

**Dr. Willy Smith III**

From: **Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo** <[ufomiami.nul](mailto:ufomiami.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:14:29 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:36:50 -0400  
Subject: Dr. Willy Smith Ill

Dr. Willy Smith has been in and out of the hospital and is gravely ill. He is not in imminent danger of death, according to his Physician, but it does not look like he will recover either.

If you would like to send an email to cheer him up, Please send it to his wife and write in the Subject: FOR WILLY:

[terrylong.nul](mailto:terrylong.nul)

Regards,

Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo  
Miami UFO Center

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:24:01 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:37:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network,  
>which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous  
>scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very  
>thorough and always sought first to find a conventional  
>explanation for each case.

It seems like the old days had a much higher number of  
creditable participants than present day. Also, it seems like  
your journal and other historical preservation efforts are  
almost like the efforts of monks during the Dark Ages to save,  
for some future time of Enlightenment or Renaissance, the "old"  
knowledge of humanity's past golden age of greatness and works.  
Today, it seems with the huge number of gullible and uncritical  
thinking folk that we are in a Ufo-illogical Dark Ages.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 10:26:30 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:42:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Lehmborg

>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 12:34:00 +0100 (BST)  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 19:08:37 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>>From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:33:42 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>>>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>>>>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>>>>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

>>>><snip>

>>Really - I was all set to be 'cerealized' and have the CC  
>>phenomenon go the way of the dodo... but I was singularly  
>>unimpressed with Mr. Williams in toto, and only reminded of  
>>what I wrote regarding Robert Nichol's doc:

>>"...And Crop Circles get faked. Sure. But, when those 'fakes'  
>>occur... don't we, generally, know who the fakers \_are\_? Don't  
>>\_they\_ tell us who they are? Don't they strut and crow and  
>>smirk and patronize?"

>>"Spin me a Catherine-Wheel, again - 'Doug'!"  
>>Stomp out an additional Adams Grave, for me - 'Dave'."

>Hi Alfred,

>Sorry if in the end all of my hype was an anti-climax; it wasn't  
>for me.

Of course not. You were not first piqued by weeks of  
anticipation. <LOL>

>It is true that Matthew isn't the most sympathetic of people at  
>times and there is undoubtedly an arrogance there. But a liar he  
>isn't.

I submit that you don't have to be a liar to be as I've  
described. You can strut and crow and smirk and patronize... and  
still be the very soul of honesty in so far as it is perceived  
by the person regarded.

>All that is happening here is what happened when he first stuck  
>his head above the ramparts; "go away you irritating little  
>creep - you're spoiling the fun".

Not at all. As one of those self-same "little creeps" myself and  
reluctant to buy in when 'giants' indicate their blessing? I'm

provoked to say, "Go away you irritating little creep, because you are not trumping that which has preceded you, answering the questions rationally asked by sincere truthseekers you seem to gleefully derogate, or in any way addressing the science investigating same. Go away because you offer nothing but ersatz ammunition to klasskurtxians. Go away because your criticism is depthless, dimensionless, and unimaginative. Go away because your experience is singular, and your objections sound to-much like an Andy Roberts re-run. Fun, really, has nothing to do with it.

>Many months ago Alfred I was pretty much where you are and I'm  
>speaking now about Ufology et al. I took note however of  
>developments, applied a rational approach, and moved on.

It remains, Stuart, that it could be you are moving on in the wrong direction... like any one of the rest of us. Like you; however, I can think and I can wait.

I appreciate your candor in expressing your thoughts on these matters, considering you a man of honor and intelligence, if I may be bold. I don't think you grind the obdurate klasskurtxian axe, by any means, but you are still a grain of sand on the beach, a sunny beach <g>, reporting to the other grains of sand a grain of sand's explication. I suspect Mr. Williams' grain of sand might be taken with the obligatory grain of salt.

"Not only queerer than we imagine," to quote Haldane, "queerer than we can imagine." Mr. Williams is just not queer enough. Neither are his protestations.

>I am  
>most certainly not a skeptic but just a more grounded  
>'believer'.

A 'skepti-liever'? A 'be-skeptic'? <g>

>No one can force you to open-your-eyes,

Or force me to close them either...

>but there  
>is a danger of isolation. Ufology in my opinion is growing up  
>and maturing; don't get left behind!

That's the least of this poet's problems, Stuart. With respect, I submit I may leave behind me what select others still perceive far to their front. I offer Mr. Williams may be one of these persons. I remain decidedly unimpressed. It may be the gentleman can fake the crop circle. But is he the crop circle? I suspect not.

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 16:38:53 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:45:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shough

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 07:08:31 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Abductions and close encounters of all kinds have been going on  
>since before humans started recording history. In every case  
>they have been interpreted through the cultural filters of the  
>place and time. They were gods, demons, angels, whatever as the  
>culture demanded.

The existence of these experiences and belief systems is a phenomenological fact. The idea that there is causal continuity underlying this phenomenology brings in a class of hypotheses, and it isn't clear that they would be mutually exclusive. One such hypothesis is the cultural determinism you mention, but the questions of if, and how, it may interrelate with other determinants seems to me to be an open and very complicated question.

>Today we're taking our first feeble steps from the surface of  
>this planet, so we interpret things through that cultural  
>filter. But that doesn't mean we're any closer to the truth  
>than people were thousands of years ago.

It's possible that it does mean this, to the extent that evolution of our scientific world view is deemed as getting "closer to the truth". Yes this is a vast philosophical quagmire, but for present purposes I suppose we all know what we mean by it. Are we closer to the truth in understanding (say) ball lightning than we were in ancient Greece? There's obviously a sense in which we are: Instead of fiery dragons, spirits and signs in the heavens we have technical papers and experiments with plasmoids - still lots of speculation, but something has changed, and largely because a few decades ago science chose to start looking at BL through a different cultural filter. This was theory-driven, not evidence-based. It's possible that ETH is the appropriate cultural filter whose time has finally arrived. But . . .

>I view the ET hypothesis as unnecessary.

In a situation of ignorance all hypotheses not refuted remain necessary.

>There is certainly  
>enough time in the planet's past for intelligent life to have  
>evolved more than once.

Yes, there is possibly enough time. If intelligence did evolve, where is it now (when witnesses are not glimpsing it whizz by)? Could it be in outer space? Given intelligence, technology and time it could be. In fact extending your supposition, there is enough time in the cosmic past for that intelligence to have



gone to (say) the opposite galactic rim and back. And if it did, would we be able to distinguish its visits from ET via observational evidence? Would the distinction have any clear meaning?

Does having remote ancestral biochemistry in common with us disqualify such off-world intelligences as "genuine" ETs? In a universe where life evolves spontaneously twice in one place we should assume that it might as easily evolve spontaneously in another similar place, and so life anywhere will be traceable (ex hypothesi) to a common remote ancestral physics.

If an alien evolution also invented quasi-DNA with the same basic structure, would they be real ETs or merely remote cosmic cousins who don't count? Where do we draw these lines, and how exactly does the drawing of them help to construct testable hypotheses?

>But that's only one thought. Some  
>physicists believe that time travel is not only possible, but  
>possibly not that difficult.

Some physicists believe that space travel is not only possible, but has actually been done. Another civilisation could possibly do it too.

>Maybe traveling through time is  
>easier than traveling vast distances through space.

Of course all travel is space-time translation, and evading the relativistic limits on this process would (will?) mean an unpredictable revolution in the significance of distance and duration both.

>Maybe the  
>hypothesis of parallel universes explains things.

It doesn't. One day it might, but presently there is no way to test between this and ETH, which is deeply connected to the facts mentioned above.

Is this a "parallel universe" which is an exact copy of this universe? Evidently not, as it contains (you imply) creatures who in some sense are coming here, whilst we are not going there. So they have a "technology" that we don't; or they don't have a technology and just get here "naturally" - like elves or maybe like some intelligent interdimensional shape-shifting plasma-blob - it matters not because how could we tell the difference between a "natural" and "technological" means? Define both "nature" and "technology" generally enough to do that for unknown agencies of unknowable scientific sophistication and possibly unlimited cosmic history (given the type of "multiverse" speculation we are talking about).

But let's try to stay economical: Do they come from a "parallel Earth", then? How can we tell? If it is a parallel but different universe, does it then have a cosmic galactic, stellar, planetary architecture or some analogue? If so who else lives in it? "Where" are their worlds in relation to ours? If they are also "parallel" (what does that mean?) are they offset to the left by 6 inches, or displaced infinitesimally in the 11th dimension or whatever? What are the cosmic traffic laws about visiting here from there, and how do they differ from the laws governing travel between two places "over there" by tunnelling through here (or conversely, two places here by tunnelling through "there")? If they are "merely" passing through, are they then not ET? Again, how could we tell? Suppose "they" came here ("here" meaning somewhere in our universe - name a random location) aeons ago in our terms: Are they then ET, or not? Or what if they evolved here, then went there? What if the entire notion of "going" (i.e local spacetime mass translation) is a redundant archaism subsumed in the physics of the process they employ?

>Or maybe, and  
>personally I think this most likely, there is an explanation we  
>haven't even thought of yet.

Quite possibly, but an idea no one has yet thought of does not make ETH "unnecessary" now. The main problem with ETH is that it is too rich. You can argue that particular types of ET theory

have particular types of problem. But in general, none of the ideas we have thought of make ETH unnecessary, because none of them is itself both necessary and clearly exclusive of it. And you can never rule out that an explanation we haven't thought of yet will turn out to be some transform of a thing we thought of before, arrived at by thinking (necessarily) about it.

"We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to return back where we started and know the place for the first time." --Elliot

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Watson

From: Nigel Watson <[nigelwatson1.nul](mailto:nigelwatson1.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 16:40:46 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:47:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Watson

>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 12:10:04 +0100 (BST)  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>From: Nick Pope <[nick.nul](mailto:nick.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:53:23 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 10:45:53 +0100 (BST)  
>>>Subject: UFO Review Issue #16

>>>The latest issue of UFO Review, issue 16, is now available  
>>at:

>>><http://www.uforeview.net>

>>>And in this issue we have:

>><snip>

>>>2. "I'm A Bastard Crop Circle Faker Maker, A Government  
>>Agent, And A Serious Pain In The Ass (for Special Branch)"

>>>One of the long forgotten men of Ufology, Matthew Williams is  
>>>still alive and well and living down in Devizes.

>><snip>

>>I'm concerned about a comment Matthew Williams made about a  
>>woman he alleges is stalking him. Matthew names this woman and  
>>says he's tempted to "smash her in the face".

>>I don't know if you checked his allegation, and perhaps his  
>>comment was 'tongue in cheek', but I don't believe you should  
>>have published this cowardly and distasteful remark.

>Hi Nick,

>I don't expect you to respond to this point but I'm beginning to  
>suspect that you might be familiar with this lady, possibly  
>through your work with abductees?

Hi List People,

This case shows the difficulties experienced by UFO  
investigators. In the past I generally interviewed high-  
strangeness experiencers with a friend or colleague. This was  
partly to get another opinion and for a bit of protection.

Some people I met were mentally disturbed. Such people can  
easily fixate on you. As a ufologist they see you as a person  
who can confirm their opinion of the world and use you to say  
their doctor or health workers are wrong. It is easy to get  
involved in a situation that can get out of control and have an

adverse impact on your life and of the experiencer.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/07/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:59:36 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:51:33 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/07/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 67  
June 7, 2006

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

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* CIA NAZI FILES RELEASED  
\*\* CRS VIEWS THE JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

CIA NAZI FILES RELEASED

Some 27,000 pages of Central Intelligence Agency records regarding operational relationships between the CIA and former Nazis following World War II were disclosed yesterday at the National Archives.

The release was announced by the Interagency Working Group (IWG) on Nazi War Crimes, which was created by a 1998 law. The IWG, which has previously overseen the declassification of eight million war crimes-related records, is chaired by former Information Security Oversight Office Director Steven Garfinkel.

The latest release almost failed to occur due to CIA recalcitrance.

"In 2002, the CIA declared that it was no longer going to follow the criteria observed since 1999 for all the participating agencies in the IWG declassification project [and that] henceforth it would produce files relating only to individuals whom we could prove had personally engaged in war crimes," recalled IWG member Richard Ben-Veniste.

"For 18 months the IWG tried to persuade CIA that its unilateral redefinition of its obligation was erroneous and unacceptable," he said.

This obstacle was eventually overcome thanks to the intervention of the sponsors of the original legislation -- Senators Mike DeWine (R-OH) and Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) and Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D-NY) -- and the effective support of Porter Goss, who had just become the new CIA Director.

CIA spokesman Stanley Moskowitz said the Agency was now committed to full disclosure regarding the historical record of CIA's connections to Nazis.

He said that when the declassification process is completed at the end of this year, "we will have withheld nothing of substance."

(Mr. Moskowitz himself was once the object of unwanted disclosure when, to the dismay of Agency officials, he was publicly identified as the CIA station chief in Tel Aviv. See

"CIA Station Chief in Israel Unmasked," Secrecy & Government Bulletin, Issue 75, November 1998.)

"The relevance of today's disclosures [on Nazi war crimes] to the issues this Nation faces today is striking," suggested IWG member Thomas H. Baer.

The question the documents raise, he said, is: "To what extent, and under what circumstances, can our Government rely upon intelligence supplied by mass murderers and those complicit in their crimes?"

Initial assessments of the new disclosures were prepared by four historians for the Interagency Working Group, each of which includes several of the newly declassified documents. See:

"New Information on Cold War CIA Stay-Behind Operations in Germany and on the Adolf Eichmann Case" by Timothy Naftali, University of Virginia:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/eprint/naftali.pdf>

"Gustav Hilger: From Hitler's Foreign Office to CIA Consultant" by Robert Wolfe, former archivist at the U.S. National Archives:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/eprint/wolfe.pdf>

"Tscherim Soobzokov" by Richard Breitman, American University:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/eprint/breitman.pdf>

"CIA Files Relating to Heinz Felfe, SS Officer and KGB Spy" by Norman J.W. Goda, Ohio University:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/eprint/goda.pdf>

For more information on the Interagency Working Group on Nazi War Crimes see:

<http://www.archives.gov/iwg/>

#### CRS VIEWS THE JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

"The Defense Department's F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) is one of three aircraft programs at the center of current debate over tactical aviation, the others being the Air Force F-22A fighter and the Navy F/A-18E/F fighter/attack plane," explains a newly updated Congressional Research Service (CRS) report.

"The JSF program is a major issue in Congress because of concerns about its cost and budgetary impact, effects on the defense industrial base, and implications for U.S. national security in the early 21st century."

Each of those matters is explored by CRS in "F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program: Background, Status, and Issues," updated June 2, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/weapons/RL30563.pdf>

See also "Proposed Termination of Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) F136 Alternate Engine," April 13, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/weapons/RL33390.pdf>

Congress does not permit direct public access to products of the Congressional Research Service.

---

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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul) with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](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](http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html)

email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Reason's Reasoning

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 16:08:27 +0000  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:54:30 -0400  
Subject: Reason's Reasoning

Note: My brother (PhD, sociology) supplied these comments as a favor to me, and does not wish to become involved in a debate. I concur with what he says, and would add or elaborate that there are unscientific scientists in every field. Also, some of the social/behavioral scientists do have a well-defined body of knowledge, others perhaps not. He has provided a number of specific examples.

I might add that at one point Bob was a program director in sociology/social psychology at the National Science Foundation, and he is very attuned to scientific method and practice.

- Dick

-----

From: Robert Hall  
To: Dick Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Subject: Reason's reasoning  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 10:14:15 -0400

Dick:

No matter how many times I review what Ms. Reason is saying, I am unsure of what she means. Hence I find it difficult to help you with a reply. It seems to me that the problems here are primarily ones of the philosophy of science and epistemology, which are more your field than mine. To suggest cases of issues resolved, I need to know what constitutes an "issue" and what constitutes "resolution."

If "resolved" means settled permanently with no further change or refinement, I doubt that we can accept the premise that physics and chemistry have resolved issues. If "resolved" means attainment of a temporary consensus (or near consensus), then there are real differences between physical sciences and social/behavioral sciences. So she may have a perfectly legitimate point. The differences between physical and social sciences are largely the result of a much later start in the latter and far less financial support.

Also a part of the difference, I believe, is in the nature of academic "disciplines." "Consensus" depends heavily on whom you include in the population who must agree. The people who are included as chemists or physicists do have a core of shared methods and knowledge. The people who are included as sociologists or political scientists or anthropologists include many who follow scientific methods, both in theory construction and compilation of empirical evidence, and they also have a core of shared methods and knowledge.

However, those considered sociologists or political scientists include, in addition to the scientific ones, many who are more in the tradition of humanities. So in these fields you have some who reject scientific methods and the conclusions drawn from those methods and some who reject ideas unless they are supported by scientific evidence. If you use a criterion of consensus, then those in disciplines such as physics and chemistry probably do more often attain good consensus on



"issues" (depending on what we mean by "issues").

You can still have a good consensus among the scientifically oriented social scientists on those rare issues that have been researched carefully and extensively. That takes us back to the relative lack of financial support and relatively short time that it has been possible to pursue scientific approaches to social "issues." You might note that in subfields such as the prehistoric archeologists within anthropology, the reliance on hard science is strong, and I believe that you can find substantial agreement in areas where there has been much research.

Of course you will still find disagreement on specifics, such as whether a civilization under study occurred 3,000 years ago or 10,000 years ago. Sorry that I cannot be of more direct help. I have the feeling that there is no way to make progress in understanding Cathy Reason's reasoning short of face-to-face discussion in which she is forced to answer a lot of questions.

Bob

-----

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 13:52:24 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:55:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Jeff Olson <[jlolson.nul](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 17:12:22 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>Deduction is still part of the scientific method. If it looks  
>>like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it is  
>>most likely a duck.

How about a really good hologram of a duck? Or a decoy duck? Or a robot duck? Or something else that goes out of its way to imitate a duck?

The duck analogy sounds good but anybody who really thinks about it for a few minutes can see it's a crock.

<snip>

>>You have certainly provided no reason. I have no idea why you  
>>are averse to the notion of ET spacecraft.

>Because magical thinking is more fun? And besides, what if one  
>doesn't like ducks?

Clearly you can't tell the difference between "magical thinking" and actually doing some thinking.

And I like ducks just fine. No problem with ducks - even if they are in my back yard. But everything with webbed feet that leaves tracks in my back yard isn't a duck - I like to know I'm really dealing with ducks first instead of just assuming it.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 14:28:42 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:58:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Ledger

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 19:36:08 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>I've certainly played my share of Frisbee golf, where even a  
>concave-bottom flying disk requires high revolutions to fly and  
>still flips over at slow speeds. Most disk-shaped craft,  
>including Project Silverbug, which evolved into the AVRO saucer,  
>never make it above the boundary layer.

Tim,

The last sentence is not correct. The boundary layer is the  
adhesion points over a lifting surface where that surface  
produces lift. The air clings to a thin boundary-molecules  
thick- as it flows over just above the lifting surface. You are  
talking about "ground effect" out of which the Avro Car never  
made it, or "climbed above". Ground effect [a cushion of air]  
is different for each wing foil shape and area; say 10 feet AGL  
for a Cessna 172 [because that's what it is] as opposed to 100  
feet for a Boeing 747.

>The only thing that might work would be a gyro-stabilized radial  
>wing design that allows for changing the blade attack angles  
>during rotation (like a helicopter blade), but that doesn't fit  
>the descriptions.

But that, of course, is old hat and inefficient. Just  
dragging/pushing a body through the air and supporting it with  
lift [wings come in handy here] is still the most efficient  
method we have when time [speed], fuel, distance, payload times  
the number of dollars are factored in. Even air forces use this  
method. If you don't believe me, go to an international airport  
where you will see hundreds [or thousands, depending on the AP]  
of examples over the course of a day.

>But I'm not even suggesting a jet or propeller drive. Hey, I'll  
go for anti-gravity or antimatter-plasma- fusion-magnetic  
propulsion.

Plasma is not a fuel or a source of propulsion. It's a by-  
product. Fusion would be a fuel source. And why would you go  
with the previous mixture of drives, fuels and effects?

>But I can't and won't assume those things were built by aliens,  
>either.

I've seen that statement in a few forms by both you and Eugene.  
Who then might be building them?

>People can be mighty clever all on their own.

Not that clever, at least up until the last couple of years, and  
even then..... You are not seriously suggesting that over the  
last few hundred years, but more specifically the last 60, that

these things are the product of "secret, experimental, military craft" are you?

I didn't think anyone was still using that as an argument. that dog won't hunt.

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Object In Manitoba Sky Nets 100 Calls - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 14:39:36 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 22:00:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: Object In Manitoba Sky Nets 100 Calls - Ledger

UFO UpDates - Toronto wrote:

>Source: The Winnipeg Sun - Manitoba, Canada  
><http://tinyurl.com/gsbo5>  
>June 7, 2006

>Object In Sky Nets 100 Calls  
>By Adam Clayton, Staff Reporter

>The Manitoba Museum has been flooded with phone calls from  
people who spotted a strange object in the sky.

<snip>

I've been doing an incident search for pilot reports of this  
bolide or fireball and there were none for that evening.t least  
none were formally reported. Perhaps the bolide's flight  
duration was too short.

Anyone with info should contact Chris Rutkowski who is working  
in conjunction with the University of Manitoba's Astronomy  
department whose staff have some hopes of pinpointing the impact  
point.

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 22:04:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

<snip>

>>And I can think of several positive reasons to believe the  
>>things are manufactured on Earth. They are apparently made of  
>>the same materials and elements found on Earth. If someone has  
>>some Element 115 at home in their sock drawer, I'm sure we'd all  
>>like to see it. They are usually proportioned to accommodate  
>>human-sized creatures. Even if they exist in some kind of quasi-  
>>realistic, transdimensional state, they apparently exist enough  
>>within our own reality and limits of physical perception that we  
>>can see them, occasionally take pictures of them, and find dents  
>>in the ground or burned plants where they've been.

>What makes you say they are made from the same materials found  
>on Earth? Same elements maybe. But there are, for example, many  
>materials presently made on earth that couldn't have been made  
>50 years ago. Ask Intel . Do you have some such material from a  
>flying saucer? Have you seen analysis thereof ? The Roswell  
>witnesses indicate materials with extraordinary light weight,  
>high strength, great resistance to being cut, burned... Are  
>these more of the hypothetical, theoretical ,science fiction  
>devices of which you are speaking?

>snip

If I might add a comment and illustration here and there. The  
point Tim, is that there are defining points at which our  
technology and their technology take separate branches. that  
vertex point, the one that separates ours from there's, does  
need better definition and distinction so that we don't get  
caught up with this false belief that it Could possibly be  
ours!. If not, we have to come up with great observations: One  
of the reasons I stress the need for good data on UFO  
behavior... witness testimony, triangulation, distance, speed,  
etc. But, getting a mass value on an unknown craft is rather  
more difficult . .

In any case, one concept, in particular, needs explanation:

Power Density. Some of the instantaneous observations made on  
UFO behavior suggest a power source way beyond our ability to  
construct in a controlled fashion. If a 5,000 Kilogram craft  
moving at 2,000 meters a second made a reverse turn in a 2  
millisecond burst over a distance of 20 meters, that would

require an output power of:

1) Acceration/Deceleration = Change in Velocity divided by time.

$$A = +2,000 - (-2,000)/2^{-3} \text{ seconds} = 2 \text{ million meters/sec}^2$$

2) Force = Mass X acceleration

$$F = 5,000 \text{ Kg} \times 2,000,000 \text{ meter/sec}^2$$

$$F = 10,000,000,000 \text{ Newtons}$$

3) The Amount of work required is: Work = Force X Distance, the above times 20:

$$\text{Work} = 200,000,000,000 \text{ Newton-meters} \quad \text{But, } 1 \text{ Newton-meter} = 1 \text{ joule}$$

So we have: 200,000,000,000 Joules of Energy!

4) But, the Energy Required (The above) has to be delivered over the entire time interval: Therefore, we get:

Work divided by time =  $1 \times 10^{14}$  Joules/sec of momentary ouput  
... That's:

$$100,000,000,000,000 \text{ Watts!}$$

That's 1,000,000,000,000 (100 watt bulbs)

Since 746 watts = 1 Horse power, That's:

268,096,515 million 500 Horse power Engines running at full power!

Can we fit that type of Energy in a 30 foot Craft? No way! So, this is the whole point I'm making on Energy Density! But, please take my illustrative example with a litte grain of salt:0 My own belief is that these are much too high! It's the concept I was most interested in pushing and this gives us all a better feel for the concept at play here.

By the way, a nuclear engine can put out about: 40,000,000,000 Watts so we're way above that too! That would be 2,500 Nuclear Powered Rocket Engines. Did anyone say where's all the fuel?

At some point, depending upon which numbers I put into the above equations, we will obtain power densities that are achievable and within our current abilities. That's the vertex point I was discussing above.

By the way, one of the reasons many speculate on mass or inertial reduction as a means of achieving such maneuvering capability, is that the energy requirements would come way down to our current levels of use and density. However, in order to reduce mass or inertia would require advances in our current understanding of Physics and then the correspondingly steeper curve of applying that new knowledge and developing useful technologies from it... still very very difficult! A vertex point way above our understanding! And, is it evan possible?

Another reason people stress inertial dampening, is the simple fact that no material (human flesh included) could probably handle the stresses I've entertained in the above example. We could've easily calculated stresses too (close) and found another vertex point for the material strength requirements. Also, the fuel requirements, etc...

BTW, one has to be able to convert this energy too from others forms. Not too mention direct it/absorb it in such a way as too not inadvertently convert it into wasted energy in the form of heat which would have easily vaporized the above craft before it ever had a chance to turn around or evan begin to stop.

By the way, this all alludes to one of my first posts on UFOupdates. This does a better job of explaining it though... let me know?

Someone can check my math too. : )

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 12:27:33 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 07:09:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>I'm not advocating any explanation for the UFO phenomenon so I  
>don't need evidence to support or prove any particular  
>explanation. All along I've simply been saying the ET hypothesis  
>should be questioned as the only answer and there are plenty  
>of both cases and research results to justify questioning it.

This is not directed at you Stan, but the discussion in general:

How disappointing, I thought I would open up e-mail under this  
subject line and find people discussing the different between  
UFO (i.e., you don't know what you are looking at therefore it  
is not identifiable to you) from flying saucers (the shape of  
something you saw flying in the sky, but never on the ground).

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 07:13:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:22:49 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>>origin.

>They don't "look and act like known Earthling produced vehicles,  
>therefore they were produced somewhere other than Earth which  
>means they are of ET origin"? Did you really just say that,  
>Stan? I can't believe you are trying to present this as logic.  
>You base all of your arguments here on bogus logic like this  
>which means it is absolutely pointless in trying to have a  
>logical debate with you.

Sorry Eugene, but I didn't know you were appointed the logic  
judge. You have made a number of comments but have been  
unwilling to provide any evidence to support them. Why should I  
accept your proclamations as a substitute for reason and  
evidence?

>>Their presence is the proof. We know they aren't from here so  
>>they are of ET origin. that is the logic.

>If there were only two possibilities - them (assuming, first, of  
>course, that 'them' really are flesh and blood entities and real  
>spaceships) being from here (Earth) or there (outer space) then  
>you might be able to use this logic.

If they are not produced here on Earth then they were produced  
somewhere off the earth. That is what ET means. That they could  
be from dozens of different places for dozens of different  
reasons using many different propulsion systems doesn't change  
it. Of course, as I have said, there are UFOs as opposed to  
flying saucers that, after investigation, turn out to be of  
astronomical, earthtech, balloon, searchlights on clouds, etc  
etc origins. Many chemicals aren't useful in treating any  
disease. Fortunately some are.

>But there are more possibilities than these two and so you have  
>no logic.

Either clearly manufactured objects behaving under intelligent  
control were manufactured here on Earth or someplace other than  
on Earth i.e. they are of ET origin. What other choice is there?  
A five dimensional parallel universe is still ET. A time  
travelled craft is still not from here now.

>It's just that you don't want to acknowledge the

>other possibilities - your reasons for dismissing them are weak,  
>at best and, for the most part, don't even exist as valid  
>objections. Your logic stands if only the two possibilities  
>exist. But tons of blur zone cases, other categories of  
>genuinely anomalous UFOs, and valid research results  
>suggest other possibilities. Thus, your logic is not logic.

Again who are you to judge? Based on what?

>>Yes, the fact is the observations indicate beings and craft not  
>>from here, therefore from off the earth, which by definition  
>>means ET.

>This is so ridiculous, it isn't even funny! I'm losing all  
>respect for you as a scientist. None of these are 'givens'.  
>There is absolutely no logic in what you are saying - only the  
>very thin appearance of logic. You start off with pure  
>assumptions. Ignore valid research. Then jump to totally  
>unfounded conclusions.

I asked for specifics about Roswell and about MJ-12, you gave none. Here you are again making proclamations with nothing behind them. Should I worry about your respect for me as a scientist? I take it I should assume that you belong to the American Nuclear Society, The American Physical Society, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics?

>The things you assume as starting points can only be gotten to  
>by roping off a very tiny portion of the UFO picture - ignoring  
>those nuts and bolts flying saucers types that have unusual  
>bizarre characteristics and that don't fit into your perfectly  
>defined spaceship category (the huge amount of cases in the blur  
>zone) and ignoring all other categories of UFOs - and I'm not  
>talking about IFOs or misperceived mundanes when I mention these  
>other categories. You then also - without any proper  
>justification for doing so - dismiss and/or ignore research that  
>shows other possible explanations may exist for the phenomenon  
>you're focussing on. Finally, you jump to unfounded conclusions  
>without any evidence whatsoever (other than the 'givens' which  
>you can't even properly get to) and call this leap of faith  
>'scientific deduction'.

>>I can't find the logic. This is not even good science fiction  
>>and no evidence has been put forth to support this.

>No evidence? Do you mean evidence like this (the kind you  
>offer): "Thousands of abductees and physical trace case  
>witnesses from all over the world describe beings that don't  
>look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act like no  
>known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were produced  
>somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>origin."?

>Because this is all you have been offering to support your  
>premature (unfounded) conclusion that some UFOs are ET  
>spaceships. You're just guessing!

Deduction is not the same as guessing or proclaiming.

>I'm not advocating any explanation for the UFO phenomenon so I  
>don't need evidence to support or prove any particular  
>explanation. All along I've simply been saying the ET hypothesis  
>should be questioned as the only answer and there are plenty  
>of both cases and research results to  
>justify questioning it.

Only answer to what? Many UFOs are non ET spacecraft. Certainly. Again that is as useful as saying often Barry Bonds doesn't hit a home run, or many isotopes aren't fissionable, or many chemicals cure no disease.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - White

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 16:43:14 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 07:14:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - White

>From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 02:29:33 +0100  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

<snip>

>As to crop circles, Matt and his team can make any size any  
>shape with enough people. The most men and women I am aware of  
>worked on a big circle a couple of years ago had about 40  
>working together - a gathering of crop artists for the season's  
>grand finale.

Without footprints, and with the precise interwoven lay of stalks, and with stalks exhibiting the "exploded nodes" observed, and at the level of precision and complexity clearly evident in the larger glyphs?

I doubt it. If a large group of people tried at night, they would be stumbling all over themselves and would still not achieve the woven/exploded node evidence.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 22:56:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 07:20:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:14:45 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>I suggested some time ago that if you rescale the distant  
>>landscapes, which means reducing #3 by about 6% in relation to  
>>#2, the UFO in #3 (flange diameter estimated by reference to  
>>proportionality of #1) still appears to be about 7% larger  
>>than in #2. On the face of it this seems inconsistent with the  
>>sequence as reported. It could be consistent with the camera  
>>moving closer to a small model just beyond the window, since  
>>the window width has enlarged at the same time by almost 5%  
>>between #2 and #3. This should be taken as a minimum value for  
>>the difference in range between lens and window since, as I  
>>pointed out, there is a very small perspective foreshortening of  
>>the window width in #3. Allowing for this, it isn't ruled out that  
>>the proportion change in angular width of the UFO and of the  
>>window frame have not only the same sign but the same exact  
>>value.

>I get the exact opposite result from Martin. Once #3 has been  
>rescaled so that the distant features match up in size, I end up  
>with the object in #3 being about 4-5% smaller than in #2.  
>This would place #3 further away from the camera, which is  
>consistent with Heflin's account.

>... I don't understand why we're getting different results  
>here unless it is because we are using different measurement  
>methods. I originally got about the same result as you when  
>attempting to judge the disc diameter on #3 direct from the  
>(rescaled) photo. But there is some subjective uncertainty about  
>the gross disc width of #3 because of the limited pixel  
>resolution and the indistinct edge of the flange where it blends  
>into the sky tone. (Using the scans in the JSE paper which are  
>the best I have.) On the other hand the dome is not clearly  
>shown in #2, so we have to try to compare unlike quantities. To  
>get around this I used #1 to find the relative width of dome and  
>flange and used this to generate an overall disc diameter of #3  
>from the more accurate dome measurement. By this method I still  
>get about a 7% increase, which I feel sure is larger than the  
>error bars due to the uncertainty in the poorly-resolved edge  
>positions.

Hi David

I looked at this yet again, using the same procedure and  
ignoring all previous measurements. I rechecked the landscape  
rescaling for #3 and conclude I had it pretty exact the first  
time at 94%. I also remeasured the disc and dome proportions  
from #1 to get 70.9% (the same as last time). Using 500% blow-  
ups I then measured the dome of the rescaled UFO #3 ,and  
applying this proportionality to find the disc width I now get  
an increase in #3 over #2 of just over 106%, pretty close to  
last time.

But squinting for a while at the very coarse pixel resolution  
you soon realise there's some subjectivity about which pixel

edge you choose to represent the slightly blurred edge. I might have been making similar pessimistic assumptions each time. So I did this again making deliberate;y different choices that might tend to favour a closer result. I then got 42.3 mm for the disc width in #3, rescaled to 39.8 mm, compared with 39 mm for #2. This gives a value of about 102% for #3 over #2.

So that's it. I feel fairly confident that the true value - for the pair of scans I am using - is somewhere in the range 102-106%. At the moment I can't see how any better measurement or method will trim between 7 and 11 percentage points off this. Any ideas?

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Engraved In Stone - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 19:30:24 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 07:22:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Engraved In Stone - Balaskas

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 11:19:03 +0000  
>Subject: Engraved In Stone

>Forwarded Messages:

>From: John B. Carlson <[Tlaloc.nul](mailto:Tlaloc.nul)>  
>To: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>Subject: Fwd: Engraved in Stone  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 00:29:28 -0400

>From: Dr. E. C. Krupp <[eckrupp.nul](mailto:eckrupp.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:59:29 -0700  
>Subject: Engraved in Stone

>Uncritical news reaction to the press release promoting a rock  
>art depiction of 1006 A.D. supernova suggests there is actually  
>evidence to support this assertion. A more skeptical analysis is  
>posted at the [\\_Sky & Telescope\\_ homepage,](#)  
><[www.SkyandTelescope.com](http://www.SkyandTelescope.com)>.

>Petroglyph panels like the White Tanks panel are not rare. There  
>is no reason to link it to any supernova event. There is nothing  
>persuasive about the imagery to support the extraordinarily  
>detailed claim. The authors say nothing about all of the other  
>imagery on the boulder and select two details for their  
>discussion. These two details are in themselves dubiously  
>interpreted.

>There is no reason to conclude the "supernova" symbol is a star  
>at all. It could be a sun symbol (more likely) or something  
>else.

>There is no reason to conclude the "scorpion" petroglyph is a  
>scorpion. This is not an explicit depiction.

>Even if the "scorpion" petroglyph is a scorpion, there is no  
>reason to conclude it is a celestial scorpion.

>Even if the "scorpion" petroglyph is actually a celestial  
>scorpion, there is no evidence it represents the stars of  
>Scorpius. There is no evidence to suggest the prehistoric  
>Indians of the American Southwest saw a scorpion in the stars of  
>Scorpius.

>This 1006 A.D. supernova petroglyph interpretation is assumption  
>and wishful thinking. There is no way to test the  
>interpretation, and the authors' suggestion that chemical dating  
>could strengthen the case is wrong. Even were the date  
>consistent with the beginning of the eleventh century, a  
>consistent date confirms nothing about iconographical meaning.

>Stung by supernovae,

>E.C. Krupp

Hi Everyone!



I fully agree with Dr. Edwin Krupp and thank Richard Hall for sharing Krupp's skeptical rebuttal with those of us on the list. Just because John Barentine (Apache Point Observatory) and Gilbert Esquerdo (Planetary Science Institute) tells us this petroglyph depicts the 1006 supernova, it's so does not mean it's true.

A simple 'Google Images' search will yield many petroglyphs with different symbols that can have as many interpretations as there are "experts" like Barentine and Esquerdo. There is no easy and simple way to determine which interpretation is the correct one, especially those petroglyphs depicting no more than a couple of very simple or crudely drawn symbols.

I wonder how astronomers Barentine and Esquerdo would interpret those petroglyphs that seem to depict human-like entities and flying saucers or other hi-tech symbols. Would they consider this as possible evidence of man's early contact with ETs or would they simply ignore it altogether not wanting to risk making themselves look foolish?

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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 18:36:52 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 07:27:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Sent: Wednesday, June 07, 2006 5:55 AM  
>Subject: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>Source: Grand Forks Herald - Minnesota, USA

><http://www.grandforks.com/mld/grandforks/news/14757502.htm>

>Wed, Jun. 07, 2006

>Marshall County, Minn.:

>'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>Producers from History Channel to visit historical museum today

>By Susanne Nadeau  
>Herald Staff Writer

>Late one August night, almost 30 years ago, a mysterious flash  
>of light bore down on a Marshall County deputy as he was  
>patrolling the western edge of the county.

>The light lasted only a few minutes, before Sheriff Deputy Val  
>Johnson, who was driving along Minnesota Highway 220, lost  
>consciousness of time.

<snip>

"Source: Grand Forks Herald - Minnesota, USA"

For the sake of accurate geography and bibliography, Grand Forks is in North Dakota, not Minnesota. It sits just west of the North Dakota-Minnesota border, not far from the Canadian border and the province of Manitoba.

Its sister city (though entirely separate municipality) is East Grand Forks, which is in Minnesota on the other side of the Red River. The Grand Forks Herald is published, of course, in North Dakota.

It's good to see the Val Johnson CE2, one of the most impressive and puzzling UFO cases, get some new attention. Fortunately for all of us, it was ably investigated and documented (by Allan Hendry, then of CUFOS).

Another, strikingly similar encounter occurred late on the evening of May 10, 1961, on a rural road just south of Osakis, Minnesota. Unfortunately, all we know about it is a clip from an obscure local paper.

Jerry Clark

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 21:51:32 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 07:38:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial

>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 01:25:28 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thursday, June 01, 2006 4:03 AM  
>>Subject: Aliens UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'

>>Source: Darren Ethier's Blog

>><http://www.gohpc.net/wordpress/?p=22>

>>Tuesday, May 30, 2006

>>Aliens, UFOs And The Extraterrestrial 'Conspiracy'...

>>I just finished reading the book, Alien Intrusion, by Gary Bates  
>>last night. The summary and title of the book intrigued me  
>>because from childhood I have always been interested in stories  
>>involving 'ETs' (extraterrestrials) and UFOs. I remember doing a  
>>presentation on UFOs as a project for one of my classes in high  
>>school. The reason why this book interested me is because I  
>>discovered a website for it advertised in the Creation  
>>Ministries International flyer that I recieved in the mail and  
>>after checking it out I thought the book would be worth a read  
>>(because of my already piqued interest in ETs). Here's the  
>>description found on the back of the book:

<snip>

>I'm completely blind-sided by this.

>Does anyone on the list know much about the book, or its writer  
>Gary Bates? I had never heard of either.

Hi Larry! Hi Everyone!

Below is my post to the UFO UpDates List about a past scheduled  
talk by this Australian UFO researcher/author:

---

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2004/oct/m22-012.shtml>

A few months later I had the pleasure of hearing Gary Bates talk  
about his findings regarding UFOs and alien abductions here in  
Canada. I spoke to him briefly after his talk where he signed a  
copy of his book 'Alien Intrusion' which I had purchased and  
read about a month earlier. Another e-mail I sent to a select  
group of people but not the UFO UpDates list is included at the  
end of this e-mail reply.

'Alien Intrusion' is just one of many so-called Christian books  
on the subject of UFOs and alien abductions. One of several well  
researched and very convincing books which I have also read that  
has a very similar message and conclusion to 'Alien Intrusion'

is 'Alien Encounters' by Chuck Missler and Mark Eastman. These and many other important UFO books by "Christian" researchers seem to have been overlooked by nearly everyone, including many ufologists. They are certainly worth reading and pondering over.

Nick Balaskas

---

Date: Tue, 19 Apr 2005 15:15:21 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
To: <snip>  
Cc: <snip>  
Organization: York University  
Subject: Alien Intrusion

<snip>

This Saturday I will be driving out to Kitchener to hear Gary Bates from Australia, author of 'Alien Intrusion', speak at the two day AiG conference (see URL below for further details). If he Gary is right about CEIII cases, and I believe he is, we now know the identity of these "ETs or aliens" and why they are interested in us and are involved in abducting humans, etc.

<http://tinyurl.com/ozoaz>

Let me know if you would like to come along.

You can also hear Gary speak about UFOs on the radio (2:30 p.m. on Oakville's JOY 1250 AM radio station which can also be heard in Toronto) earlier that same day. Gary returns to Australia again in May.

<http://tinyurl.com/pb8rn>

Last Saturday I was in Hamilton at another two day conference except this one had an Orthodox Christian perspective. The main speaker was Hieromonk Ambrose, previously known as Father Alexey Young (a close friend of the late Father Seraphim Rose who authored 'Orthodoxy and the Religion of the Future' which deals with UFOs and also indentifies who these ETs or aliens really are).

<http://tinyurl.com/pzzzf>

Father Ambrose was kind enough to answer my questions about some of the ETs or aliens of the past, and in particular the Nephilim which are mentioned in the Bible and talked about in more detail in the writings of the Church Fathers. I have tracked down their collected commentaries about the Nephilim as mentioned in Genesis in a single volume at Redeemer University College in Ancaster, Ontario. I hope to check it out soon. The Nephilim have never left Earth and some accounts by present day monks have related encounters with them that to me differ very little from so-called "UFO or alien abductions".

I will not be driving to Washington, D.C. later this month. I was there last October for a search of alleged UFO wreckage and alien bodies beneath the Capitol and UFO documents at the National Archives. Later this month I will be going to Ottawa instead for Easter (Orthodox Easter Sunday is never before Passover and this year is on May 1).

---

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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Russo

From: **Edoardo Russo** <[e.russo.nul](mailto:e.russo.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 08 Jun 2006 09:31:38 +0200  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 10:04:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away - Russo

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 16:42:44 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Karl Pflock Passes Away

>He managed to maintain a sense of humor even while inflicted  
>with ALS [ALS, Lou Gehrig's disease] - motor neurone disease  
> - and his pungent writings both in 'Saucer Smear' and in  
>the book 'Shockingly Close to the Truth' were a joy to read.

Ciao Christopher and all,

As soon as I learnt of this diagnose by reading "Saucer Smear", last year, I wrote Karl to express my deepest participation and friendliness to him since - besides being an active ufologist for more than 30 years - in the last 10 years I've been the moving force for the local branch of the Italian ALS association, since the day my younger brother was diagnosed with ALS.

As far as this damned rare disease, I know of only another fellow ufologist (and a friend of mine since many years) who was killed by ALS: Michel Figuet had been a long-time UFO investigator since the 1970's and was author of a 1979 monmouth-book cataloguing and summarizing all close encounter reports in France, a catalogue he had actively kept updating until 2001. [You may have read of his personal sighting testimony of 1965 or around, when he was on a French Navy submarine, since it was among the "best cases" Jacques Vall=E9e took to the Sturrock panel.]

Now Karl has joined Michel and maybe they're now enjoying each other's well-known sense of humour and self-irony, a rare ability in ufology and one they both were gifted with and kind enough to share with us.

R.I.P.

- - -

Edoardo Russo  
Centro Italiano Studi Ufologici  
CISU, Casella postale 82, 10100 Torino  
tel 011.30.78.63 - fax 011.54.50.33  
<http://www.cisu.org>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 11:31:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

>Source: Grand Forks Herald - Minnesota, USA

><http://www.grandforks.com/mld/grandforks/news/14757502.htm>

>Wed, Jun. 07, 2006

>Marshall County, Minn.:

>'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>Producers from History Channel to visit historical museum today

>By Susanne Nadeau  
>Herald Staff Writer

>Late one August night, almost 30 years ago, a mysterious flash  
>of light bore down on a Marshall County deputy as he was  
>patrolling the western edge of the county.

>The light lasted only a few minutes, before Sheriff Deputy Val  
>Johnson, who was driving along Minnesota Highway 220, lost  
>consciousness of time.

>A few minutes grew into half an hour - 40 minutes, before  
>Johnson became aware of the night again, and when that happened,  
>damage had been done to his eyes and his squad car.

>The cause of the light has remained a mystery since August 1979.  
>And it's been the subject of much speculation. Enough  
>.speculation to draw the occasional interest of publications and  
>television producers, according to Ethel Thorlaciuss, the  
>director of the Marshall County Historical Museum.

>Today, Thorlaciuss said, producers from the History Channel will  
>be visiting the museum, which houses the squad car Johnson was  
>driving that night.

>The car retains unusual damage, she said, from a broken  
>headlight to a long dent in the hood, a hole in the windshield  
>and an antenna bent at a 45-degree angle.

The Val Johnson case, which occurred in August 1980 (not 1979)  
is one that the late (lamented?) Philip J. Klass wrote about in  
his aptly named book, UFOs, The Public Deceived (1983). The book  
was aptly named because he deceived the public in several  
instances, this being one of them.

In his book Klass gave an accurate, straightforward accounting  
of the case and then stated that it was either a hoax or the  
"real thing" involving aliens that did damage to the car. From  
his writing it is clear that Klass "favored" the hoax  
explanation. Several years after the publication of his book I  
challenged him to write to the chief of police of Warren, MN to  
inform him that Johnson should be charged with damage to public  
property because he (Klass) had proved over and over that there  
were no ET's flying around so the damage must have been done by  
Johnson, who was a practical joker.

(A practical joker? Where did Klass get that idea? Klass talked to another policemen at Warren and learned that Johnson might do something for laughs, like hide your coffee cup.) So far as I know Klass never took up my challenge.

For those of you without access to Klass' book I have quoted the penultimate paragraph/conclusion (preceded by a summary of the case an evidence) at:

[www.brumac.8k.com](http://www.brumac.8k.com)

Click on Papers and scroll down to, Prosaic Explanations: the Failure of UFO Skepticism.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Morton

From: Dave Morton <[Marspyrs.nul](mailto:Marspyrs.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 21:52:02 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:23:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Morton

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:22:49 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>>Yes, the fact is the observations indicate beings and craft not  
>>from here, therefore from off the earth, which by definition  
>>means ET.

>This is so ridiculous, it isn't even funny! I'm losing all  
>respect for you as a scientist. None of these are 'givens'.  
>There is absolutely no logic in what you are saying - only the  
>very thin appearance of logic. You start off with pure  
>assumptions. Ignore valid research. Then jump to totally  
>unfounded conclusions.

>The things you assume as starting points can only be gotten to  
>by roping off a very tiny portion of the UFO picture - ignoring  
>those nuts and bolts flying saucers types that have unusual  
>bizarre characteristics and that don't fit into your perfectly  
>defined spaceship category (the huge amount of cases in the blur  
>zone) and ignoring all other categories of UFOs - and I'm not  
>talking about IFOs or misperceived mundanes when I mention these  
>other categories. You then also - without any proper  
>justification for doing so - dismiss and/or ignore research that  
>shows other possible explanations may exist for the phenomenon  
>you're focussing on. Finally, you jump to unfounded conclusions  
>without any evidence whatsoever (other than the 'givens' which  
>you can't even properly get to) and call this leap of faith  
>'scientific deduction'.

>>I can't find the logic. This is not even good science fiction and no  
>>evidence has been put forth to support this.

<snip>

What an incredible waste of time.

They might live under the earth (not likely), which is ET since  
they don't live on the earth and don't interact with us in the  
usual, earthly ways.

They might be from the earth coming from its past or future -  
which is still ET because it's not "earth now".

They might be from a parallel universe, which is ET because  
they're not from this universe.

They might be from another dimension, which is ET because  
they're not from dimensions known to us.

They might be from other planets in other galaxies.

A few recent lights in the sky might be military vehicles.

Whatever scenario you pick, most or all of the flying saucers are not from around here. They are from somewhere else.

Stan, thank you for your cogent arguments and use of deduction. I think some sophomores are just trying to pulverize you for the fun of it - as a rite of passage into adulthood. They have not succeeded, but doubtless think they have.

Dave Morton

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 05:53:55 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:27:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Golubik

>How the actual camera automatically works and can be manually  
>manipulated is also an open question. The closest recommended  
>shot with the camera is three feet. The fastest shutter speed  
>1/1200 sec. I'm not sure on the directional sensitivity of the  
>detector until I play with it. What type of shutter was it...  
>I'll let you know. There is the added property of affecting the  
>exposer by waiting a different length of time before peeling  
>back the opposite half of the film. The impact of this also has  
>to be explored.

Maybe I missed it in all the verbiage that this thread has  
generated, but exactly which model Polaroid camera were these  
photos supposed to have been taken with? I'd like to look up the  
specifications.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 06:00:02 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:29:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Shell

>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 10:09:16 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>I am concerned that this discovery of 'alien life' may turn out  
>to be a physics experiment that accidentally escaped from the  
>lab. Now that it can interact and compete with the indigenous  
>life on our planet, the consequences of this accidental (or  
>intentional?) release of this alien life could be a threat to  
>our survival worse than a real alien invasion.

Maybe, Nick, but these "red rains", "rains of blood", etc., have  
been happening for thousands of years. See the work of Charles  
Fort for many reports. And there have been regular reports of  
this phenomenon since Fort. It appears to be a natural, if  
uncommon, phenomenon.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 11:11:32 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:30:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>>From Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:32 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Golubik

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:14:45 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>>No, no, no! If the order of the photos is reversed, the 3D does  
>>\_not\_ become inverted. Otherwise the most distant objects would  
>>become the closest; the closest objects (like the window and  
>>mirror) would be way off in the distance. If you think about it  
>>for a moment, this would be absurd.

><snip>

>It's not absurd if you've ever looked at free floating 3D  
>images. . . and you miss my point again... if you've ever  
>reversed the left with the right I'm saying it would be obvious  
>to determine this. Reversed 3D images create a concave-like  
>effect. If I used "inverted" it is to convey some of the  
>activity that occurs. If you can't show someone, then we have to  
>come up with some terms that describe or inspire a connection  
>with the effect. It's not absurd... its conveys my point (swap)  
>beautifully!

This is correct because the angular relationship between  
foreground, mid-ground and background objects is different for  
each eye. David's feeling that it is absurd stems from the  
reasonable idea that if you look at the world standing up, then  
look again when hanging upside down with eye positions reversed,  
the view will not pop inside out. The hills will stay far away.  
But the situation with two photographs is different because the  
fixed perspective relationships in each view are not  
transferable.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)





# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 06:20:21 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:32:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Power Density. Some of the instantaneous observations made on  
>UFO behavior suggest a power source way beyond our ability to  
>construct in a controlled fashion. If a 5,000 Kilogram craft  
>moving at 2,000 meters a second made a reverse turn in a 2  
>millisecond burst over a distance of 20 meters, that would  
>require an output power of:

I didn't check your math, but I wonder why you assume so much weight. Jess Marcel and others who handled bits of the Roswell wreckage have all emphasized it's extraordinarily light weight.

I think one important part of the equation has to be that this assumed 30 foot craft might only weight a few hundred pounds, not five tons.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:06:15 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:33:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Hall

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:24:01 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network,  
>>which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous  
>>scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very  
>>thorough and always sought first to find a conventional  
>>explanation for each case.

>It seems like the old days had a much higher number of  
>creditable participants than present day. Also, it seems like  
>your journal and other historical preservation efforts are  
>almost like the efforts of monks during the Dark Ages to save,  
>for some future time of Enlightenment or Renaissance, the "old"  
>knowledge of humanity's past golden age of greatness and works.  
>Today, it seems with the huge number of gullible and uncritical  
>thinking folk that we are in a Ufo-illogical Dark Ages.

I like your analogy! Feeling very monkish these days.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 09:03:12 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:36:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 23:45:08 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 18:06:16 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 21:49:40 +0100  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>>>Rex Heflin revealed that he  
>>>was a been model maker and Dr Black commented that it was quite  
>>>possible to fake a photograph and then forget about it.

>Sorry about that - it was a result of scanning the text from the  
>faded, stencil duplicated, typewritten pages of a prehistoric  
>copy of MUFOB. The word is 'keen'.

I just wanted to add a comment here concerning this show. I had an opportunity to view the segment on Rex Heflin last night at Richard Hall's. I happened to be visiting the University of Maryland which wasn't too far from his residence. I hadn't gone there specifically to view the tape but was simply coming by to say hello and one thing lead to another.

Rex Heflin answered some critical questions put to him in a responsible manner. He stated that he was open to the investigative process and that it was also part of his job and nothing foreign to him. He appeared straightforward and unperturbed by the criticism.

The interview was conducted on the location of the sighting which made it very interesting for me. (see below).

The first segment of the interview appeared unbroken followed by another segment where he was apparently answering questions about model building. It was obviously selected or sound bited in such a way as to put him in a bad light. He was simply answering questions about model building (apparently while growing up as a youth). I think a large population of men would have answered these types of questions in a similar manner. He did interject that he hadn't the time anymore to enjoy these types of hobbies.

While he was answering these 'unheard' questions they cut to some shots of model trains (this part of the video had some problems due to the tape having been caught in the recorder earlier downstairs. They had apparently taped these on location while at his house.

Reinforcing the above, I don't recall hearing the interviewers

questions during the initial part of this segment (curiously different from the first segment) since they were cut out of the broadcast. It was more disjointed and selective in nature. I think this was simply done on purpose to make the viewer unaware of the true nature of the questions being placed to him. In any case, Heflin answered them honestly and to his credit

I wish I could watch it again to confirm some of my post impressions. Perhaps Richard could add a few comments to confirm these observations. I was rather tired and still had an hour's drive home ahead of me.

Dr Hartman was also part of the first major segment. He briefly recreated the Heflin shots using a dangling model on a string (wind blowing pendulum action in play and rotations appearing that increased the apparent period of the swing as different

In any event, this wasn't a very detailed analysis. You could plainly see the string during the live taping, but the still shots on the Polaroid weren't being commented on in such a way as to reveal to the viewers whether or not this string was also visible. Perhaps Dr. Hartman commented on this but it was cut out of the broadcast also? To me, this would have been an argument in their favor! So, in my way of thinking, the string must have shown up on his (Hartman's) Polaroids even though we couldn't see them on the stills presented. Correspondingly, this would have made their arguments weaker. (Black/Hartman)

In reality, if Hartman hadn't commented on the string, this would again be another clear sign of an apparently objective scientist appearing to be going after the truth when, in reality, not doing so. Was he asking himself the right kinds of questions was the interviewer not that astute? I would have drilled Hartman on these aspects. I also thought the string that they were using was rather thick too.

He did comment on the great depth of field which is obvious to anyone familiar with cameras/film speed... so why not comment on the string too... it should have been in focus also (Heflin#1). I couldn't really tell if the UFO recreation they had showed was actually in great focus? He did appear to be much less than three feet from the model when he took the shot. That it was still in focus was the point he was driving at... so why no comment on the string as well? Perhaps, it is because they already knew it hadn't shown up in the originals? (1968)

Why three feet? I believe you can't get any closer than three feet from your subject with this camera. At least, that is what is recommended. Actual tests are warranted though.

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](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## NUFORC 1974 - 1977

From: Wendy Connors <[fadeddiscs.nul](mailto:fadeddiscs.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 10:23:31 -0600  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 12:41:02 -0400  
Subject: NUFORC 1974 - 1977

Greetings Fellow Listarians,

Just a reminder for your summer enjoyment that the NUFORC Case Recordings for 1974-1977 are available in a limited edition.

Compilation includes 252 mp3 recordings comprising a total run time of over 44 hours. Also, a guide to each recording is included for print out.

This is solid, raw, in-your-face, meat and taters Ufology of witness interviews conducted by Robert Gribble. This material is for the most discriminating and serious researcher that desires the audio history to complement the written history. Rediscover the fun of Ufology you once knew and appreciated.

The following link will take you to the audio listing:

<http://www.fadeddiscs.com/gribble02.html>

Thank you for supporting the Audio History of Ufology Project and Give Your iPod and Yourself a Summer Treat! You will not be disappointed!

Wendy Connors  
[www.fadeddiscs.com](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 08:37:50 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 13:17:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Fleming

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:24:01 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network,  
>>which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous  
>>scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very  
>>thorough and always sought first to find a conventional  
>>explanation for each case.

>It seems like the old days had a much higher number of  
>creditable participants than present day. Also, it seems like  
>your journal and other historical preservation efforts are  
>almost like the efforts of monks during the Dark Ages to save,  
>for some future time of Enlightenment or Renaissance, the "old"  
>knowledge of humanity's past golden age of greatness and works.  
>Today, it seems with the huge number of gullible and uncritical  
>thinking folk that we are in a Ufo-illogical Dark Ages.

And do you suppose that the present situation can be blamed on a recent increase in the breeding rates of the UFO nuts that you enjoy bashing so much? If so, your knowledge of history is also at a dark age level. By all accounts I've read there were just as many "gullible and uncritical thinking folk" associated with the UFO phenomenon in the "golden age" as there are now, perhaps even more. The real difference between then and now is that there are far fewer serious scientists and technical people investigating UFOs now, not any increase in uncritical thinking.

The decline of serious investigative organizations is the direct result of the government efforts to quell public interest in the subject as recommended by the Robertson Panel report. As everyone should know, those efforts reached their successful culmination with the release of the infamous Condon report - or more specifically the release of the report's executive summary, which had nothing to do with the evidence presented in the body of the report. Since the scientific establishment enthusiastically accepted Condon's assertion that science had nothing to gain by studying UFOs, few scientists have wasted their time on UFO studies that they know cannot get funding and will never be published in peer-reviewed journals.

Starting in the 1950s, the government and the academic hierarchies wished to bring the study of UFOs into disrepute. They succeeded completely, as groups with large amounts of political power ususually do. The fact that so much time is spent on this list remarking on how disreputable UFOlogy is evidence of their great success.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

### An Operation By Strange Entities In Argentina?

From: Scott Corrales <[lornis1.nul](mailto:lornis1.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 09:55:50 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 13:21:48 -0400  
Subject: An Operation By Strange Entities In Argentina?

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology  
June 7, 2006

SOURCE: CIUFOS-LA PAMPA  
DATE: 06.06.06

Argentina: An Operation By Strange Entities?

E.R., 50, lives with her husband in La Pampa and on April 18, 2006 began to feel herself affected by intense back pain.

4 days after being in said condition, she went to a local clinic where she was treated by a doctor who detected=97after a thorough checkup=97a considerable inflammation the the liver, bladder, pancreas, kidney and left lung, issuing a primary diagnosis: pancreatic cancer. She immediately ordered tests which were evaluated by another professional and confirmed the diagnosis. The physician began to administer medications.

In spite of this, E.R.=92s condition worsened, compelling her to remain at rest in her bedroom. While listening to the sound of the TV set coming in from the dining room, she entered into a crisis and felt herself floating toward a very large, white light. When she was about to be absorbed into the light, she felt herself being "...snatched away by several shadows..." who told her mentally that "...this was not the time..."

At that moment she was able to see the figures clearly, realizing at the same time that she was somewhere else and not in her bedroom.

Fully lucid and awake, she was able to observe that she was lying on a sort of platform, oval-shaped and bathed in an intense light which seemed to be suspended from a type of structure or support a meter and a half in diameter, silvery-colored and seemingly metallic.

Around this platform she noted the presence of the 5 beings who debated the critical condition of her health.

One of these beings stood at her left and the remaining 4 on he right. These indicated that "...there was no other alternative other than to go in..."

After this, the being on her left introduced one of its long, thin arms into E.R. on her left side under her ribs, while she was held by her arms, legs and head.

She felt that something was "...torn out and dragged..." from within her body, causing intense pain. The extracted materila was given to the other beings. The intense pain was followed by a feeling of emptiness and gradual relief that permeated throughout the entire area.

While she clearly remembers the physiognomy of the beings, she has also been able to recall some of the statements they made: "...from this moment on you will put aside all medications..." and "...from this moment on you will be a different person..."



After a period of time she could not determine, she regained consciousness, this time in her bed, able to hear the sound from the television set.

Upon remembering her experience, she began to touch the affected area and felt a void, as though something was missing. Upon pressing her body, she felt the characteristic pain that follows an operation.

Two days after the experience, E.R. got up from the bed on which she had remained for nearly a week, noticing that her pains were almost completely gone. The next day she went to the clinic for a consultation with the physician, requesting an immediate clinical examination.

With the results in her hands and after the corresponding review, she attested to the noticeable reduction in her condition=92s levels, while experiencing a slow by steady recovery, stressing that she has no answers that may account for the change or development observed.

As far as the beings are concerned, E.R. states that they were tall, thin, with long slender arms. Their heads were medium-sized with a pronounced volume in the occipital region. Their mouths were small, like their noses; eyes were medium-sized, slanted, very dark; smooth angular faces, small chins, with no visible cheekbones.

No clothing was visible. Their bodies were lead-blue in color and their movements were swift.

E.R. did not notice any hands, and was uncertain about the use of instruments during the procedure. She did remember noticing a small isolated platform to the left of her location: it was seemingly metallic, silver-hued and very bright.

Finally, it should be noticed that E.R. was under strict treatment due to a severe cardiopathy with arterial lesions and persistent hypertension.

At present she has continued with her daily life. Her body is stabilized with some ups and downs, and she has not taken any medications.

-----

Translation (c) 2006 Scott Corrales, IHU  
Special thanks to Raul Oscar Chaves

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

### Strange Experience Of Argentina's Julio Oscar

From: **Scott Corrales** <[lornis1.nul](mailto:lornis1.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 09:56:17 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 13:25:48 -0400  
Subject: Strange Experience Of Argentina's Julio Oscar

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology  
June 7, 2006  
SOURCE: CIUFOS-LAPAMPA  
DATE: 06.05.06

The Strange Experience of Julio Oscar  
by Raul Oscar Chaves

Julio Oscar, 48, married, a resident of the province of Buenos Aires (Argentina), moved to La Pampa in the month of July 2005 to be reunited with his sister Rosa after a separation of over 20 years.

His body has been affected by his hard life of farm labor. A lung operation was necessary due to his work venting seeds in grain silos; his right leg underwent surgery to correct a limp caused by a permanent muscular contraction. The surgeries had taken place in Bahia Blanca's Penna Hospital.

In his relative's house one day, watching the TV by himself in the dining room, a sudden blackout occurred followed by the sudden appearance of a sphere of light measuring some 10 cm in diameter on the wall beside the television set (which was mounted to the wall). The brightly-hued orb vanished in a matter of seconds and the power was restored; an intrigued Julio Oscar had dinner and continued watching TV before going to bed. The time was approximately 22:30 hrs.

A few days later, while removing wallpaper from the top of a ladder, his body began to experience tremors which persisted until dinnertime. This caused him to take to his bed.

The time was 22:00 hours and he was alone again. The cause of the tremors: unknown.

He turned out the light on his nightstand. An intensely bright light measuring 40 cm across appeared over the windowsill at that time. It diminished in size as it placed itself over his body, only centimeters from his skin, scanning it, moving up and down from head to toes. Thoughts entered his mind, expressions such as, in his own words: "me querian llevar" ("They wanted to take me away").

The next morning, Rosa approached his bed concerned about his silence, as Julio was an early riser. She ascertained that he was motionless and unresponsive to external stimuli and questions, presenting a very high temperature.

After a while, Julio was able to open his eyes. Trying to articulate a coherent sentence, he told his sister: "...they came to take me away, they wanted to take me and you weren't there..."

Skeptical by nature, he did not understand the experience he had undergone nor did he remember details that would allow him to reach one conclusion or another.

Trying to forget the event, Julio returned to his everyday

activities, walking more frequently and for longer distances, also riding a bicycle.

It should be mentioned that the muscular contraction in his affected leg kept him from walking normally, and his pulmonary insufficiency only allowed him to cover the length of a block in two or three installments, during which he would stop to catch his breath and regain strength.

He gained weight, his movements became normalized and only a slight limp could be observed.

Visiting First Aid Center, he decided to return home on foot, covering a distance of over 40 city blocks in an hour and a half, stopping only once to regain his strength. Three months later, Julio returned to his hometown with his body almost completely restored, and a visible change in personality from considerable skepticism and total lack of faith to the permanent use of a Rosary given to him by his relatives.

Did the unusual experience affect his life? No doubt, when we take the foregoing into consideration.

-----

Translation (c) 2006, S. Corrales, IHU  
Special thanks to Raul Oscar Chaves)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

### Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 10:34:26 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 15:35:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

In reference to my previous posts. I just wanted to add, that in the proposed pendulum characterization I've outlined, separate rotations of the object (small model in this case/and outside the plane of the photograph), where the suspended model was not exactly horizontally suspended, any rotations of the object would most likely contribute to vertical blurring on both sides of the photo simultaneously. In Heflin's photo#1, it only shows up on the right side. So, again, it still passes muster. However, actual tests are still warranted to account for additional components in the swing action that may diminish this effect.

Just to make another point more clear from some of my earlier posts: The higher the actual speed of the shots are determined to be, the less likely it is that they were faked. In other words, the stopping action of the camera was so high that it would not pick up routine blurring of a faked UFO dangling and blowing in the wind. Since (apparently) blurring shows up in Heflin#, this is still evidence in favor of Heflin (we caught the UFO in a quick maneuver etc), despite pendulum action/(wind) of a dangling object at close range, that we might attempt to infer is causing that blurring, as I've outlined previously.

Once I determine, with actual film and camera, what the detection limit on various strings types and thickness are in reality, we will be able to properly gauge this aspect of the case more clearly and exactly what I've been doing since I began reanalyzing this case.

The reason the pendulum action becomes a better means of separating the close up model vs the far away real object, is simply because some string arrangements may not show up on film (likely). In that case, as I've already outlined, we need the support of other physical artifacts/evidence from the Heflin photos (unusual blurring) that can further and more definitively support his claims (pendulum in the wind modeling).

By the way, Martin Sough did notice this blurring also. But in my case, I'm also attaching more significance to it as it relates to separating out a close up model vs a far away object (Pendulum modeling): Trying to use this small and recorded aspect as a means to help Heflin's claims... a filter, if you will... we can calculate instantaneous velocity whether close of or far away. And, in that way, find some extraordinary laying dormant in the 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Jesse Marcel & Interview By Tom Horn

From: Tom Horn <[tomhorn.nul](mailto:tomhorn.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 09:33:10 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 15:41:08 -0400  
Subject: Jesse Marcel & Interview By Tom Horn

My engineer tried to fix the sound problems but due to technical issues with the interview, portions of the audio in the interview I did with Jesse Marcel Jr. had to be removed.

No conspiracy, just something funky with the microphone.

I am scheduled to interview Col. Jesse Marcel Jr. again, this time live on the Q-Files - July 7, 2006. If you would like to submit a specific question, to be asked during that program, email your question to me at [raidersnewsupdate.nul](mailto:raidersnewsupdate.nul) and provide:

1) your first name; and 2) the State you reside in (Example: John, from Texas).

A limited number of listener submitted questions will be accepted for the live program.

Meanwhile I have posted the parts of the original audio that was salvaged here:

<http://www.raidersnewsupdate.com/marcel.htm>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update -Yturria

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:56:47 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:05:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update -Yturria

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 14:28:29 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 02 Jun 2006 18:13:57 +0000  
>>Subject: Mexican FLIR Footage Update [was: MSNBC's Cosby Show]

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>To: Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Thu, 1 Jun 2006 09:03:53 -0400  
>>>Subject: MSNBC's Cosby Show

>>>Some of you may have caught the Rita Cosby Show last  
>>>night on MSNBC between 10 and 11 PM EST.

<snip>

>>>I saw portions of the FLIR video from Mexico over  
>>>and over (this section of the Mexican DOD sighting  
>>>is probably ground lights, at least the Mexican AF  
>>>hasn't reported on any experiments or data that  
>>>would prove otherwise)

>>The Mexican Airt Force doesn't have to prove  
>>anything, Sir. You've only done your own personal  
>>study and analysis of the footage, not the whole  
>>case. In the end your results reflect only your own  
>>personal conclusions which don't establish, in any  
>>way, the true facts of what happened that day in the  
>>Campeche air space.

>My "personal study and analysis" was done at the  
>request of the Mexican Air Force (through Jaime  
>Maussan). My analysis is posted at my web site:

Incorrect. Your involvement in this case in terms of a personal  
study and analysis was not requested by the Mexican Air Force  
but just by Jaime Maussan and following my advice even before  
the case was made public. As Jaime's personal advisor I  
sugessted to invite some external sources to the investigation  
in order to have diferent points of view and get a wide approach  
to the case.

Some results were presented during the meetings on those days  
and some others were discarded as irrelevant. Your personal  
study and results were considered but still remain inconclusive.  
The personal notes you provided to Jaime Maussan suggesting the  
posibility of some lights at ground level were discarded for the  
reasons I explained before and discussed many times.

>It may be true that the Mexican Air Force  
>doesn't "have" to prove anything. However, I should  
>think they would want to answer any questions related  
>to the March 4, 2004 FLIR sightings. I did analyze  
>the footage and also the verbal comments and managed  
>to reconstruct the history of the sighting.

Same as other colleagues we invited to the investigation and certainly the same work we did with our research team. You were not the only one and at the end some of your results were considered and some others not.

>I also provided analysis that showed A) the initial  
>radar target is unexplained (radar UFO) and B) the  
>FLIR lights were very likely distant and may have  
>been as distant as the oil field fires about 100  
>miles away.

As I mentioned your personal conclusion proved to be inaccurate and without solid basis as it fell into speculation and not facts.

>After I submitted the first draft of my analysis to  
>the Mexican DOD in the summer of 2004 I was told they  
>were "happy" with it.

Don't get a wrong idea. You were told by Jaime Maussan and it was him who was " happy " with your colaboration but not satisfied with some of your conclusions because they did'nt match most of the other results we received on this case from other sources and certainly did'nt match our own studies.

I was there and have been always there in this investigation and only you mentioned the oil field theory wich resulted laughable even for the Air Force officials.

>I also made several suggestions as to experiments  
>they could do with their system to prove or disprove  
>the oil field theory. I was never told that they did  
>any such experiments, even though various types of  
>experiments could have been carried out as part  
>of their routine surveillance, such as flying along  
>the same track again. (Better yet would have been  
>flying from a location over the oil field toward the  
>area where they had the sighting while recording the  
>appearance of the oil fires.) I was told, without any  
>evidence to support the statement, that "we fly in  
>that area all the time and don't see oil fires" or  
>something like that. Well, if that were true, you'd  
>think they could have sent me a copy of one of their  
>FLIR video recordings made while flying in that area  
>so I could compare it with the "UFO" FLIR video.

You are certainly asking for a "proof of life" to change your whole conception of the case and conditioning your criteria to certain evidence that convince yourself you were wrong all the time about those oil field possibility wich at the end it's not of our interest.

If you reject the facts we have been publishing authorized by the Air Force in the sense that many subsequent flights over that area proved the mysterious lights have not appeared again that's your privilege.

You don't have to believe us and we don't have to believe you either.

>I have said that I analyzed the video and found that  
>the FLIR light images were at least partially  
>consistent with being ground lights a long distance  
>from the aircraft (ten or more miles). I have  
>concluded that the oil field flare theory is  
>a possibility which must remain a possibility until  
>proven otherwise by data such as I have requested.

I agree but must add it will remain a possibility to you not us. It's your right and your privilege.

>and not shared by many other sources - as important  
>and vauable as yours might be. You may be convinced  
>by your own study but that will not change anything  
>in this case as your opinion is not fact, just a  
>theory like the others.

>True, my opinion may not be "fact" but it is based on  
>the facts of the case, as nearly as I can discern the  
>facts.



>>Here in Mexico we conducted a complete investigation  
>>along with the original source that is the Mexican  
>>Air Force and they provided much co-operation on this  
>>research including subsequent flights over the zone  
>>in very similar conditions and never found anything  
>>unusual - the phenomena never repeated and the FLIR  
>>cameras didn't register those mysterious lights.  
>>Do I need to say more?

>So, further investigation was carried out by the Air  
>Force. Wish I had been informed.

>After the dozens of hours I spent on the analysis it  
>would have nice to be able to prove something about  
>the FLIR lights. (The experiments I requested were  
>not difficult or time consuming.)

If this is a matter of a single issue that a new flight over  
that are recording with the FLIR camera results negative, that  
no light appear an any time then it's been said and done. Not  
one time but many times. Not just after March 5, 2004 but even  
before during months of flight operations by the Air Force over  
South Mexico.

These issues were the first ones to be considered at the  
beginning of this investigation just to be sure there were no  
similar precedents like this one. Simple routinary procedure in  
our research.

As a matter of fact during his own investigation the Air Force  
instructed subsequent flights over the Campeche aerial space  
after March 5, 2004 to be alert and record all the flight  
incidents in case those unknwn luminous objects would appear  
again and to get as much data as posible.

The mysterious lights didn't appear again.

We have mentioned this over and over a hundred times as  
confirmed facts. It's not fair to ignore our participation in  
this research and also the Air Force own informations. Then you  
have been informed.

>>To ask for a "test flight" of the Mexican Air Force  
>>is naive and nonsense as they have national  
>>priorities like their anti-drug operations and can't  
>>deviate from their programs and budgets to please a  
>>foreign request in order to prove something not  
>>included in their agenda. This is easy to understand.

>So they can request that a "foreigner" spend lots of  
>time analyzing data that provide only part of the  
>story but don't have the time to provide the data that  
>prove "the rest of the story" (data that demonstrate  
>the failure of the oil field hypothesis).

Wrong again. The Air Force did'nt request anything from you. The  
request was made by Jaime Maussan under the terms I explained  
before. The data that proved the rest of the story as you say  
has been made widely public here in Mexico on national  
television to the mexican people who incidentally don't have any  
doubt about the authenticity of the case. The same way the oil  
field hoax was exposed as well as the hoaxer and his motives  
many times on national television and radio with facts and  
evidences.

Unfortunately living on the US you have'nt been aware of all the  
developments and updates of our research on this major case and  
that's why I mentioned the insufficient data problem. However we  
recognize and thank the value and honesty of your colaboration  
even that we have diferences in our concepts.

>>However the Mexican Air Force and the Mexican DoD  
>>have been kind enough to provide us results on their  
>>subsequent flights over that area, including more  
>>FLIR footage confirming the phenomena has not  
>>repeated or replicated since March 5, 2004.

>>This response from the Air Force was according to the  
>>mutual agreement of co-operation in this  
>>investigation and they respected their comittment  
>>according to the rules established.

>What you say above suggests that you have video FLIR  
>data that disproves the oil field hypothesis. Then, I  
>say, bring it on. Show us FLIR video taken when the  
>plane was flying in the same area and the same  
>direction (eastward) and looking in the same  
>direction (toward the oli field) and under comparable  
>weather conditions which shows no oil fires.

Then we agree. A simple video will disqualify de-facto the extremely weak oil field hypothesis. After so many allegations a simple video will prove how wrong and definitely naive was this hoaxer that invented such ridiculous ilussion proving at the same time how naive were those who believed that fantasy.

You see what I meant?

By the way - the oil field flames hoaxer had that same opportunity to prove his theory once for all to the world on that infamous tv show by National Geographic. The chance of his life but failed trying to recreate a similar flight and unable to get those mysterious lights on camera he deviated the airplane far away from the actual site and placed the plane over an oil plataform in the ocean just to pretend these were the lights the C26A FLIR camera recorded that day.

This was the end of his debunking campaign. Nothing more to say.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 18:16:53 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:06:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Shough

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>For those of you without access to Klass' book I have quoted the  
>penultimate paragraph/conclusion (preceded by a summary of the  
>case an evidence) at:

>[www.brumac.8k.com](http://www.brumac.8k.com)

>Click on Papers and scroll down to, Prosaic Explanations: the  
>Failure of UFO Skepticism.

Thanks Bruce.

As well as the Val Johnson piece I was also entertained by your Arnold paper - enumerating the six different explanations championed successively by Menzel - or several at least; two or three of them seem (insofar as one can tell) to be versions of mountain lee wave phenomena with different knobs on.

One quote from Keay Davidson re the daylight fireball theory also bears comment. This is the idea that a seasonal and diurnal meteor rate maximum occurring in June in the afternoon "lends support" (as Klass said) to the theory. But fireball rates (different from the zenithal hourly rate of ordinary shower meteors) vary such that in the northern hemisphere the peak occurs at the vernal equinox (March), and the diurnal peak is always in the early evening, not in the afternoon.

eg: <http://www.imo.net/fireball/rates>

Well I suppose the end of June (the solstice) is nearer March than some other dates! And 1500 hrs is nearer 1800 than some other times of day. But in any case the ranges of both variations are only about a factor 3 at best, and fireballs (mag -3 or more) are not such a common sight that the statistical peak is a very useful predictor. Moreover a daylight fireball (mag -10 or more) is a very much rarer thing again.

I can't see that this statistical fudge has any force in the argument (without prejudice to whether Arnold saw a daylight fireball or not).

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Scheldroup

From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:25:37 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:10:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Scheldroup

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>>>And I can think of several positive reasons to believe the  
>>>>things are manufactured on Earth. They are apparently made of  
>>>>the same materials and elements found on Earth. If someone has  
>>>>some Element 115 at home in their sock drawer, I'm sure we'd all  
>>>>like to see it. They are usually proportioned to accommodate  
>>>>human-sized creatures. Even if they exist in some kind of quasi-  
>>>>realistic, transdimensional state, they apparently exist enough  
>>>>within our own reality and limits of physical perception that we  
>>>>can see them, occasionally take pictures of them, and find dents  
>>>>in the ground or burned plants where they've been.

>>>>What makes you say they are made from the same materials found  
>>>>on Earth? Same elements maybe. But there are, for example, many  
>>>>materials presently made on earth that couldn't have been made  
>>>>50 years ago. Ask Intel . Do you have some such material from a  
>>>>flying saucer? Have you seen analysis thereof ? The Roswell  
>>>>witnesses indicate materials with extraordinary light weight,  
>>>>high strength, great resistance to being cut, burned... Are  
>>>>these more of the hypothetical, theoretical ,science fiction  
>>>>devices of which you are speaking?

<snip>

>100,000,000,000,000 Watts!

>That's 1,000,000,000,000 (100 watt bulbs)

>Since 746 watts = 1 Horse power, That's:

>268,096,515 million 500 Horse power Engines running at full  
>power!

>Can we fit that type of Energy in a 30 foot Craft? No way! So,  
>this is the whole point I'm making on Energy Density!

The equivalent energy density stored in a small planet would not  
be enough to be cause for anything but tiny tiny changes which  
affect the moments occupied by the surrounding space in gravity

(weak), for that matter... generate any potentially high-energy force-fields without an equivalent drop in mass contained thereof a small planet.

Perhaps no more energy required then what space already has then, but how then is gravity coupled what particle to tighten up space-time?

Then there's that steering problem again, where does all the mass momentum meet,... exchange back into what sized bottle again?

This planet full of transfer will fit into what? Oops! Forgot my space helmet stop! Turn around... fast or slow? You want the handy-sized soylent green chips or just plain human spread? <g>

John

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Gehrman

From: **Ed Gehrman** <[egehrman.nul](mailto:egehrman.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 10:43:47 -0700  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:12:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Gehrman

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:22:49 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>But there are more possibilities than these two and so you have  
>>no logic.

>Either clearly manufactured objects behaving under intelligent  
>control were manufactured here on Earth or someplace other than  
>on Earth i.e. they are of ET origin. What other choice is there?

Stan, Eugene, EBK, List,

I see two other choices. There is now evidence that Mars may  
have had an atmosphere twenty thousand years ago which was  
destroyed after being struck by a comet fragment .

<http://www.grahamhancock.com/forum/SpexarthG1.php?p=1>

There are signs of civilization on Mars and this civilization  
might still be with us, living where they please, using advanced  
technology to enchant and delude us while they either farm us or  
study our habits and behavior just as we do with Zoo animals.

Yes, these are still ET. But I get the feeling that Stan means  
"Star folk" when he uses that term and I've lost faith in that  
religion.

Another possibility is an ancient civilization, evolved from  
dinosaurs, or monotremes, or other ancient mammals who through  
convergent evolution became hominids. There was plenty of time  
for all to make that ascent. But the numerous substantial  
cataclysmic events over the last two hundred million years could  
have killed them off or driven them underground and hidden any  
evidence of their existence.

Many civilizations could have come and gone and we'd be unaware,  
their graves, long untended, covered with ice or water. What we  
now encounter may be only vestiges of once powerful ancient  
empires. If they purposefully kept themselves hidden or  
obscured, we might not have noticed. When we did, we saw gods or  
fairies or "little people", or just mysteries of life that never  
could be fathomed, or UFO.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:31:25 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:13:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

Hi, Bruce,

>The Val Johnson case, which occurred in August 1980 (not 1979)  
>is one that the late (lamented?) Philip J. Klass wrote about in  
>his aptly named book, UFOs, The Public Deceived (1983). The book  
>was aptly named because he deceived the public in several  
>instances, this being one of them.

>In his book Klass gave an accurate, straightforward accounting  
>of the case and then stated that it was either a hoax or the  
>"real thing" involving aliens that did damage to the car. From  
>his writing it is clear that Klass "favored" the hoax  
>explanation.

Why the scare quotes around favored? Do you mean this to be  
ironic commentary, or are these just randomly generated quotation  
marks? Of course Klass favored the hoax explanation. What  
choice did he have?

In doing so, Klass set up the usual strawmen, expressing the  
idea that the Johnson encounter involved a real UFO in such a  
preposterous fashion that the hoax explanation - even in the  
absence of the slightest evidence - had to be the preferred one.

>Several years after the publication of his book I  
>challenged him to write to the chief of police of Warren, MN to  
>inform him that Johnson should be charged with damage to public  
>property because he (Klass) had proved over and over that there  
>were no ET's flying around so the damage must have been done by  
>Johnson, who was a practical joker.

I actually spoke on the phone with the police chief. I told him  
what Klass had said about Johnson. The police chief seemed  
dumbfounded. If I had asked him if Johnson was an  
extraterrestrial, I don't think he could have been any more  
astounded or befuddled.

Suffice it to say he did not think Johnson was a hoaxer, and it  
was clearly an idea that had not occurred to him. He spent most  
of the rest of the conversation asking who "this guy" (as he  
called Klass) was and what he could possibly be up to. I told  
him Klass was a crank.

One would hope that Klass didn't actually believe his own  
bullshit on this or other matters, but unfortunately, I am  
pretty certain that he did. As the saying goes, there's no fool  
like an old fool.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## UFO Abducted Town's Residents In 1965 Says Author

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:19:59 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:19:59 -0400  
Subject: UFO Abducted Town's Residents In 1965 Says Author

Source: Grantham Today - Lincolnshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/hpnzb>

09 June 2006

UFO Abducted Town's Residents In 1965 Says Author

By Journal editor  
Nick Woodhead

Were you in Grantham on the evening of November 9, 1965?

Yes? Then you were abducted by aliens but inconveniently have had the memory wiped, according to a new book.

Indeed, only a cover-up by the Journal and all the usual Government suspects has prevented the story being told... until now.

Asylum =96 The Definitive UFO And Alien Abduction Experience is written by Anthony R. Mallin and claims to be based on the story of a real person, Clive Powers, who as a boy in 1960 was groomed by the aliens when they touched down in Syston five years earlier.

When the Grantham landing happened in Green Lane, Powers suffered the torment of abduction while 'drawn' out to the site with his mate.

He was sent to Rauceby and thence to an asylum in Croydon where his memory was agonisingly unravelled by a mysterious psychiatrist.

It can be difficult to follow what's going on and it's difficult to check as the author claims names have been changed, oddly, to avoid "possible contraventions" of the Official Secrets Act. Perhaps there might have been greater concerns about making enemies from further afield.

But there are plenty of place names and so on to tickle the fancy of the Grantham reader, even if you were lucky enough not to get whisked away on that evening 40 years ago.

Powers, who seemed to live in both Hamilton Road and Melbourne Road, went to Belton Lane Primary School and St Wulfram's (where some pretty amazing things happened). He worked at Parnell's TV shop and there is, inevitably, a big Ministry of Defence cover-up surrounding RAF Spitalgate and possibly the goings-on at Barkston Heath.

But the real villains of the piece are at the Journal. When our intrepid hero is attempting to research what really happened he is met by sinister questions.

"They wanted to know who we were and where we were from and how

to make contact with us. Without thinking twice we agreed to supplying our contact details to them.

"Looking back that was stupid. Even now we don't actually know who these people were and we immediately realised my quest for the truth was no longer a private matter."

Hmmm. Actually that quote has been adjusted, because the author has difficulty knowing when to use full stops and when to start new sentences which adds to the rambling nature of the narrative and the suspicion that he might just be completely barking.

But the camera never lies, surely? If you find yourself having a sceptical moment, or if you're struggling to work out just what's going on, you can flick to the end of the book to see the pictures of the aliens.

Let me nail my colours to the mast. I say it didn't happen ... but then in my position I would, wouldn't I?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 14:38:33 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:33:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:22:49 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Sorry Eugene, but I didn't know you were appointed the logic  
>judge. You have made a number of comments but have been  
>unwilling to provide any evidence to support them. Why should I  
>accept your proclamations as a substitute for reason and  
>evidence?

Simply not true! I've not made proclamations at all. I've simply questioned your conclusions and said other explanations should be considered. And I have provided plenty of facts to justify my questioning your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships - which has been the only focus of my discussion with you from its inception.

<snip>

>Our ancestors didn't have spy satellietes, didn't have instant  
>communication that could track high performance craft moving  
>across the skies from point to point.They didn't have high  
>flying aircraft describing craft moving up, up, and away from  
>them.

You can guarantee all this? You can absolutely rule all this out? You can say with definite certainty that no other human group, hominid species, or, say, raptor species evolved a technological civilization on Earth prior to our appearance on the scene with our arrogance? You've proven for sure that the ancient artifacts that look like airplanes, the pictures on cave walls that may depict pilots operating flying craft, the primitive batteries from before our technological era that have been found, etc., etc., etc., aren't from or aren't representative of an older technological Earth-based civilization?

These examples are often used to support the idea that flying saucers and their supposed pilots have been here for a long time. Why do they have to be ET? Oh, because the accepted idea is that there is no other Earth-evolved civilization so therefore they have to be ET. You don't have to be a "logic judge" to know this reasoning is wrong.

Maybe there is lots of evidence around to indicate a prior Earth-evolved technological civilization but it isn't acknowledged for what it is because our arrogance prefers to write pieces of evidence off as 'funeral (burial) objects', for example, instead. And maybe when it is recognized as representative of technology it all of a sudden has to be ET coming here for thousands of years.

Prove to me its ET we're dealing with - you're making the

claims. I'm not making any claims - let's recognize this fact and recognize that I'm merely questioning your ETH and saying it's a premature conclusion to say some UFOs are ET spaceships. Why are you asking me for evidence when I'm not saying any particular thing is so? Where have I said that I'm advocating an older Earth-based civilization as the answer? I'm merely asking why you can completely rule it out. I'm merely questioning your conclusions. I've been very specific about why it is proper to question your conclusions. You've made some conclusions and the onus is on you to demonstrate why it's ET and why it can't be anything else. It's not for me to show why your ETH isn't the answer or why it isn't true - which is not even what I'm trying to do.

You are guilty of very heavy sleight of hand in this discussion! I'm being very specific - and have been since square one - as to why I say your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships is premature. I've pointed out that there are plenty of apparent high-tech vehicle cases that possess characteristics which may indicate they could be something else. These are "ducks" that "look like a duck, quack like a duck, and waddle like a duck" but they don't fart like a duck. Until you explain these then you can't say all the other ducks in the pond are real ducks - because you just might not have heard them fart. You've merely objected with proclamations such as "I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems" and the onus is on you to prove this is what's indeed happening in these blur zone cases - not on me to prove other older Earth-evolved civilizations are responsible for it. I'm not saying that they are! Just asking you why you can rule them out and how you know some UFOs are ET spaceships instead of from older Earth-based civilizations. You keep avoiding giving me an answer - and avoid producing your evidence to support your answer - while demanding of me evidence of something I'm not even saying is so. Very smooth, Stan, but you're caught at your game and while those on this listserv who can't think or reason properly may fall for your sleight of hand, those that can think and reason properly see what you're doing and their replies indicate it to be so.

There is plenty to suggest technology may have existed on Earth prior to our involvement. It's you and your supporters that have to prove why ancient artifacts, for instance, are dismissable as 'burial object' type stuff or 'religious ceremony' stuff, or that has to prove this stuff to be ET (if indeed it is or does represent earlier technology on Earth) since you're the one saying ET is here and older Earth-based technological civilizations aren't viable. I'm being specific when I say this stuff exists and that it may (key word: may - no conclusions here) represent evidence of older Earth-based technology. It's you and your supporters who have to prove either it's all stuff like 'funeral objects' if you want to dismiss it as supportive of older Earth-based civilizations or claim it's due to ET being here for thousands of years.

So, there is, after all, a valid reason to propose the older Earth-based technological civilization hypothesis. Now, if you want to assert that some UFOs are ET spaceships you have to explain all this stuff away - not just with words but with evidence - that is, why it's all able to be dismissed as 'funeral object' type stuff and not representative of technology, or, if it does represent technology, why it has (again based on evidence) to be ET and not from an older Earth-based species.

These artifacts exist! It may be the evidence you've demanded for an older Earth-evolved technological civilization. It certainly puts this hypothesis on the table. Now you prove why it doesn't do this job. Provide evidence instead of words. Provide definitive reasons to dismiss it as non-technological, or representative of ET's technology.

So, I've now been specific as to why the older Earth-based technological civilization should be considered as a possible solution. But I'll even add a current case - the Peter Khoury case - and the trace evidence that is part of it - to further support this hypothesis. Now, you say, that is, you tell me - based on evidence - why this case is not as good as any of the ones you use to justify your conclusions and, at the same time, provide conclusive reasoning as to why human DNA was recovered in that case if ET was involved. I want hard facts,

Stan, not just speculation. I'm not trying to prove any explanation here. I'm simply trying to get you to prove why the older Earth-based civilization hypothesis can't be considered as viable when considering the cases you are using to support your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships.

My whole discussion with you has been in regards to your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships. I, from the very beginning, have asserted it's a premature conclusion. I've asserted nothing more! I've been very specific as to why I think it's premature. I've mentioned the tons of cases in the 'blur zone' - the cases that indicate the presense of a high-tech vehicle but the 'vehicle' demonstrates characteristics that indicate it may be something else. I've mentioned the other categories of UFOs - really truely anomalous ones and not IFOs or misperceived mundanes - that suggest a bigger UFO phenomenon. I've mentioned research done by Alvin Lawson that suggests a different process could be at work. How is this not being specific? And now, I've mentioned the older artifacts that exist - which I didn't mention before because you've known all along they exist.

So, please explain to me, Stan, because I'm very confused as to why you keep saying I haven't been specific or provided anything to back up my arguements. I'm not trying to prove older Earth civilizations to be the solution, just saying it can't yet be ruled out. And I've been very specific as to why (all the above) it can't be ruled out. In fact, I'm not trying to prove any solution to the UFO enigma. Also, in fact, I've not been trying to disprove or disqualify in any way the ETH. So why do you keep accusing me of having an 'alien phobia' or implying that I'm adverse to the ETH.

Let's clear the water you've been making muddy, Stan. I've proclaimed nothing! I've merely questioned your conclusions. And I've provided many facts and data to support raising the question as to if the ETH is the only viable solution to the cases you've focussed on. You've opted to simply dismiss the facts and data I've provided simply by saying they're irrelevant or by proclaiming things like "I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems." It's you that has been doing all of the proclaiming - starting with your "some UFOs are ET spaceships" statements right up to your objections to the facts and data I've presented.

Deal with the cases in the 'blur zone.' Don't just say they are irrelevant. Prove why they are irrelevant and have no bearing on the cases you focus on. Why do the apparent high-tech vehicles that have bizarre characteristics which indicate they may not be high-tech vehicles at all behave the way they do (and don't just assume "I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems"). Justify why they don't get considered along with the nicely behaving high-tech vehicles. And demonstrate why the other categories of UFOs should be roped off from the group you choose to focus on. Demonstrate why you are able to pick and choose cases and ignore (not consider) others. Why does a one-meter in diameter globe of light that appears to be intelligently controlled (but doesn't look like a high-tech flying saucer vehicle) deserve to be cut off from consideration as part of the group you've focussed on. Do you really think it is proper to seperate them on appearances and behavior - especially when there is a hugh category where appearance and behavior blurs with something else?

>Please show me any evidence for these unknown high tech  
>civilizations on Earth. I have often said there may have been  
>many different civilizations about which we are totally ignorant  
>that were here. That doesn't change the fact that very high  
>performance craft are here now from somewhere else.

Stan, you can't make the statement "high performance craft are here now from somewhere else" simply because you don't know for sure they're from somewhere else. For that matter, you aren't even sure they are high performance craft.

Older Earth high-tech civilizations may have existed, or may not have. We don't know. I've mentioned ancient artifacts and such that might be evidence. Evidence is no good if the jury

dismisses it as evidence. Again, I'm not saying older Earth high-tech civilizations are the answer - just a possibility. These artifacts and such might qualify as evidence. You must demonstrate why they're not - you're proclaiming no Earth-based older high-tech civilization is involved and that ET is, remember? And explain away the blur zone cases, as well as cases like the Peter Khoury case with its implications. Then demonstrate how Al Lawson's work is not important.

I've done my part and adequately supported why it is proper to question your conclusion. Now you do the same and justify your conclusion. Saying there are a huge amount of cases describing high-tech vehicles that we know aren't from here doesn't cut it. Yet that's all you've been able to do.

>If they are not produced here on Earth then they were produced  
>somewhere off the earth. That is what ET means.

<snip>

>Either clearly manufactured objects behaving under intelligent  
>control were manufactured here on Earth or someplace other than  
>on Earth i.e. they are of ET origin. What other choice is there?  
>A five dimensional parallel universe is still ET. A time  
>travelled craft is still not from here now.

Foul, Stan! This is not really true. This is more sleight of hand - more shrewd deception - on your part. Stop trying to confuse the definition of ET. For the intents and purposes of the discussion we've been having, ET means a species that originated and evolved on another planet while from 'here' means a species that originated and evolved on Earth. If it evolved on Earth and travelled (migrated) into outer space it's still an Earth-based civilization, not an ET one. If it's from Earth's future and travelled back in time (but evolved on Earth) it's an Earth-based one - doesn't matter if it's from here now or not. A "time travelled craft" is either from a civilization that evolved on Earth or it isn't. We don't become ETs to ourselves because we learn to time travel.

>>It's just that you don't want to acknowledge the  
>>other possibilities - your reasons for dismissing them are weak,  
>>at best and, for the most part, don't even exist as valid  
>>objections. Your logic stands if only the two possibilities  
>>exist. But tons of blur zone cases, other categories of  
>>genuinely anomalous UFOs, and valid research results  
>>suggest other possibilities. Thus, your logic is not logic.

>Again who are you to judge? Based on what?

Based on the fact that you can't use an assumption to make a conclusion, which is what you're doing. And based on you can't just dismiss facts and data with statements like "they're irrelevant" and "people have often misinterpreted Lawson's research." You must show why they're irrelevant. You must show how his work is misinterpreted and then why it's not valid for consideration in conjunction with the phenomenon you're discussing.

>I asked for specifics about Roswell and about MJ-12, you gave  
>none. Here you are again making proclamations with nothing behind  
>them. Should I worry about your respect for me as a scientist? I  
>take it I should assume that you belong to the American Nuclear  
>Society, The American Physical Society, the American Institute of  
>Aeronautics and Astronautics?

Clever, Stan. But I questioned your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships. That's what our discussion has been about. I told you at the very outset I wasn't interested in discussing Roswell and MJ-12 and I was very specific as to why not (I have little interest in the case, as well as consider it to be of little importance). We're dealing with two separate issues here. One is Roswell/MJ-12 and the other is your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships. Let's keep these separate. They have nothing to do with each other. Stop trying to sidetrack the discussion into Roswell and MJ-12 and stop trying to make it look like my refusing to fall for your attempts to distract me in that direction is the same thing as me not being specific.

If your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships is valid then it should stand on more cases than just Roswell. Either the



hugh number of high-tech vehicle cases you've been going on about are indeed high-tech vehicles made and/or piloted by ET or they're not. You don't need Roswell. So stop trying to make it look like my refusal to get drawn into a discussion of that one case supports what you are accusing me of and supports your conclusions in any way. We're discussing this hugh number of high-tech vehicle cases you've brought up and if (whether or not) they prove your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships. Leave Roswell alone. Let's discuss your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships, as I've been trying to do with you from square one.

No, you shouldn't worry about my respect for you as a scientist. That wasn't the point. The point is, someone with your credentials and your experience in science - which I deeply respect - must know that the type of reasoning you've been providing here is invalid, illogical, and full of fallacy. If you don't know it then there is something wrong. If you do know it then 'what gives'? I'm asking myself these questions and, if so, you can be sure that others - those who can think rationally and whose opinion (of you or of anything else) is of value - are asking themselves the same questions. These are some of what a scientist should be worried about - his credibility and perceived motives.

Do I have to be a member of the groups you mentioned to be able to think logically and reason rationally? Does being a member of those groups guarantee that one always thinks logically and rationally? Or does it guarantee one won't ever be deceptive or use sleight of hand in a discussion? Do I have to be a member of these groups to question your logic? Or, is this more sleight of hand on your part, Stan? More distraction? More of "if you can't make it with facts then make the other guy look bad"?

>>Because this is all you have been offering to support your  
>>premature (unfounded) conclusion that some UFOs are ET  
>>spaceships. You're just guessing!

>Deduction is not the same as guessing or proclaiming.

Correct! But this isn't deduction. It's jumping to conclusions. When you ignore data and research it's not more than a guess.

>>I'm not advocating any explanation for the UFO phenomenon so I  
>>don't need evidence to support or prove any particular  
>>explanation. All along I've simply been saying the ET hypothesis  
>>should be questioned as the only answer and there are plenty  
>>of both cases and research results to  
>>justify questioning it.

>Only answer to what? Many UFOs are non ET spacecraft. Certainly.  
>Again that is as useful as saying often Barry Bonds doesn't hit  
>a home run, or many isotopes aren't fissionable, or many  
>chemicals cure no disease.

It's very useful if you're really trying to understand the UFO phenomenon. Barry Bonds has nothing to do with it. Your isotopes/chemicals analogy doesn't apply. Whether or not some isotopes are fissionable or whether or not some chemicals don't cure disease (and some isotopes are fissionable and some chemicals do cure disease) isn't the point - the point is whether or not you actually have a fissionable isotope or a disease-curing chemical in your midst. You're just assuming you have a fissionable isotope or a disease-curing chemical. That's the bottom line. Doesn't matter if some do or don't or even which ones do or don't - it's whether or not you have one.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 18:55:02 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:36:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Dickenson

>From: Lan Fleming <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
>To: UFOUpdates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 08:37:50 -0500  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>Starting in the 1950s, the government and the academic  
>hierarchies wished to bring the study of UFOs into disrepute.  
>They succeeded completely, as groups with large amounts of  
>political power ususally do. The fact that so much time is  
>spent on this list remarking on how disreputable Ufology is  
>evidence of their great success.

You're too right Lan,

And we all should know by now that 'scientific peer review' is just as censored and politicized as any other media.

Even so, think the UFO fraternity harms itself by not facing up to the split between 'nuts & bolts' and "strangeness" events.

Sure we can understand a scientifically qualified person wanting to stay within his `rules' - but the events don't!

A general reader will see well-attested reports of objects that obey physics rules (only a bit faster than human craft etc.) and of objects/entities that definitely do not. There are too many of those to just ignore - no matter how uncomfortable that makes us.

Suppose that's asking for UFO History to be just that - an impartial record, without judgmental censorship.

After all, censorship kept us officially believing in an Earth centered system for more than 1500 years after the Ionian Greeks had disproved 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Mars & Saturn Converge

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 15:17:05 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:38:50 -0400  
Subject: Mars & Saturn Converge

This might generate a few UFO reports:

-----

Watch Mars and Saturn Converge

By Joe Rao  
SPACE.com Skywatching Columnist  
posted: 09 June 2006  
06:12 am ET

Two bright planets are approaching each other in our evening sky.

Mars, which was so brilliant last fall and has since diminished dramatically in brightness, and Saturn, which has adorned our evening sky since midwinter, are currently visible about one-quarter of the way up from the western horizon as darkness falls.

-----

See the rest at:

[http://www.space.com/spacewatch/060609\\_night\\_sky.html](http://www.space.com/spacewatch/060609_night_sky.html)

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 11:22:22 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:41:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 05:53:55 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:32 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Golubik

>>How the actual camera automatically works and can be manually  
>>manipulated is also an open question. The closest recommended  
>>shot with the camera is three feet. The fastest shutter speed  
>>1/1200 sec. I'm not sure on the directional sensitivity of the  
>>detector until I play with it. What type of shutter was it...  
>>I'll let you know. There is the added property of affecting the  
>>exposer by waiting a different length of time before peeling  
>>back the opposite half of the film. The impact of this also has  
>>to be explored.

>Maybe I missed it in all the verbiage that this thread has  
>generated, but exactly which model Polaroid camera were these  
>photos supposed to have been taken with? I'd like to look up the  
>specifications.

Hi Bob,

Polaroid 101 automatic camera. Some photos for people at eBay:

<http://www.ebay.com/my/viItem?ItemId=7418165983#photo>

F.L. 114 mm, aperature f8.0 - f42.0

I used to own one in my youth until he got ripped off in a  
burglarly 30+ years ago. As can be seen from the photos, there  
is an optional manual adjustness for photo lightness, but  
otherwise the camera is fully automatic. It was the first  
electronic eye automatic exposure system on the consumer market.  
I don't know the specifics of the various shutter speeds or what  
procedure it used to set f-stops and shutter speeds.

I don't remember if it also had a focus adustment. I don't think  
so. If it was a typical Cameras for Dummies Edwin Land  
production, it used aspheric optics and large f-stops so no  
focusing was required. The viewfinder was also on top of the  
camera, an issue in Heflin's photo 1 out his windshield when  
Hartmann noticed the viewfinder would have been blocked.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:42:20 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:46:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 05:53:55 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:32 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>How the actual camera automatically works and can be manually  
>>manipulated is also an open question. The closest recommended  
>>shot with the camera is three feet. The fastest shutter speed  
>>1/1200 sec. I'm not sure on the directional sensitivity of the  
>>detector until I play with it. What type of shutter was it...  
>>I'll let you know. There is the added property of affecting the  
>>exposer by waiting a different length of time before peeling  
>>back the opposite half of the film. The impact of this also has  
>>to be explored.

>Maybe I missed it in all the verbiage that this thread has  
>generated, but exactly which model Polaroid camera were these  
>photos supposed to have been taken with? I'd like to look up the  
>specifications.

No Problem Bob, let me know what you find. The camera was a  
Polaroid 101, with an eight pack of 107 B&W Film. 30 sec peel-  
back wait time at 74 degrees. ASA 3000.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:04:02 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:51:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

Viktor offered an interesting analysis...

I think the problem here is that there are way, way too many assumptions that have to be made to draw reasonable conclusions about power requirements and inertia forces because an analysis still has to rely on our current state of knowledge about fundamental forces in the universe. We know quite a bit about how some EM forces work in the 3-4 dimensional space we can easily measure. But we still don't really know how something as simple as a magnet even works. We know a lot about how to measure field strength, but we don't know a lot about what it actually is.

For all I know, maybe there's a way to work in some of the higher (or lower, depending how you want to look at it) dimension so that something enclosed in a field effectively has no real mass in 4-dimensional space. I don't know why that would be, but there could be a lot of similar unknowns out there that make reaching any kind of conclusion about what UFOs and their occupants might be.

We are, with our little monkey brains, extremely limited in our ability to naturally sense or mechanically measure the range and scope of the universe. Why is the Periodic Table of Elements so lop-sided? Would we find additional elements to fill it out and give it symmetry if we had a better understanding how the elements work in multiple dimensions? Maybe. Maybe they would make more sense if we used a 3-D or 4-D chart. I don't know.

I don't know what reality is. I can't define it. So all kinds of things might be happening here that I don't even have a start at understanding. Creatures and people living in reversed or skewed time. Material echoes of people's dreams. Mass psychic intrusions from obscure Earth-based entities. Things that sound like the nuttiest kind of bad sci-fi fantasy or wacky philosophies. Delusions that are somehow "real?"

In a way, it would be nice and easy if UFOs were just alien creatures from another planet, who interact and work with reality the same way we do, who put their three-legged pants on in the morning pretty much like us. Then their spaceships would be some kind of cool metal or plastic and fly in the same 4-D spacetime we understand. And their feelings and motivations were basically the same as ours. "Alien" but not that different.

But I'm afraid that "aliens from another planet" just doesn't cover it. This week, I'm leaning toward some kind of Earth-based "thing" maybe entities, maybe... I don't know... that doesn't interact with time as we understand it. I only think that because it's one of the few things that make sense when you consider the number of interactions versus the proof that remains just out of reach. Like something that you grab in a dream but vanishes when you wake up. It could happen if manipulating or moving through time was not a problem. A saucer



crashes, it makes the news, another saucer is sent back to make sure it doesn't happen. Or that a certain piece of film gets lost in the mail. Or whatever.

Next week, I may not feel the same way about it. Either way, I can't just assume an ET source. So I'm still stuck with a good, solid, respectable, "I don't 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 15:14:33 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:53:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

>From: Lan Fleming <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
>To: UFOUpdates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 08:37:50 -0500  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:24:01 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network,  
>>>which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous  
>>>scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very  
>>>thorough and always sought first to find a conventional  
>>>explanation for each case.

>>It seems like the old days had a much higher number of  
>>creditable participants than present day. Also, it seems like  
>>your journal and other historical preservation efforts are  
>>almost like the efforts of monks during the Dark Ages to save,  
>>for some future time of Enlightenment or Renaissance, the "old"  
>>knowledge of humanity's past golden age of greatness and works.  
>>Today, it seems with the huge number of gullible and uncritical  
>>thinking folk that we are in a Ufo-illogical Dark Ages.

>And do you suppose that the present situation can be blamed on a  
>recent increase in the breeding rates of the UFO nuts that you  
>enjoy bashing so much?  
>If so, your knowledge of history is also at a dark age level.

I do not enjoy "bashing UFO nuts", I've got better things to do than that. Usually I just try to ignore them. I do not claim that there is no useful research being done in UFOlogy currently either. Nor do I claim UFO nuts are breeding like flies. I do claim that the poor state of education in the US (and World of course), the dumbing down of information and entertainment (sound bite summaries of complex topics, reality shows), the desire of an uneducated electorate by government, and the encouragement of employment in non-technical areas (via better salaries in law and sales) all contribute to a populace with reduced critical thinking.

Note that the kind of job growth encouraged by various treaties in the US involve service industries these days, which do not require critical thinking, whereas in earlier days we were in a Cold War against the USSR which pushed the US to emphasize technical and scientific educations and jobs. Remember the tremendous spurt caused by the launch of Sputnik. These days, kids are mainly inspired by Grand Theft Auto or Britney Spears or Gangster rap.

>By all accounts I've read there were just  
>as many "gullible and uncritical thinking folk" associated with  
>the UFO phenomenon in the "golden age" as there are now, perhaps

>even more.

I know about the contactees and gullible folk back then. I am talking about the percentage of such folk compared to the scientists and engineers involved in the field. Perhaps it just seems like there are alot more gullible folk since they now have the luxury of a personal international information distribution system (the Internet).

>The real difference between then and now is that  
>there are far fewer serious scientists and technical people  
>investigating UFOs now, not any increase in uncritical thinking.

You're wrong about the uncritical thinking issue but I'll let it pass for the sake of discussion. And, let's assume its simply due to the fewer scientists and technical people researching UFOs rather than simply fewer such folk in general.

>The decline of serious investigative organizations is the direct  
>result of the government efforts to quell public interest in the  
>subject as recommended by the Robertson Panel report. As  
>everyone should know, those efforts reached their successful  
>culmination with the release ofthe infamous Condon report - or  
>more specifically the release of the report's executive summary,  
>which had nothing to do with the evidence presented in the body  
>of the report. Since the scientific establishment  
>enthusiastically accepted Condon's assertion that science had  
>nothing to gain by studying UFOs, few scientists have wasted  
>their time on UFO studies that they know cannot get funding and  
>will never be published in peer-reviewed journals.

So you are saying that the scientists that supported the team investigation efforts (in NICAP/MUFON/APRO) were solely motivated by publishing? And that they would not have done it without being compensated? I doubt it. I would suspect most performed this work unfunded, in their free time and for the sake of pure science/wonder. The Condon report should have hardly affected them directly. However, I can understand the peer pressure of people making fun of them for continuing to work on something that was discredited by that report. With or without a Condon report, such derision would have occurred throughout the period we are talking about (1950-1980). How many funded technical papers were published each year on the topic? Does it really correspond to the Condon report?

>Starting in the 1950s, the government and the academic  
>hierarchies wished to bring the study of UFOs into disrepute.  
>They succeeded completely, as groups with large amounts of  
>political power ususally do. The fact that so much time is  
>spent on this list remarking on how disreputable UFology is  
>evidence of their great success.

If this conspiracy has any public facts to document them, then it would be interesting to see. I suspect that such an institutional bias is unwritten and typical of all disciplines where the dogma (paradigm) of the organization is protected against any anomalies. It does not take much to frame the study of UFOs within the acceptable paradigm (bolides, plasma, fireballs, sprites, ball lightning) but whenever one goes outside it one will encounter resistance. Regardless of what the hierarchies state, what the scientist or engineer does in his free time is beyond their perview so should not affect the numbers of these folk involved in UFOs. Yet they seem fewer.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 15:27:26 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:55:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 06:20:21 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>Power Density. Some of the instantaneous observations made on  
>>UFO behavior suggest a power source way beyond our ability to  
>>construct in a controlled fashion. If a 5,000 Kilogram craft  
>>moving at 2,000 meters a second made a reverse turn in a 2  
>>millisecond burst over a distance of 20 meters, that would  
>>require an output power of:

>I didn't check your math, but I wonder why you assume so much  
>weight. Jess Marcel and others who handled bits of the Roswell  
>wreckage have all emphasized it's extraordinarily light weight.

>I think one important part of the equation has to be that this  
>assumed 30 foot craft might only weight a few hundred pounds,  
>not five tons.

>Bob Shell

Now that we have Energy Density down as a concept, these are  
great questions!

You can put whatever values you want. That's why I wrote  
everything out, etc. Anyone can do the math now. It's not that  
hard, really.

By the way I can't assume densities of metals at that level  
based upon stories unless we can show what the actual volume and  
weight of those were and exactly what part of the alleged craft  
they came from. If I had picked up that portion of an alleged  
metal craft and had as much time with it as some apparently did,  
not only would I have weighed it (you can use a stick and a rock  
in the field, balance it on either end and later replace the  
object with another rock, then weighed that substitute rock), I  
would have found how much water it displaced in my bath tub too  
or simply measured it's thickness with a another stick or  
rock... got it's rough surface area \_ whatever? Thereby getting  
it's rough density and then comparing it with know metallic  
compounds and pure metallic elements. I would have also buried a  
piece instantly for later retrieval. Of course, Isotope ratios  
could be checked later and as analysis tools improved we could  
do more and more (I won't go into details).

For comparison, it certainly would be nice if we all could play  
around with a thin piece (sheet) of Titanium too?

Until we weigh an actual UFO, we have to assume some reasonable  
starting point. Perhaps I was a bit high. I just grabbed a  
number out of my head to see where it would lead. But, as I  
state in my posting, the concept of energy density is one that  
is seldom explained properly. That is the thrust of that earlier

e-mail. Move all the values around and we can develop a graph with cut-offs with each variable type. If this has never been done before, it should have long ago. Again, this is my point. This is a common language we should all share and I'm just taking the time to explain it a little better... I hope?

There's nothing difficult here... that's my point also. We can all make this accessible to understanding without getting into complicated scientific jargon. Communication is far more important.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:54:06 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:58:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 14:28:42 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>Ground effect [a cushion of air]  
>is different for each wing foil shape and area; say 10 feet AGL  
>for a Cessna 172 [because that's what it is] as opposed to 100  
>feet for a Boeing 747.

I stand corrected.

>>The only thing that might work would be a gyro-stabilized radial  
>>wing design that allows for changing the blade attack angles  
>>during rotation (like a helicopter blade), but that doesn't fit  
>>the descriptions.

>But that, of course, is old hat and inefficient. Just  
>dragging/pushing a body through the air and supporting it with  
>lift [wings come in handy here] is still the most efficient  
>method we have when time [speed], fuel, distance, payload times  
>the number of dollars are factored in. Even air forces use this  
>method. If you don't believe me, go to an international airport  
>where you will see hundreds [or thousands, depending on the AP]  
>of examples over the course of a day.

Of course, wings and lifting bodies do the trick, but we're  
talking about good, old-fashioned, symmetrical flying disks  
here, which are generally crappy lifting bodies. I don't see to  
many of them flying around airports.

>>But I'm not even suggesting a jet or propeller drive. Hey, I'll  
>go for anti-gravity or antimatter-plasma- fusion-magnetic  
>propulsion.

>Plasma is not a fuel or a source of propulsion. It's a by-  
>product. Fusion would be a fuel source. And why would you go  
>with the previous mixture of drives, fuels and effects?

I was just being facetious. For all I know, UFOs are powered by  
pixie dust.

>>But I can't and won't assume those things were built by aliens,  
>>either.

>I've seen that statement in a few forms by both you and Eugene.  
>Who then might be building them?

Do we even know if they're "built," in any ordinary way? I  
don't, do you? Or are you just assuming it? I don't have one to  
look at and hit with a hammer. So I don't know if they're even  
built, much less who or what might be responsible for them.

It's so easy to make basic, fundamental and possibly completely  
wrong assumptions about these things.

In another post, I say that at the moment (and my notion of it

changes from moment to moment), I have a vague notion that they have something to do with manipulating time. It's one of the few ways to account for the proof always being just beyond our fingertips. Every time we get the "smoking gun," somebody or something moves backwards or sideways through time and takes out the bullets. I don't know who is doing it or how it works. And tomorrow I may think it's an unworkable idea. It's like a word you have on the tip of your tongue. There but not there.

>>People can be mighty clever all on their own.

>Not that clever, at least up until the last couple of years, and >even then..... You are not seriously suggesting that over the >last few hundred years, but more specifically the last 60, that >these things are the product of "secret, experimental, military >craft" are you?

No, certainly not all of them. Occam's Razor, and a fear of pelicanism, won't let me conclude that all the descriptions are wrong. The descriptions are just too many, too often and too weird.

So in the weirder, extra-strange sightings and encounters, we're probably not talking about Capt. Roger Ramjet flying experimental stuff built by Skunk Works.

>I didn't think anyone was still using that as an argument. that >dog won't hunt.

No, what I'm talking about I can almost not put into words. I find myself at a loss for the appropriate terminology.

And please understand that I'm not reaching a conclusion about anything or explaining anything.

I'm trying to encompass possibilities of "entities" or "intelligences" that exist external or parallel to our own perception of reality, who have certain abilities, whether natural or technical, to control forces we aren't aware of and don't understand. And these people or things or whatever, are able to interact with us in physical and non-physical ways (through our consciousnesses), and in ways that don't correspond to the way we understand "time," that manifest themselves in UFO sightings that include photographs, interactions, telepathy, time effects, physical traces, etc. I repeat - this is not an explanation, only an exploration of possibilities.

And I'm trying to work up from what we know exists. Which means us. We know we exist, so let's start from there, before we start bringing in completely fictional and unproven space aliens.

So "ET" only becomes one possibility out of many, but certainly nothing that qualifies as a logical default position. "It isn't this, this or this, so it HAS to be aliens from other planets." There are many more possibilities, including (I assume) many that I'm just not smart or imaginative enough to come up with. I have an obligation to bring my own ignorance into the calculations.

And all of it brings me right back to: "I don't 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Jesse Marcel & Interview By Tom Horn - White

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 17:00:33 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:59:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jesse Marcel & Interview By Tom Horn - White

>From: Tom Horn <[tomhorn.nul](mailto:tomhorn.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 09:33:10 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Jesse Marcel & Interview By Tom Horn

>My engineer tried to fix the sound problems but due to technical  
>issues with the interview, portions of the audio in the  
>interview I did with Jesse Marcel Jr. had to be removed.

>No conspiracy, just something funky with the microphone.

As a 26 year target of highly advanced electronic harassment,  
"something funkys" happen all the time to our members, as well  
as to shows which regularly discuss government and corporate  
crimes. I would not presume this incident wasn't electronic  
harassment.

Doesn't prove it is, of course - I'm just saying it is highly  
consistent with electronic harassment.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:38:07 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 07:04:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>What makes you say they are made from the same materials found  
>>on Earth? Same elements maybe. But there are, for example, many  
>>materials presently made on earth that couldn't have been made  
>>50 years ago. Ask Intel . Do you have some such material from a  
>>flying saucer? Have you seen analysis thereof ? The Roswell  
>>witnesses indicate materials with extraordinary light weight,  
>>high strength, great resistance to being cut, burned... Are  
>>these more of the hypothetical, theoretical ,science fiction  
>>devices of which you are speaking?

>><snip>

>If I might add a comment and illustration here and there. The  
>point Tim, is that there are defining points at which our  
>technology and their technology take separate branches. that  
>vertex point, the one that separates ours from there's, does  
>need better definition and distinction so that we don't get  
>caught up with this false belief that it Could possibly be  
>ours!. If not, we have to come up with great observations: One  
>of the reasons I stress the need for good data on UFO  
>behavior... witness testimony, triangulation, distance, speed,  
>etc. But, getting a mass value on an unknown craft is rather  
>more difficult.....

>In any case, one concept, in particular, needs explanation:

>Power Density. Some of the instantaneous observations made on  
>UFO behavior suggest a power source way beyond our ability to  
>construct in a controlled fashion. If a 5,000 Kilogram craft  
>moving at 2,000 meters a second made a reverse turn in a 2  
>millisecond burst over a distance of 20 meters, that would  
>require an output power of:

Unfortunately, what follows is one of those straw man arguments  
using unrealistic made-up numbers, resulting in outrageously  
inflated numbers. There is observational data (e.g., Paul Hill's  
2 UFO sightings detailed in his book "Unconventional Flying  
Objects") placing maximum UFO accelerations in the neighborhood  
of 100 g's or 1000 m/sec<sup>2</sup>. Compare this with what Victor gets

with his made up example below. The results you get all depend on your assumptions.

>1) Acceleration/Deceleration = Change in Velocity divided by time.

>A = +2,000 - (-2,000)/2^-3 seconds = 2 million meters/sec^2

Well let's see. 2 million m/sec^2 is 200,000 g's (!) or 2000 times the observational accelerations of around 1000 m/sec^2 (100 g's).

Here's how the same object could exhibit 100 g accelerations and still seem to be practically turning around on a dime. Decelerate over 2 seconds and 2000 meters to a dead stop. Deceleration = -2000 m/sec / 2 m = -1000 m/sec^2 or -100 g. Then reaccelerate in opposite direction to original speed in 2 seconds in a space of 2000 meters.

To the naked eye observer, the rapid decelerations and accelerations are barely perceptible. Instead, one sees the object doing a 180 degree turn and shooting back off in the opposite direction. There is no need to invoke arbitrary and absurdly high accelerations to get a perception of "instantaneous" reversal.

>2) Force = Mass X acceleration

>F = 5,000 Kg x 2,000,000 meter/sec^2

>F = 10,000,000,000 Newtons

Or 10 billion Newtons. That certainly sounds daunting. But using the more realistic 100 g's, this number is reduced 2000 times to 5 million Newtons. By comparison, a 747 develops about a million Newtons of thrust on takeoff and the Saturn 5 moon rocket about 35 million. So this lower thrust number is not exactly "impossible."

On the other hand, this is creating a lot of force over a small volume of craft. Current current aeronautical materials wouldn't hold up. But nanotechnology materials now emerging from labs, such as carbon nanotubule threads and fabrics (100 times stronger than steel) can probably handle the g forces.

(Added note: All this also assumes conventional propulsion type technologies and Newtonian physics. Field propulsion technology, however, could conceivably reduce g-force stresses on craft and occupants by accelerating/decelerating all things at the same rate, i.e. at light speed. More esoteric theoretical possibilities such as inertial mass reduction would do the same thing.)

>3) The Amount of work required is: Work = Force X Distance,  
>the above times 20:

>Work = 200,000,000,000 Newton-meters But, 1 Newton-meter = 1  
>joule So we have: 200,000,000,000 Joules of Energy!

Or 200 billion Joules. However, there is a flaw in the calculation somewhere because this is 10 times more energy than the total kinetic energy of the object to brake to a stop and then reaccelerate back to original speed.

K.E. = 1/2 m x v^2 = 1/2 x 5000 kg x 2000^2 = 10^10 or 10 billion Joules

The object loses 10 billion Joules of K.E. when stopping and needs another 10 billion to reaccelerate back up to speed: total 20 billion Joules.

Just to keep things in perspective, gasoline has about 150 million Joules of chemical energy per gallon. So slowing to a stop requires the energy equivalent of about 70 gallons of gasoline and another 70 gallons to speed up. This is spread out over 4 seconds, so about 35 gallons per second. This is about 10 times the energy consumption rate of a 747 on takeoff, which is impressive, but, again, hardly impossible. Again, for comparison, a Saturn 5 burned somewhere around 4000 gallons of fuel and oxidizer per second on takeoff.

>4) But, the Energy Required (The above) has to be delivered

>over the entire time interval: Therefore, we get:

>Work divided by time =  $1 \times 10^{14}$  Joules/sec of momentary output  
>... That's:

>100,000,000,000,000 Watts!

Or in what I consider my more realistic example using different assumptions, the power could be 20 billion joules/4 seconds or 5 billion Watts or 5 million kilowatts, which is 200,000 times smaller than Victor's number.

>That's 1,000,000,000,000 (100 watt bulbs)

>Since 746 watts = 1 Horse power, That's:

>268,096,515 million 500 Horse power Engines running at full  
>power!

Except divide that down by 200,000. This is now "only" 6.7 million horsepower or 13,400 500 horsepower engines. By comparison, the 747 jet engines generate about 170,000 horsepower at maximum thrust, but the Saturn 5 generated 160 million horsepower at takeoff, or 2 dozens times more power. Even the much more modest solid-fuel escape rockets attached to the Apollo command module (for emergency escapes) generated over a million horsepower.

Thus the required power consumption is still impressive, but again within parameters of human-built machines using primitive chemical propulsion systems.

>Can we fit that type of Energy in a 30 foot Craft? No way!

>So,  
>this is the whole point I'm making on Energy Density! But,  
>please take my illustrative example with a little grain of salt:  
>My own belief is that these are much too high!

Exactly, like way, way too high.

>It's the concept  
>I was most interested in pushing and this gives us all a better  
>feel for the concept at play here.

OK

>By the way, a nuclear engine can put out about: 40,000,000,000  
>Watts so we're way above that too!

Not if we use already existing observational data about actual UFO accelerations instead of picking an absurd number out of a hat. In that case, the actual power consumption in your example 5000 kg craft gets scaled down 200,000 times to 5,000,000,000 Watts, or 1/8th of the nuclear engine.

>That would be 2,500 Nuclear  
>Powered Rocket Engines. Did anyone say where's all the fuel?

>At some point, depending upon which numbers I put into the above  
>equations, we will obtain power densities that are achievable  
>and within our current abilities. That's the vertex point I was  
>discussing above.

Start with a more realistic example, and you'll discover the power densities are already within our current abilities.

>By the way, one of the reasons many speculate on mass or  
>inertial reduction as a means of achieving such maneuvering  
>capability, is that the energy requirements would come way down  
>to our current levels of use and density. However, in order to  
>reduce mass or inertia would require advances in our current  
>understanding of Physics and then the correspondingly steeper  
>curve of applying that new knowledge and developing useful  
>technologies from it... still very very difficult! A vertex  
>point way above our understanding! And, is it even possible?

Well, nobody knows for sure, which is why I tread lightly on the subject above. The Tampere University spinning superconductor experiment by Eugene Podkletnov in 1992 claimed 2% inertial mass reduction, but what has happened since then is a little obscure.

>Another reason people stress inertial dampening, is the simple  
>fact that no material (human flesh included) could probably  
>handle the stresses I've entertained in the above example. We  
>could've easily calculated stresses too (close) and found  
>another vertex point for the material strength requirements.  
>Also, the fuel requirements, etc...

Antigravity field propulsion would also protect the crew since they could be accelerated simultaneously with craft. Hence no lag time behind the craft and no differential acceleration, which is what creates the crushing forces on the body without such protection.

>BTW, one has to be able to convert this energy too from others  
>forms. Not too mention direct it/absorb it in such a way as too  
>not inadvertently convert it into wasted energy in the form of  
>heat which would have easily vaporized the above craft before it  
>ever had a chance to turn around or even begin to stop.

The craft doesn't continuously have to generate such energies and power densities, but can do it in short bursts over a period of a few seconds. E.g., at 100 g acceleration ( $\sim 1000 \text{ m/sec}^2$ ), a craft can accelerate to orbital velocity ( $\sim 8000 \text{ m/sec}$ ) in only 8 seconds and escape velocity ( $\sim 10,000 \text{ m/sec}$ ) in only 10 seconds.

Take energy to orbit. Neglecting frictional energy, minimum energy to low orbit (100 miles) for a 5000 kg craft is about 64 billion Joules kinetic energy and 8 billion Joules potential energy: Total 72 billion Joules. The following high efficiency energy storage devices could conceivably supply the needed energies:

1. High speed spinning disc or flywheel:

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 19:50:51 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 07:19:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Ed Gehrman <[egehrman.nul](mailto:egehrman.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 10:43:47 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:22:49 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Another possibility is an ancient civilization, evolved from  
>dinosaurs, or monotremes, or other ancient mammals who through  
>convergent evolution became hominids. There was plenty of time  
>for all to make that ascent. But the numerous substantial  
>cataclysmic events over the last two hundred million years could  
>have killed them off or driven them underground and hidden any  
>evidence of their existence.

>Many civilizations could have come and gone and we'd be unaware,  
>their graves, long untended, covered with ice or water. What we  
>now encounter may be only vestages of once powerful ancient  
>empires. If they purposefully kept themselves hidden or  
>obscured, we might not have noticed. When we did, we saw gods or  
>fairies or "little people", or just mysteries of life that never  
>could be fathomed, or UFO.

Very well put, Ed. Very well put! I agree with you this far (but not when you say ET can't be, or isn't, getting here).

But you said it nicely - older Earth-based technological civilizations can't be ruled out based on what we know to date. It's not for me to prove they existed, rather it's for Stan and his supporters to prove they didn't exist. He (they) are the ones making the claims, the conclusions, and the proclamations. I'm just questioning what he's claiming is the truth (that some UFOs are ET spaceships) and enough data has been presented which justifies questioning Stan's conclusions. Enough data has been presented to justify wondering if other solutions are viable or applicable - including the older Earth-based technological civilizations hypothesis. I'm not saying he's wrong, just that his conclusions in this regard are premature. I'm not saying there is another explanation, only that we don't know yet if his is the proper answer.

Stan likes to pretend I'm speaking against the ET hypothesis and that I'm proclaiming there is another explanation for the flying saucer - the high-tech UFOs. Not so. Stan likes to also pretend that I'm not presenting anything to back up why I'm questioning things and likes to falsely accuse me of not being specific. This, he does while not being specific himself - a perfect example of transference.

Stan starts with a bunch of assumptions then rolls them together into a conclusion. Then he calls it "scientific deduction" and

accuses anyone who presents data to justify questioning his conclusions and the process by which he came to them of not being specific, not providing anything to back up their objections, and of making proclamations. He can do this because he simply ignores the data they present to refute what he says or explains it away with more proclamations that he doesn't get specific about.

So, I agree with Dave Morton. This is indeed a waste of time. We're going around and around in circles with Stan's assumptions being used to support conclusions that are used again to support more assumptions in his argument - all the while he ignores data being presented, or explains it away with mere proclamations (or by making false accusations of not being specific and of not providing anything to back up the questioning).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 18:17:05 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 08:59:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Shell

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:24:01 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network,  
>>which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous  
>>scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very  
>>thorough and always sought first to find a conventional  
>>explanation for each case.

>It seems like the old days had a much higher number of  
>creditable participants than present day. Also, it seems like  
>your journal and other historical preservation efforts are  
>almost like the efforts of monks during the Dark Ages to save,  
>for some future time of Enlightenment or Renaissance, the "old"  
>knowledge of humanity's past golden age of greatness and works.  
>Today, it seems with the huge number of gullible and uncritical  
>thinking folk that we are in a Ufo-illogical Dark Ages.

Like UFOs themselves, the study of the phenomenon comes in waves, each one with a slightly different flavor, much of it having to do with available technology. The growth of the Internet, coupled by the introduction of relatively inexpensive portable digital cameras (especially on cell phones), has created a new wave of interest and interested people who naturally have to be re-educated about UFO history. I don't see a problem with that.

To over-glorify the work of the past would be a mistake, too, however. I've always appreciated the work of NICAP and others who went out and did their best to try and bring some quantification to the field, and the result was the development of some good, solid databases that can now be used for reference. But even during the "golden age," not all of the investigations were conducted well, and there were still more people in contactee cults than doing real investigation. And, although they can't be "blamed" for it, who knows how much of the hard work done by the UFO organizations was lost, or ended up rotting and fading away in old filing cabinets because the organizations ran out of money and/or enthusiasm after decades of failing to find an answer to the thing?

And after all that hard, diligent work, the golden age researchers never did find a solution, did they? A lot of the data tended to skew toward "nuts and bolts, ET" explanations, and the weird stuff, like witness's reports of telepathic communication or time distortion that didn't fit, were ignored. It took decades for researchers to even start acknowledging the abduction aspects. As shown in this and other threads, I still find among the older researchers a definite predisposition toward wanting these UFO things to be Bug-Eyed Aliens from Mars, or something from a pulp magazine from the 30's-50's. "If it's unknown, it must be aliens from another planet." Well, that



hypothesis didn't pan out any better than the others, did it? So in a lot of ways the previous batch of researchers really dropped the ball. They got side-tracked and obsessed with cases they thought had "undeniable proof," and wasted a lot of time and effort.

Money has always been a problem. Conducting good research requires an awful lot of time and energy and resources, and it hasn't gotten any cheaper. In fact, because of the increased number of good sightings, reported via the Internet, a lot more money would be necessary to adequately organize and train and send out qualified researchers. As a result, some farmer could have a dead alien tucked away in his tool shed, and nobody interested would ever get out to take a look at it.

On the positive side, we no longer have to rely on the occasional, sensationalized UFO book to come out, or scrounge through local papers looking for back-page sighting reports. News of UFO sightings is practically immediate, which allows those directly involved to investigate and present their case quicker, and for any glaring holes or discrepancies to be immediately hammered. No more waiting months and years to study bad, grainy, half-tone UFO photos, now we can look at bad, grainy, over-pixillated UFO photos a week after they were taken. I don't know if this is exactly progress, but it does help separate the wheat from the chaff a little sooner.

Anyway, I'm looking at UFO research as in a transitional stage. The older researchers, inspired by Buck Rogers and FATE Magazine, are sadly passing away. Newer researchers, not including the perennial kooks, are still trying to find a handle on the subject. It may eventually be that the Internet will serve as an organizing point, with individual researchers tackling the field work for sightings in their local areas, and then responding to detail questions put to them through the Internet site. That might be interesting, as well as more cost effective and immediate. Education still needs to be prioritized, particularly trying to avoid bringing one's personal beliefs into the investigation. But that's always been the hard part. The mere fact that someone is interested in researching means they already have a predisposition. Why would anyone to it out of the blue?

Anyway, rather than decrying the current state of UFO study and its apparent lack of interest in previous investigation, it might be better to steer more toward educating interested people who might want to the field work, teaching witnesses how to properly view and report their sightings, and collecting and organizing data received via the Internet to make it functional.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Olson

From: **Jeff Olson** <[jlolson.nul](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 16:18:52 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:01:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Olson

>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:31:25 -0500  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

Jerome Clark:

<snip>

>One would hope that Klass didn't actually believe his own  
>bullshit on this or other matters, but unfortunately, I am  
>pretty certain that he did. As the saying goes, there's no fool  
>like an old fool.

You mean you don't think he was being paid (or paid enough) to  
write that garbage?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Olson

From: Jeff Olson <[jlolson.nul](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 16:29:33 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:03:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Olson

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 13:52:24 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Jeff Olson <[jlolson.nul](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 17:12:22 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>>Deduction is still part of the scientific method. If it looks  
>>>like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it is  
>>>most likely a duck.

>How about a really good hologram of a duck? Or a decoy duck? Or a robot  
>duck? Or something else that goes out of its way to imitate a duck?

>The duck analogy sounds good but anybody who really thinks about it  
>for a few minutes can see it's a crock.  
<snip>

Eugene,

I'm not saying this to be offensive, but I'm getting the strong sense that you might be one of those Christians who believe the UFOs/aliens are in actuality demons, hobgoblins, or some other form of spiritual apparition.

Am I right?

That would help explain how you could write something like the above. It's hard to imagine why anyone would make such a statement except under the dictates of some strong emotional agenda.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 19:34:19 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:05:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Balaskas

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 06:00:02 -0400  
>Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 10:09:16 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>>Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>>I am concerned that this discovery of 'alien life' may turn out  
>>to be a physics experiment that accidentally escaped from the  
>>lab. Now that it can interact and compete with the indigenous  
>>life on our planet, the consequences of this accidental (or  
>>intentional?) release of this alien life could be a threat to  
>>our survival worse than a real alien invasion.

>Maybe, Nick, but these "red rains", "rains of blood", etc., have  
>been happening for thousands of years. See the work of Charles  
>Fort for many reports. And there have been regular reports of  
>this phenomenon since Fort. It appears to be a natural, if  
>uncommon, phenomenon.

Thanks for your reply Bob!

Yes, this is true. Although some of these red rain events have  
been attributed to miracles by God, this is the first time that  
I'm aware of where scientists have claimed that these red-tinted  
cell-like structures in water which lack DNA must be of ET  
origin!

If these red-tinted cell-like structures are indeed airborne ET  
organisms that have been discovered in our upper atmosphere, one  
would expect the jet stream to eventually carry them all over  
the world. I have not learned of any recent reports of red rain  
falling in countries other than India though.

Just like snow is part of the usual winter weather for countries  
such as Canada, dust storms are very much part of the daily  
weather forecasts for other countries. During a dust storm that  
coloured the entire sky over Cairo into a uniform red, my flight  
was one of the very last allowed to take-off since these fine  
dust particles can quickly destroy jet engines. On another  
occasion I was driven to an astronomical site in the interior of  
Saudi Arabia at night during a major dust storm. As morning  
arrived, the storm was still raging and the visibility was zero.  
When the visibility started to improve later in the day and I  
started to see a red desert with red coloured distant mesas  
under a red coloured sky, it would not have taken much to  
convince me that I was on Mars!

If the incredible claim by physicist Godfrey Louis in the  
journal 'Astrophysics and Space' that these previously unknown  
micro-organisms are very likely ET in origin turns out to be  
true, this big and important story could have very serious  
consequences for all life on Earth and should not be overlooked  
or dismissed.

Nick Balaskas

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 11:40:51 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:08:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 05:53:55 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 06:48:32 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO - Golubik

>>How the actual camera automatically works and can be manually  
>>manipulated is also an open question. The closest recommended  
>>shot with the camera is three feet. The fastest shutter speed  
>>1/1200 sec. I'm not sure on the directional sensitivity of the  
>>detector until I play with it. What type of shutter was it...  
>>I'll let you know. There is the added property of affecting the  
>>exposer by waiting a different length of time before peeling  
>>back the opposite half of the film. The impact of this also has  
>>to be explored.

>Maybe I missed it in all the verbiage that this thread has  
>generated, but exactly which model Polaroid camera were these  
>photos supposed to have been taken with? I'd like to look up the  
>specifications.

Yes you missed it, numerous times in fact. I'd guess (without  
looking back) that some 8 or 10 messages, maybe more, have  
contained the quoted and again-quoted information that it was  
a Polaroid 101. (FL 114 mm, f8 - ~ f42, auto exposure, colour/BW  
selector switch) This verbiage is also available in just about  
any of the basic case literature. I wonder what other verbiage  
you missed?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 08:10:10 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:09:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 11:22:22 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Polaroid 101 automatic camera. Some photos for people at eBay:

><http://www.ebay.com.my/viItem?ItemId=7418165983#photo>

>F.L. 114 mm, aperature f8.0 - f42.0

>I used to own one in my youth until he got ripped off in a  
>burglarly 30+ years ago. As can be seen from the photos, there  
>is an optional manual adjustness for photo lightness, but  
>otherwise the camera is fully automatic. It was the first  
>electronic eye automatic exposure system on the consumer market.  
>I don't know the specifics of the various shutter speeds or what  
>procedure it used to set f-stops and shutter speeds.

>I don't remember if it also had a focus adustment. I don't think  
>so. If it was a typical Cameras for Dummies Edwin Land  
>production, it used aspheric optics and large f-stops so no  
>focusing was required. The viewfinder was also on top of the  
>camera, an issue in Heflin's photo 1 out his windshield when  
>Hartmann noticed the viewfinder would have been blocked.

OK, thanks for the info. I have a couple Polaroid 101 cameras in my collection.

The Polaroid 101 camera does have focus adjustment. In fact you must focus it. You can see in the photo that there are two tabs at the rear of the bellows. You focus by putting one forefinger of each hand on the tab and slide both tabs right or left. This changes the angle of the struts that support the lensboard and moves it forward or backward with respect to the film. The viewfinder on top has a built-in coincidence type rangefinder. You see a double image when something is out of focus, and as you move the tabs you bring the two images together until you see just one. At that point the subject is in focus. It is not a very fast process.

A simple CdS cell system controls exposure. The CdS cell controls the voltage sent to a capacitor and the amount of charge in the capacitor controls the aperture and how long the shutter remains open in a programmed sequence. This is similar to the system used on many early automatic cameras.

According to Collector's Guide to Instant Cameras by Michael J. Posner, the Polaroid 101 has the following specifications:

Years manufactured: 1963 - 1967  
Original price: \$ 134.95  
Film types accepted: Type 107 and Type 108  
Lens: 114mm f/8.8 to f/42  
Shutter speeds: 1/9 to 1/1200 second, plus up to 10 seconds in time exposure mode

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/09/06

From: **Aftergood Steven** <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 21:30:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:13:02 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/09/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 68  
June 9, 2006

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

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* FORMER DDCI STUDEMAN NAMED TO PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASS BOARD  
\*\* AVOIDING CONTAMINATION FROM CHEM/BIO/NUKE WEAPONS  
\*\* CRS: ACCOUNTING FOR POW/MIAS, AND MORE

FORMER DDCI STUDEMAN NAMED TO PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASS BOARD

U.S. Navy Admiral (ret.) William O. Studeman was appointed this week by Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert (R-IL) to serve on the Public Interest Declassification Board.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/06/pidb060606.html>

Adm. Studeman is a former Deputy Director of Central Intelligence and a former Director of the National Security Agency. As a member of the Board, he is now supposed to represent the public interest in declassification of government records.

Adm. Studeman is currently vice president and deputy general manager for intelligence and information superiority at Northrop Grumman Mission Systems.

He is the eighth member of the nine-person Board named to date. The Board is chaired by former CIA Inspector General L. Britt Snider.

The Public Interest Declassification Board advises the President on declassification policies and priorities. The Board will hold a public meeting on June 23 at the National Archives.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2006/06/fr060806.html>

AVOIDING CONTAMINATION FROM CHEM/BIO/NUKE WEAPONS

Tactics, techniques and procedures that military forces should use to avoid contamination from an attack involving chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) weapons are set forth in a recent military manual.

"The possibility that an adversary will use CBRN weapons against the United States and its allies continues to increase daily," the manual states.

"If these weapons are used, our forces must be ready to implement the principles of CBRN defense [including] contamination avoidance, protection, and decontamination."

"Executed at all levels and coupled with an effective retaliatory

response, these fundamentals will increase the likelihood of a US victory."

See "Multiservice Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Contamination Avoidance," U.S. Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, February 2006 (13.5 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-11-3.pdf>

CRS: ACCOUNTING FOR POW/MIAS, AND MORE

"There has been a long-running controversy about the fate of certain U.S. prisoners of war (POWs) and servicemembers missing in action (MIAs) as a result of various U.S. military operations," a newly updated Congressional Research Service (CRS) report on the subject begins.

"While few people familiar with the issue feel that any Americans are still being held against their will in communist countries associated with the Cold War, more feel that some may have been so held in the past in the Soviet Union, China, North Korea, or North Vietnam," according to the CRS author.

There is currently one U.S. Army soldier who is listed as a Prisoner of War following his capture by Iraqi insurgents on April 9, 2004.

See "POWs and MIAs: Status and Accounting Issues," June 1, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33452.pdf>

Some other recent CRS reports obtained by Secrecy News that are not readily available in the public domain include the following:

"Federal Emergency Management and Homeland Security Organization: Historical Developments and Legislative Options," updated June 1, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homsec/RL33369.pdf>

"Military Airlift: C-17 Aircraft Program," updated May 30, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL30685.pdf>

"F/A-22 Raptor," updated May 24, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL31673.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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul) with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)

Secrecy News is archived at:  
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/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](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](http://www.fas.org/sgp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:15:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 16:08:27 +0000  
>Subject: Reason's Reasoning

<snip>

>From: Robert Hall  
>To: Dick Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>Subject: Reason's reasoning  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 10:14:15 -0400

>No matter how many times I review what Ms. Reason is saying, I  
>am unsure of what she means. Hence I find it difficult to help  
>you with a reply. It seems to me that the problems here are  
>primarily ones of the philosophy of science and epistemology,  
>which are more your field than mine. To suggest cases of issues  
>resolved, I need to know what constitutes an "issue" and what  
>constitutes "resolution."

Ok, let's clarify: An issue is decisively settled when the weight of evidence supporting some position is so great, that there is absolutely no point, in the light of the evidence currently available, in arguing a contrary position.

(This assumes of course that one's intention is to do good science.)

>If "resolved" means settled permanently with no further change  
>or refinement, I doubt that we can accept the premise that  
>physics and chemistry have resolved issues. If "resolved" means  
>attainment of a temporary consensus (or near consensus), then  
>there are real differences between physical sciences and  
>social/behavioral sciences. So she may have a perfectly  
>legitimate point.

Now this is really interesting. I'd asked for an example of a controversy which had been decisively settled on the basis of evidence. But the Halls completely evade this question of evidence, and instead focus on the notion of "consensus" - by which they presumably mean, consensus of opinion.

In a way this encapsulates the problem of the social sciences - they depend not on evidence, but on opinions about evidence. The Halls appears to be suggesting a model in which what counts is whether there is a consensus of opinion - in other words, whether opinions agree or disagree.

But "consensus of opinion" is the modus operandi of the Humanities, not the sciences. In science what matters is not opinion but evidence, and in particular evidence in the form of testable predictions.

Indeed, consensus by itself means very little - it's quite possible for a group of people to have a consensus about something which is (probably) completely false, such as the consensus among Creationists about Darwinian evolution.

>The differences between physical and social

>sciences are largely the result of a much later start in the  
>latter and far less financial support.

Bingo! And funny that I should have mentioned this on the List only recently. Here is Excuse #1 why the social sciences have so little to show for their existence. I don't think this is the place to offer a detailed critique of this claim (but note that The Halls offers absolutely no evidence to support it) but the social sciences have been in existence now for well over a century. Just how long do they need to show that they're actually capable of achieving something?

>Also a part of the difference, I believe, is in the nature of  
>academic "disciplines." "Consensus" depends heavily on whom you  
>include in the population who must agree. The people who are  
>included as chemists or physicists do have a core of shared  
>methods and knowledge. The people who are included as  
>sociologists or political scientists or anthropologists include  
>many who follow scientific methods, both in theory construction  
>and compilation of empirical evidence, and they also have a core  
>of shared methods and knowledge.

"Theory construction" is not a scientific process - it's a philosophical process. It's only when theory becomes testable that the process becomes scientific (in other words, empirical).

I would like to see some evidence, by the way, that "theory construction" in the social sciences has anything whatsoever to do with the scientific method - or even that social scientists have any idea what this would actually entail.

>However, those considered sociologists or political scientists  
>include, in addition to the scientific ones, many who are more  
>in the tradition of humanities. So in these fields you have some  
>who reject scientific methods and the conclusions drawn from  
>those methods and some who reject ideas unless they are  
>supported by scientific evidence. If you use a criterion of  
>consensus, then those in disciplines such as physics and  
>chemistry probably do more often attain good consensus on  
>"issues" (depending on what we mean by "issues").

Now this is really dodgy, isn't it? We already know that many social scientists claim to be using the scientific method. What matters is whether those claims have any basis in reality, and the Halls provide no evidence that they do.

>You can still have a good consensus among the scientifically  
>oriented social scientists on those rare issues that have been  
>researched carefully and extensively.

But this is completely circular. If you define a peer group exclusively in terms of people who agree on something, then of course you will always have consensus! This just goes to show what a useless criterion this notion of "consensus" really is.

>That takes us back to the  
>relative lack of financial support and relatively short time  
>that it has been possible to pursue scientific approaches to  
>social "issues."

As I've already indicated, I'm not at all impressed by this excuse.

>You might note that in subfields such as the >prehistoric  
>archeologists within anthropology, the reliance on >hard science  
is strong, and I believe that you can find >substantial  
agreement in areas where there has been much >research.

Well it's certainly a convenient (if bizarre) redefinition of boundaries to consider prehistoric archeology a "subfield" within anthropology!

But archaeology itself is just a method, which is always used in conjunction with other methods. Archeologists will work in conjunction with archivists, specialists in ancient languages, specialists in reconstructing ancient crafts, specialists in modern-day cultures, and of course, plain old historians. For all that, I think the degree of agreement (let alone the reliability of the evidence base) is probably rather less than the Halls are claiming.

But notwithstanding all that, archeological methods are simply not social science methods. They are so different the comparison is meaningless.

>Of course you will still find disagreement on specifics, such as  
>whether a civilization under study occurred 3,000 years ago or  
>10,000 years ago.

Only a social scientist could claim that a 7000 year dating error was a mere specific ;-)

>Sorry that I cannot be of more direct help. I  
>have the feeling that there is no way to make progress in  
>understanding Cathy Reason's reasoning short of face-to-face  
>discussion in which she is forced to answer a lot of questions.

I'm fascinated that Robert Hall's idea of a face-to-face discussion is a process in which someone else is forced to answer a lot of questions, especially as he seems to have opted not to answer any himself ;-)

But this is really all rather puzzling. If the Halls really have no notion of what it means for a question to be decided on the basis of evidence, and can't figure it out without forcing someone to answer a lot of detailed questions, one is left wondering what on earth they think the scientific method actually is. And this seems to me fairly typical of social scientists: They talk a lot about scientific method, and make a lot of claims about it, but when challenged on what they think it actually is, they become strangely silent.

By the way, in case anyone is starting to think that none of this has anything to do with Ufology, well I think it does. Because most of what can be said about the social sciences - both good and bad - can probably, it seems to me, be said about Ufology as well.

Ok, enough. I now have to consult my tenth cousin thrice removed, Professor Vernon W Verblondjet (Chair of the Department of Unnecessary and Superfluous Studies at the University of Utter Buckinghamshire) on what to do when charged at by a man brandishing a wet catfish.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 14:32:22 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:39:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>Bingo! And funny that I should have mentioned this on the List  
>only recently. Here is Excuse #1 why the social sciences have so  
>little to show for their existence. I don't think this is the  
>place to offer a detailed critique of this claim (but note that  
>The Halls offers absolutely no evidence to support it) but the  
>social sciences have been in existence now for well over a  
>century. Just how long do they need to show that they're  
>actually capable of achieving something?

Cathy, thanks for doing the hard work - hope to preserve (and use) your full message, it's well worth a re-read for many folk.

A century-and-a-half ago a wise chap said of contemporary 'psychologists':

"In no other department has there been so much movement, and so little progress.

...

Under these circumstances, it is impossible to avoid a suspicion that there is some fundamental error in the manner in which these inquiries have been prosecuted"

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:14:18 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:43:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 18:17:05 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:24:01 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network,  
>>>which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous  
>>>scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very  
>>>thorough and always sought first to find a conventional  
>>>explanation for each case.

>>It seems like the old days had a much higher number of  
>>creditable participants than present day. Also, it seems like  
>>your journal and other historical preservation efforts are  
>>almost like the efforts of monks during the Dark Ages to save,  
>>for some future time of Enlightenment or Renaissance, the "old"  
>>knowledge of humanity's past golden age of greatness and works.  
>>Today, it seems with the huge number of gullible and uncritical  
>>thinking folk that we are in a Ufo-illogical Dark Ages.

>Like UFOs themselves, the study of the phenomenon comes in  
>waves, each one with a slightly different flavor, much of it  
>having to do with available technology. The growth of the  
>Internet, coupled by the introduction of relatively inexpensive  
>portable digital cameras (especially on cell phones), has  
>created a new wave of interest and interested people who  
>naturally have to be re-educated about UFO history. I don't see  
>a problem with that.

Without going to the effort of examining statistics, of which,  
the data is probably hard to get, it seems to me that the  
correlation of serious, qualified, credentialed people examining  
the UFO phenomena was more correlated to the peak in  
scientists/engineers that came about as a result of the GI Bill  
and Sputnik crisis. A certain percentage of these folk would  
have looked upon the UFO question as a challenge, much as more  
common folk see the crossword puzzle or jumble. It would stick  
in their craw and they would likely only have dropped the topic  
over a certain period of time because of lack of substantial  
progress.

Actively educating the new folk is not really necessary in the  
Internet world where such UFO history information is  
hypertextually linked (at least as a start). The problems are 1)  
the basic philosophy of the education system that got these kids  
through K-12 grades has become relativistic and focused on  
esteem building and has not prioritized critical thinking, 2)  
the dumbing down of people (via too many entertainment choices,  
music that does not stimulate the mind properly, rampant sex on

TV/Internet, permitting rampant illegal immigrants, deemphasizing science/engineering in lieu of high paying law/sales jobs).

>To over-glorify the work of the past would be a mistake, too, >however. I've always appreciated the work of NICAP and others >who went out and did their best to try and bring some >quantification to the field, and the result was the development >of some good, solid databases that can now be used for >reference. But even during the "golden age," not all of the >investigations were conducted well, and there were still more >people in contactee cults than doing real investigation.

I realize this, but the key point that impressed me was the quality of the past investigators.

>And, >although they can't be "blamed" for it, who knows how much of >the hard work done by the UFO organizations was lost, or ended >up rotting and fading away in old filing cabinets because the >organizations ran out of money and/or enthusiasm after decades >of failing to find an answer to the thing.

Yes, this is always a problem with past work. Even the various technical organizations in the government suffer from this kind of decay.

>And after all that hard, diligent work, the golden age >researchers never did find a solution, did they?

No, but the kind of trained minds they represented that were brought to bear on the problem were very impressive. The primary problem with their efforts were their lack of desire(?) to gather/analyze proactive data rather than be reactive. Only a handful of folk were proactive and they were the only ones who seriously had a chance to answer at least part of the UFO source question. Rather than spend precious dollars for travelling to witnesses, instruments could have been built, ever improving them to gather exactly the data they needed to make serious data backed and duplicatable statements.

>A lot of the >data tended to skew toward "nuts and bolts, ET" explanations, >and the weird stuff, like witness's reports of telepathic >communication or time distortion that didn't fit, were ignored. >It took decades for researchers to even start acknowledging the >abduction aspects. As shown in this and other threads, I still >find among the older researchers a definite predisposition >toward wanting these UFO things to be Bug-Eyed Aliens from Mars, >or something from a pulp magazine from the 30's-50's. "If it's >unknown, it must be aliens from another planet." Well, that >hypothesis didn't pan out any better than the others, did it? So >in a lot of ways the previous batch of researchers really >dropped the ball. They got side-tracked and obsessed with cases >they thought had "undeniable proof," and wasted a lot of time >and effort.

Yes, in a way I think some (most) did drop the ball. But do we really have the rationale of why they dropped it? Maybe it was just too hard to gather the kind of data they needed to approach the solving the question.

Even today, it is clear and obvious that the best way to gather meaningful data on UFOs is proactive data collection, but little is done although tons of amazingly powerful computers are out there and amazingly powerful cameras to connect to them and the ability to automate and postprocess data is cheap and simple. Hell, the computer can text message you or call your cell phone and let you know an event is happening. Relatively cheap radio frequency and magnetometer sensors can gather and realtime-analyze spectrum too. Back in the older days this kind of effort would have taken more work than "simply" interviewing a witness and using critical thinking to determine what could have caused the event.

>Money has always been a problem. Conducting good research >requires an awful lot of time and energy and resources, and it >hasn't gotten any cheaper. In fact, because of the increased >number of good sightings, reported via the Internet, a lot more >money would be necessary to adequately organize and train and >send out qualified researchers. As a result, some farmer could

>have a dead alien tucked away in his tool shed, and nobody  
>interested would ever get out to take a look at it.

Perhaps research costs more if you are following the traditional reactive paradigm of interviewing witnesses. However, proactive approaches should cost much less than was possible in the Golden Age.

>On the positive side, we no longer have to rely on the  
>occasional, sensationalized UFO book to come out, or scrounge  
>through local papers looking for back-page sighting reports.  
>News of UFO sightings is practically immediate, which allows  
>those directly involved to investigate and present their case  
>quicker, and for any glaring holes or discrepancies to be  
>immediately hammered. No more waiting months and years to study  
>bad, grainy, half-tone UFO photos, now we can look at bad,  
>grainy, over-pixelated UFO photos a week after they were taken.  
>I don't know if this is exactly progress, but it does help  
>separate the wheat from the chaff a little sooner.

I think the problem that was exemplified by the Golden Age interviews was that no matter how many cases come in and you research, you are always limited about the kind of data and resolution you can ever get. This means that usually, you will never be able to resolve a case. And certainly you will never be able to conclusively say this is an ET UFO (at least with data substantial enough to convince scientists) (also ignoring the recovery of debris/aliens/etc). But build an instrument set and describe it completely and gather data such that others can replicate if they want, then you are getting into science and respect rather than what UFOlogy has seemed to turned into... a sociology research field.

>Anyway, I'm looking at UFO research as in a transitional stage.  
>The older researchers, inspired by Buck Rogers and FATE Magazine, are sadly passing away. Newer researchers, not including the perennial kooks, are still trying to find a handle on the subject. It may eventually be that the Internet will serve as an organizing point, with individual researchers tackling the field work for sightings in their local areas, and then responding to detail questions put to them through the Internet site. That might be interesting, as well as more cost effective and immediate. Education still needs to be prioritized, particularly trying to avoid bringing one's personal beliefs into the investigation. But that's always been the hard part. The mere fact that someone is interested in researching means they already have a predisposition. Why would anyone to it out of the blue?

Because it is a mystery they want an answer to.

>Anyway, rather than decrying the current state of UFO study and its apparent lack of interest in previous investigation, it might be better to steer more toward educating interested people who might want to do the field work, teaching witnesses how to properly view and report their sightings, and collecting and organizing data received via the Internet to make it functional.

Perhaps. All that seems to support the reactive paradigm though. I would prefer to eschew that approach and the grounds that its been done and did not reach any conclusions (plus lots of people seem to want to do it that way anyway).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 09:19:56 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 14:03:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:38:07 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>>>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

<snip>

Unfortunately, the following post was accidentally sent before completion and EBK didn't get the followup message to cancel it.

Please ignore. I'll post the final version later today.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:29:35 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 14:09:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Jeff Olson <[jlolson.nul](mailto:jlolson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 16:29:33 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 13:52:24 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>How about a really good hologram of a duck? Or a decoy duck? Or a robot  
>>duck? Or something else that goes out of its way to imitate a duck?

>>The duck analogy sounds good but anybody who really thinks about it  
>>for a few minutes can see it's a crock.

<snip>

>I'm not saying this to be offensive, but I'm getting the strong  
>sense that you might be one of those Christians who believe the  
>UFOs/aliens are in actuality demons, hobgoblins, or some other  
>form of spiritual apparition.

>Am I right?

>That would help explain how you could write something like the  
>above. It's hard to imagine why anyone would make such a  
>statement except under the dictates of some strong emotional  
>agenda.

This is so funny I can barely contain myself! All of it!

First, no, I am not a Christian. But I have a brother who is a Penecostal minister and who holds the views you wonder whether I have or not (UFOs/aliens being demonic or spiritual apparitions). Funny thing is, for nearly twenty years he and I have been conflicting harshly - often to the point of his not speaking to me for prolonged periods of time -regarding these very views, as I oppose them when he tries to tell me UFOs are from the devil, etc.! So, you're so far off base here you need a warp drive to get back!

Second, why do you say "that would help explain how you could write something like the above"? So would my just not wanting to assume anything (explain "why I wrote it"). Why does merely questioning why some apparent high-tech vehicle-type UFOs demonstrate such bizarre qualities invoke such an intense reaction in you - and require such an extreme explanation on your part.

Third, questioning a premature conclusion requires someone to be caught in "the dictates of some strong emotional agenda"? Questioning (but not taking a stand against - merely giving it the same weight as other explanations) requires one to be in "the dictates of some strong emotional agenda"? I confess you got me bewildered here! I think it more likely you are the one functioning within "the dictates of some strong emotional agenda" - you seem to get quite uncomfortable when the ETH is

questioned.

Fourth, you have evidence, I suppose, that rules out "spiritual apparition(s)" as a possible solution to the UFO enigma? You can prove that another form of conscious being or intelligence (less dense physically than us) is not responsible? Because I can't! So, while I don't advocate this as the solution, I don't dismiss it as a possible answer.

Fifth, are you sure it's not you who has become the zealot - UFOs and aliens seem to have become a religion to you!

Sixth, I didn't take offense! I'm just wondering how you ever came to need to ask such wierd questions based on what I've said - why you would get such a "strong sense" of me being of that frame of mind. In any event, you are as wrong as you can be!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:39:17 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 17:52:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:56:47 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 14:28:29 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

Based on your reply to Dr. Maccabee, Mr. Garza, your "research" team and "research" seem quite flawed. Unless you are operating using some new form of scientific method, you lose all credibility by offering arm-waving claims with no substantiation. We are to just trust you? Well, then why even publish the UFO FLIR video at all? We can just "trust" that you that you have a video of UFOs locked away in a desk somewhere.

If the Mexican Air Force really made a number flights, then they should provide the confirmatory video that they did so. By matching the flight path on the FLIR video screen and camera angle and magification than we can truly confirm or deny the oil flare claims. If the aircraft flew too far south then they will not see the lights. But no, we have to trust them and you. This is not science.

Also, the claims you make can be proven false simply by examining the early part of the "UFO" FLIR video prior to any UFOs. The FLIR zooms in on bright lights but the crew makes no comments about them.

So we must deduce that the crew felt they were not UFOs. But they are unknown bright FLIR lights. So are you telling me that no crew ever saw anything like those objects in future flights?

This would indicate that either the crews or Mexican Air Force is lying. Yes, just armwave all these early bright FLIR light zooms. I'll bet your team of experts never tried to correlate them with actual objects on the ground as others have. One critical bright FLIR light (prior to the 'UFO' FLIR light groups) is definitely correlated to a gas burnoff flare on the ground (not out in the the Campeche Bay) fairly near the beach/coast. No mention about this from you experts.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Dan Aykroyd On CNN

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>

Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:04:49 -0400

Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:04:49 -0400

Subject: Dan Aykroyd On CNN

Source: CNN - Atlanta, Georgia, USA

<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0606/09/acd.01.html>

Aired June 9, 2006 - 22:00 ET

Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees

J.D.Roberts [Substitute Host]: For (INAUDIBLE) of flying saucers, June is a very special time. It was 59 years ago this month that modern reports of UFOs and aliens among us began filtering in. A number of opinion polls suggest that as many as 48 percent of all Americans believe that aliens visit earth. That could mean that there's a ready market for Dan Aykroyd's latest film, but this is no cone head reunion. It's a documentary. Dan Aykroyd, unplugged, on UFOs. Anderson recently spoke with Aykroyd and producer David Sereda.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

Anderson Cooper, CNN Anchor: So you really believe that UFOs exist. Why?

Dan Aykroyd, Unplugged On UFOs: Well, I think the preponderance of anecdotal evidence from pilots, from law enforcement people, from people who have had experiences and sightings, I think also my own experience. I've had a high altitude sighting with three other people. It definitely wasn't a helicopter, a jet. Now of course, you know, a professional would discount my sighting and say, well, you don't really know. I can't sit here and tell you 100 percent that I saw a craft that was created by beings from another planet outside of our sphere of technology. I can't tell you 100 percent. I can just tell you what I saw and what I feel. They're here. They're looking at us in a Petri dish and I've got to say, the way mankind is behaving, they're probably very disappointed.

Cooper: David, why did you make this documentary?

David Sereda, Producer, Unplugged On UFOs: Well, actually, in 1968, I was 7 years old, walking home from elementary school. And all of these people were pointing up in the sky at this metallic disc-shaped UFO with a little, you know, knob on the top. And it was clear. This thing was down low, you know 3500 feet. If I had a video camera back then, it would have been some of the best footage we've ever seen to date.

And when you see one of these things, I mean, 20 clear minutes people were pounding on the neighbor's doors, get out here. Look at this thing. And when you look at it and you replay that in your memory, it's beyond all the videotapes and the photographs. It's so real to me. It was so real to me at such a young age that I just couldn't ignore it. So I was engaged at 7 years old into this phenomenon.

Cooper: In the film Dan, you talk about a personal experience

that you had. I just want to play some of that from the movie.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

Aykroyd: I woke up in the middle of the night and I said to my wife, they're calling me, they're calling me. I want to go outside, they want me to come outside and see. Something outside wants me to come out and see. Oh, just go back to bed. I went back to bed but the next day in the media - in newspapers and radio - all over upstate New York and Ontario and Quebec and Vermont, people spoke about this urge they had to go out of their houses at 3:00 in the morning and look up into the sky.

(END OF VIDEO CLIP)

Cooper: Come on, is that for real?

Aykroyd: Yeah, you could research, that was in the mid-80s. In fact it was a pink spiral that appeared in the sky. People went out, telepathically urged like I was, I didn't go, shmuck. They went out, in the sky they saw this pink spiral in the sky, huge, miles, like two miles long. And the Air Force said it was a Chinese rocket.

Cooper: Isn't this sort of one of those things that's like the Kennedy assassination? I mean there are people, no matter what evidence is put forward, there is no evidence or that, you know the lights turn out to be, you know, a plane or a helicopter or something or just a natural phenomenon. Aykroyd: The moon, all the old excuses.

Cooper: There's nothing - this argument can never be settled.

Aykroyd: Half the world believes in the latest polls and half doesn't. And those who don't will never believe. We can show them everything and they're not going to - until they're taken up themselves or the guy walks up and shakes their hand or probes them or whatever they do.

Cooper: I mean look, do you believe there's people who - there's all these people who claim to have been abducted by aliens.

Aykroyd: I believe them.

Cooper: You do, really?

Aykroyd: I don't believe all of them, but I was in a room at the Fifth Avenue Medical Institute with John MacK and his staff and his assistant, his clinical assistant got up and gave a 15-minute presentation that was absolutely riveting. Here is what people are telling us. John MacK was a Harvard psychiatrist, he discovered this through work in hypnosis and he saw people were regressed and telling these stories. It's all the same. Now is it a mass hallucination? Some people say its sleep terror.

Cooper: Right. There are people who said, well, you know, I woke up, I couldn't move, I was paralyzed. It was the aliens who did it and the doctors say well that's sleep terror. You wake up, you feel you can't move.

Aykroyd: It could be. But I have people that I believe are credible that claim they've been taken that have the scoop marks and that have been implanted.

Cooper: If they came by in the middle of the night -

Aykroyd: Yes, I'd go.

Cooper: You'd go really?

Aykroyd: Yeah, as long as I wasn't a probed. As long as they let me drive.

Cooper: And as long as you'd be back in the morning or else your wife would kill you.

Aykroyd: Well that's right. Or she can come, too.

(END OF VIDEOTAPE)

Roberts: I've just been doodling a little here. It's all easy to

laugh about, of course, unless it happened to you.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

Unknown: Touching me. Quit touching me. Ah!

(END OF VIDEO CLIP)

Roberts: Under hypnosis, some people vividly recall what they claim are alien abductions. We're going to have their stories for you.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

Roberts: Before the break, we cited poll numbers indicating that up to 48 percent of Americans think that UFOs are real. If that number surprises you, well, wait until we dig just a little bit deeper. A stunning number of people not only believe in UFOs, they're convinced that they've been taken along for a ride. Here's CNN's Gary Tuchman.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

Gary Tuchman, CNN Correspondent: Clayton and Donna Lee consider themselves a happy couple. How long have you guys been married?

Donna Lee: 18 1/2 years, it will be 19 years January 2nd.

Tuchman: But not an ordinary couple.

Clayton Lee: I want to go home. I want to go home!

Tuchman: Under hypnosis -

Relax completely and listen to the sound of my voice.

Tuchman: It's apparent the Lees are quite out of the ordinary.

Donna Lee: Oh, no. I just need to go. I just need to go.

Tuchman: What's going on here? Clayton and Donna Lee are trying to retrieve memories about being kidnapped by creatures from another world. Donna has drawn a picture of an alien who she says captured her. Clayton says one of his capturers looked similar. How many times have you been abducted by aliens?

Clayton Lee: More than 10. Yeah. More than 20 probably.

We have come to visit you in peace.

Tuchman: For most people, visions of alien abductions are limited to the movies and TV. But in a CNN/Time magazine poll in 1997, 2 percent of respondents said they had been abducted by aliens or knew someone who was. Based on the sample that correlated to more than 5 million Americans. Clayton Lee says he was a child in this Houston park the first time he was abducted. Saying he was lifted in the air.

Clayton Lee: And I remember just floating up, higher and higher, until all that was around me were stars and blackness. And then I blacked out.

Tuchman: The hypnotist tries to retrieve further memories of that day.

Clayton Lee: Quit touching me. Quit touching me. Ah!

What is that, Clayton?

Oh!

What's the reason for all this?

They gave me something.

What was it they gave you?

They gave me something.

Tuchman: The hypnotist, who's a private investigator, also claims to have been an abductee. You can understand how a lot of

people would think, this is really far out.

Unidentified Male: Well I think it's far out. I think it's bizarre. And I wish it had never happened to me. My life would be a lot better.

Tuchman: Susan Clancy is a Harvard psychiatrist who decided to do research on people's abduction claims.

Susan Clancy, Harvard Psychiatrist: When I ran the first add looking for people who thought they had been abducted by aliens, I thought we'd get very few calls, but we were inundated with calls for a month after we ran one ad.

Tuchman: The ads were for subjects who wanted to be included in her new book about people who believed they were kidnapped by aliens. But Clancy is determined she is not a believer.

Clancy: So people have symptoms like psychological distress, anxiety, sexual problems, nightmares. And for better or for worse, today being abducted by aliens is a culturally available explanation for why you might have some of these symptoms.

Tuchman: With all the reported alien abductions, you might think there would be one high-quality photograph or videotape that would indisputably show aliens in action. Until that happens, most people will have their doubts. But not all people.

Clayton remains convinced this scar is a remnant of an experimental operation to collect his DNA. Donna believes a fetus was taken from her body. Is it possible - possible that you just have a vivid imagination? And that this really didn't happen? Donna Lee: No. I mean, I have a vivid imagination, but I know it happened.

Tuchman: And they both say they expect to be abducted again. At any time. Gary Tuchman, CNN, Houston.

(END OF VIDEOTAPE)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:41:06 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:22:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Ledger

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 15:27:26 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 06:20:21 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>I didn't check your math, but I wonder why you assume so much  
>>weight. Jess Marcel and others who handled bits of the Roswell  
>>wreckage have all emphasized it's extraordinarily light weight.

>>I think one important part of the equation has to be that this  
>>assumed 30 foot craft might only weight a few hundred pounds,  
>>not five tons.

>>Bob Shell

>Now that we have Energy Density down as a concept, these are  
>great questions!

>You can put whatever values you want. That's why I wrote  
>everything out, etc. Anyone can do the math now. It's not that  
>hard, really.

>By the way I can't assume densities of metals at that level  
>based upon stories unless we can show what the actual volume and  
>weight of those were and exactly what part of the alleged craft  
>they came from. If I had picked up that portion of an alleged  
>metal craft and had as much time with it as some apparently did,  
>not only would I have weighed it (you can use a stick and a rock  
>in the field, balance it on either end and later replace the  
>object with another rock, then weighed that substitute rock), I  
>would have found how much water it displaced in my bath tub too  
>or simply measured it's thickness with a another stick or  
>rock... got it's rough surface area \_ whatever? Thereby getting  
>it's rough density and then comparing it with know metallic  
>compounds and pure metallic elements. I would have also buried a  
>piece instantly for later retrieval. Of course, Isotope ratios  
>could be checked later and as analysis tools improved we could  
>do more and more (I won't go into details).

>For comparison, it certainly would be nice if we all could play  
>around with a thin piece (sheet) of Titanium too?

>Until we weigh an actual UFO, we have to assume some reasonable  
>starting point. Perhaps I was a bit high. I just grabbed a  
>number out of my head to see where it would lead. But, as I  
>state in my posting, the concept of energy density is one that  
>is seldom explained properly. That is the thrust of that earlier  
>e-mail. Move all the values around and we can develop a graph  
>with cut-offs with each variable type. If this has never been  
>done before, it should have long ago. Again, this is my point.  
>This is a common language we should all share and I'm just  
>taking the time to explain it a little better... I hope?

>There's nothing difficult here... that's my point also. We can  
>all make this accessible to understanding without getting into  
>complicated scientific jargon. Communication is far more  
>important.

Victor and Bob,

Just a couple of points. In his book Paul Hill noted one incident where trace evidence of the "landing gear impressions" probably from one of Ted Phillip's cases and where testing was done in control soil some short distance away indicated that whatever made the impression weighed about 30 tons. The Witness said the object was about 25 feet in diameter. If there was exotic material recovered at Roswell there's no reason to believe that the stuff handled by Jesse Marcel Jr. has to be structural material. It could have been from some other articles inside the thing. If so it could not be viewed as that which would contribute to the weight of the craft other than being in the craft. There's the possibility, however, that some downward pressure was being exerted by whatever drove the 30 ton machine to hold it firmly in place on the ground contributing to the deepness of the soil impressions. Maybe it was very light and needed that downward pressure to keep it from blowing over.

There's the Childerhose photo over Fort McCleod, Canada taken by a RCAF pilot in 1956 that Bruce Maccabee looked into. Richard Haines wrote this up in Peter Sturrock's "The UFO Enigma". Bruce has it on his site. In the book it states that "If acting as an isotropic Lambertian radiator, the power output within the spectral range of the film would have been in excess of 10-to the ninth power-watts."

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:15:27 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:25:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Maccabee

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 15:14:33 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Lan Fleming <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
>>To: UFOUpdates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 08:37:50 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

<snip>

>So you are saying that the scientists that supported the team  
>investigation efforts (in NICAP/MUFON/APRO) were solely  
>motivated by publishing? And that they would not have done it  
>without being compensated? I doubt it. I would suspect most  
>performed this work unfunded, in their free time and for the  
>sake of pure science/wonder. The Condon report should have  
>hardly affected them directly. However, I can understand the  
>peer pressure of people making fun of them for continuing to  
>work on something that was discredited by that report. With or  
>without a Condon report, such derision would have occurred  
>throughout the period we are talking about (1950-1980). How many  
>funded technical papers were published each year on the topic?  
>Does it really correspond to the Condon report?

>>Starting in the 1950s, the government and the academic  
>>hierarchies wished to bring the study of UFOs into disrepute.  
>>They succeeded completely, as groups with large amounts of  
>>political power ususually do. The fact that so much time is  
>>spent on this list remarking on how disreputable UFOlogy is  
>>evidence of their great success.

>If this conspiracy has any public facts to document them, then  
>it would be interesting to see. I suspect that such an  
>institutional bias is unwritten and typical of all disciplines  
>where the dogma (paradigm) of the organization is protected  
>against any anomalies. It does not take much to frame the study  
>of UFOs within the acceptable paradigm (bolides, plasma,  
>fireballs, sprites, ball lightning) but whenever one goes  
>outside it one will encounter resistance. Regardless of what the  
>hierarchies state, what the scientist or engineer does in his  
>free time is beyond their perview so should not affect the  
>numbers of these folk involved in UFOs. Yet they seem fewer.

There may or may not be a real conspiracy to prevent publication  
of UFO-positive related papers in peer reviewed journals. But at  
the very least there is an institutional bias. Vide,

<http://.brumac.8k.com/still> in default/still in default.html

This takes you to a paper I wrote 20 years ago... updated to two  
years ago... entitled Still In Default. Why that title will  
become apparent when you read the paper.

However, you may want to simply scroll down to the section  
entitle Non-Publication of Papers which describes the history of  
my attempts to publish positive UFO papers. Mostly the establish



had a harder head than mine... but... I did win one! (or two!)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:54:59 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:27:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Maccabee

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:38:07 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>>By the way, a nuclear engine can put out about: 40,000,000,000  
>>Watts so we're way above that too!

>Not if we use already existing observational data about actual  
>UFO accelerations instead of picking an absurd number out of a  
>hat. In that case, the actual power consumption in your example  
>5000 kg craft gets scaled down 200,000 times to 5,000,000,000  
>Watts, or 1/8th of the nuclear engine.

>>That would be 2,500 Nuclear  
>>>Powered Rocket Engines. Did anyone say where's all the fuel?

>>At some point, depending upon which numbers I put into the above  
>>equations, we will obtain power densities that are achievable  
>>and within our current abilities. That's the vertex point I was  
>>discussing above.

>Start with a more realistic example, and you'll discover the  
>power densities are already within our current abilities.

>>By the way, one of the reasons many speculate on mass or  
>>inertial reduction as a means of achieving such maneuvering  
>>capability, is that the energy requirements would come way down  
>>to our current levels of use and density. However, in order to  
>>reduce mass or inertia would require advances in our current  
>>understanding of Physics and then the correspondingly steeper  
>>curve of applying that new knowledge and developing useful  
>>technologies from it... still very very difficult! A vertex  
>>point way above our understanding! And, is it even possible?

<snip>

>>Another reason people stress inertial dampening, is the simple  
>>fact that no material (human flesh included) could probably  
>>handle the stresses I've entertained in the above example. We  
>>could've easily calculated stresses too (close) and found  
>>another vertex point for the material strength requirements.  
>>Also, the fuel requirements, etc...

>Antigravity field propulsion would also protect the crew since  
>they could be accelerated simultaneously with craft. Hence no  
>lag time behind the craft and no differential acceleration,  
>which is what creates the crushing forces on the body without  
>such protection.

>>BTW, one has to be able to convert this energy too from others  
>>forms. Not too mention direct it/absorb it in such a way as too

>>not inadvertently convert it into wasted energy in the form of  
>>heat which would have easily vaporized the above craft before it  
>>ever had a chance to turn around or even begin to stop.

>The craft doesn't continuously have to generate such energies  
>and power densities, but can do it in short bursts over a period  
>of a few seconds. E.g., at 100 g acceleration (~1000 m/sec<sup>2</sup>), a  
>craft can accelerate to orbital velocity (~8000 m/sec) in only 8  
>seconds and escape velocity (~10,000 m/sec) in only 10 seconds.

The second half of the following paper presents  
actual data on UFO acceleration  
including a calculations of over 100 to over 500 g's.  
This is based on video evidence. In the case of the July 21  
1995 video it was possible to calculate "exact" values.

<http://brumac.8k.com/Acceleration/ACCELERATION.htm>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 11:02:37 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:29:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Rudiak

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 12:40:35 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 10:14:16 -0300  
>>>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers [was: Jesse Marcel Jr...]

>>What makes you say they are made from the same materials found  
>>on Earth? Same elements maybe. But there are, for example,  
>>many materials presently made on earth that couldn't have been  
>>made 50 years ago. Ask Intel . Do you have some such material  
>>from a flying saucer? Have you seen analysis thereof? The  
>>Roswellwitnesses indicate materials with extraordinary light  
>>weight, high strength, great resistance to being cut, burned...  
>>Are these more of the hypothetical, theoretical ,science fiction  
>>devices of which you are speaking?

>>snip

>If I might add a comment and illustration here and there. The  
>point Tim, is that there are defining points at which our  
>technology and their technology take separate branches. that  
>vertex point, the one that separates ours from there's, does  
>need better definition and distinction so that we don't get  
>caught up with this false belief that it Could possibly be  
>ours!. If not, we have to come up with great observations: One  
>of the reasons I stress the need for good data on UFO  
>behavior... witness testimony, triangulation, distance, speed,  
>etc. But, getting a mass value on an unknown craft is rather  
>more difficult . .

>In any case, one concept, in particular, needs explanation:

>Power Density. Some of the instantaneous observations made on  
>UFO behavior suggest a power source way beyond our ability to  
>construct in a controlled fashion. If a 5,000 Kilogram craft  
>moving at 2,000 meters a second made a reverse turn in a 2  
>millisecond burst over a distance of 20 meters, that would  
>require an output power of:

Unfortunately, what follows is one of those "UFOs violate the laws of physics" arguments based on using unrealistic made-up numbers, resulting in outrageously inflated accelerations, forces, energies, and powers. (Although Victor isn't trying to debunk here, debunkers often use such arguments to try do exactly that.)

There is already observational data (e.g., Paul Hill's 2 UFO sightings detailed in his book "Unconventional Flying Objects") placing maximum UFO accelerations in the neighborhood of 100 g's or 1000 m/sec<sup>2</sup>. Here are some example cases from past Updates posts:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/oct/m04-009.shtml>  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/2005/oct/m05-008.shtml>

Compare this with what Victor gets with his made-up example below. The results you get all depend on your assumptions.

In fairness, and as Victor notes below, this was just a thought experiment on his part, but I think it wise to start with more realistic numbers from the gitgo, else one's conclusions about UFO physics end of "way out there."

>1) Acceleration/Deceleration = Change in Velocity divided by  
>time.  $A = +2,000 - (-2,000)/2^{-3}$  seconds = 2 million  
>meters/sec<sup>2</sup>

Well let's see. 2 million m/sec<sup>2</sup> is ~200,000 g's (!) or 2000 times the observational accelerations of around 1000 m/sec<sup>2</sup> (100 g's).

Here's how the same object could have 100 g accelerations and still seem to be practically turning around on a dime. Decelerate over 2 seconds and 2000 meters to a dead stop:

stopping distance =  $1/2 \times \text{acceleration} \times \text{time}^2$   
=  $1/2 \times 1000 \text{ m/sec}^2 \times 2^2 \text{ sec} = 2000 \text{ m}$   
Deceleration = velocity/time  
=  $-2000 \text{ m/sec} / 2 \text{ sec} = -1000 \text{ m/sec}^2$  or -100 g.

Then to complete the 180 degree turnaround, reaccelerate in the opposite direction to original speed in 2 seconds in a space of 2000 meters.

To the naked eye observer, the rapid deceleration and acceleration are barely perceptible. Instead, one sees the object doing a 180 degree turn and shooting back off in the opposite direction. Thus there is no need to invoke arbitrary and absurdly high accelerations to get a perception of "instantaneous" reversal.

>2) Force = Mass X acceleration  
>F = 5,000 Kg x 2,000,000 meter/sec<sup>2</sup>  
>F = 10,000,000,000 Newtons

Or 10 billion Newtons. That certainly sounds daunting. But using the more realistic 100 g's, this number is reduced 2000 times to 5 million Newtons. By comparison, a 747 develops about a million Newtons of thrust on takeoff and the Saturn 5 moon rocket about 35 million Newtons on takeoff. So 5 million Nts. is not exactly "impossible."

On the other hand, this is creating a lot of force over a small volume of craft of low mass. Current aeronautical materials wouldn't hold up. But nanotechnology materials now emerging from labs, such as carbon nanotubule threads and fabrics (at least 60 times stronger than steel) can probably handle the stresses.

(Added note: All this also assumes conventional propulsion type technologies and Newtonian physics. Field propulsion technology, however, could conceivably reduce g-force stresses on craft and occupants by accelerating/decelerating all things at the same rate. More esoteric theoretical possibilities such as inertial mass reduction would do the same thing. Victor also brings this point up below.)

>3) The Amount of work required is: Work = Force X Distance,  
>the above times 20:

>Work = 200,000,000,000 Newton-meters But, 1 Newton-meter =  
>1 joule So we have: 200,000,000,000 Joules of Energy!

Or 200 billion Joules. However, there is a flaw in the calculation somewhere because this is 10 times more energy than

the total kinetic energy of the object to brake to a stop and then reaccelerate back to original speed.

$K.E. = 1/2 m \times v^2 = 1/2 \times 5000 \text{ kg} \times 2000^2 = 10^{10}$  or 10 billion Joules

The object loses 10 billion Joules of K.E. when stopping and needs another 10 billion to reaccelerate back up to speed: total 20 billion Joules.

Just to keep things in perspective, gasoline has about 150 million Joules of chemical energy per gallon. So slowing to a stop requires the energy equivalent of about 70 gallons of gasoline and another 70 gallons to speed up. This is spread out over 4 seconds, so about 35 gallons per second. This is about 10 times the energy consumption rate of a 747 on takeoff, which is impressive, but, again, hardly impossible. Again, for comparison, a Saturn 5 burned somewhere around 1000 gallons/sec of fuel (kerosene) on takeoff, or 30 times the energy of the saucer in its hypothetical quick reversal.

>4) But, the Energy Required (The above) has to be delivered >over the entire time interval: Therefore, we get:

>Work divided by time =  $1 \times 10^{14}$  Joules/sec of momentary output >... That's:

> 100,000,000,000,000 Watts!

Or in what I consider my more realistic example using different assumptions, the power would be a much more modest 20 billion joules/4 seconds or 5 billion Watts, which is 200,000 times smaller than Victor's number!

>That's 1,000,000,000,000 (100 watt bulbs)  
>Since 746 watts = 1 Horse power, That's: 268,096,515  
>million 500 Horse power Engines running at full power!

Except divide that down by 200,000. This is now "only" 6.7 million horsepower or 13,400 500 horsepower engines. By comparison, the 747 jet engines generate about 500,000 horsepower at maximum thrust, but the Saturn 5 generated 160 million horsepower at takeoff, or 2 dozens times more power than needed by the saucer. Even the much more modest solid-fuel escape rockets attached to the Apollo command module (for emergency escapes) generated over a million horsepower.

Thus the required power generation is still impressive, but again within parameters of human-built machines using primitive and inefficient chemical propulsion systems.

>Can we fit that type of Energy in a 30 foot Craft? No way!

No way using your numbers, which is why this is a "UFOs violate the laws of physics" argument.

However, yes way if you start with more realistic assumptions grounded in actual observation data. The energy/power numbers then come down over 5 orders of magnitude to numbers that are now just a little bit beyond our own small aircraft, but not that much.

>So,  
>this is the whole point I'm making on Energy Density! But,  
>please take my illustrative example with a little grain of  
>salt:0 My own belief is that these are much too high!

Glad you recognize this. Yes I agree. The numbers are indeed MUCH too high.

>It's the concept I was most interested in pushing and this gives >us all a better feel for the concept at play here.

OK, just a thought experiment.

>By the way, a nuclear engine can put out about: 40,000,000,000 >Watts so we're way above that too!

Not if we use already existing observational data about actual UFO accelerations instead of picking an absurd number out of a hat. In that case, the actual power consumption in your example

craft gets scaled down 200,000 times to 5,000,000,000 Watts, or 1/8th of the nuclear engine. However, if you have a large energy storage system, discussed further below, you also don't need a large power generator.

>That would be 2,500 Nuclear  
>Powered Rocket Engines. Did anyone say where's all the fuel?

>At some point, depending upon which numbers I put into the  
>above equations, we will obtain power densities that are  
>achievable and within our current abilities. That's the vertex  
>point I was discussing above.

Start with a more realistic example, and you'll discover the power densities are already about within our current abilities.

>By the way, one of the reasons many speculate on mass or  
>inertial reduction as a means of achieving such maneuvering  
>capability, is that the energy requirements would come way  
>down  
>to our current levels of use and density. However, in order to  
>reduce mass or inertia would require advances in our current  
>understanding of Physics and then the correspondingly steeper  
>curve of applying that new knowledge and developing useful  
>technologies from it... still very very difficult! A vertex  
>point way above our understanding! And, is it even possible?

Well, nobody knows for sure, which is why I tread lightly on the subject above. The Tampere University spinning superconductor experiment by Eugene Podkletnov in 1992 claimed 2% inertial mass reduction, but what has happened since then is a little obscure.

>Another reason people stress inertial dampening, is the simple  
>fact that no material (human flesh included) could probably  
>handle the stresses I've entertained in the above example. We  
>could've easily calculated stresses too (close) and found  
>another vertex point for the material strength requirements.  
>Also, the fuel requirements, etc...

Antigravity field propulsion would also protect the crew since they could be accelerated simultaneously with craft. Hence no lag time behind the craft and no differential acceleration, which is what creates the crushing forces on the body without such protection.

>BTW, one has to be able to convert this energy too from others  
>forms. Not too mention direct it/absorb it in such a way as  
>too not inadvertently convert it into wasted energy in the form  
>of heat which would have easily vaporized the above craft before  
>it ever had a chance to turn around or even begin to stop.

The craft doesn't have to continuously generate such energies and power densities, but can do it in short bursts over a period of a few seconds. E.g., at 100 g acceleration ( $\sim 1000 \text{ m/sec}^2$ ), a craft can accelerate to orbital velocity ( $\sim 8000 \text{ m/sec}$ ) in only 8 seconds and escape velocity ( $\sim 10,000 \text{ m/sec}$ ) in only 10 seconds.

Take energy to orbit. Neglecting frictional energy, minimum energy to low orbit (100 miles) for a 5000 kg craft is about 64 billion Joules kinetic energy and 8 billion Joules potential energy: Total 72 billion Joules (energy equivalent of roughly 500 gallons of gasoline). Let's double that to allow for frictional losses through the atmosphere and leave a little reserve for emergencies. This takes the needed energy storage for these brief bursts of speed up to around 200 billion Joules. In between these short bursts, the unknown energy source is slowly recharging the energy storage device, easing power demands on the main energy source.

(Think of this as something like an electric hybrid car in which a battery, capacitor, or flywheel provides the necessary spurts of energy for passing other cars, climbing hills, etc., then gets recharged by the main motor between the spurts.)

The following high efficiency energy storage devices could conceivably supply the needed energies:

1. High speed flywheel: A 100 kg (220 pound) 2 meter diameter disc spinning at 10,000 times/second would store about 200 billion Joules. Energy conversion efficiency into electricity

for modern dynamos is around 99%. (Note: Paul Hill noted this as a possible energy storage device for saucers when he considered the problem of energy density and heating. At 99% efficiency, there would be 2 billion Joules of waste heat, which would probably be very manageable.)

2. Magnetic storage ring: A 5 meter radius circular magnetic coil with 200 turns of superconductor and carrying a million amps would store roughly 200 billion Joules. Conversion to electric energy through superconductors is 100% efficient. To make this practical would require lightweight, high-temperature superconductors with probably an order of magnitude higher current carrying capacity of present superconductors. However, ultraconductors exist with much higher conductivities than metals such as copper or silver. One of these is carbon nanotubes, with theoretical conductances up to 1000 times that of metals. These also have very high strength and heat conductance. Resistive heat losses of only 0.1% (or 200 million watts in this case) should be easily manageable.

3. Supercapacitor: Modern supercapacitors approaching market are getting close to having the necessary energy densities. One now being hyped as nearing production by EESstor Inc., is said to utilize a barium titanate dielectric with 37 farads capacitance (which is actually HUGE), operates at 3.5 kV, and has an energy density of 280 Wh/kg. That would mean one unit would store  $1/2 CV^2 = 1/2 \times 37F \times (3.5 \times 10^3V)^2 = 227$  million Joules (in an all-electric car, this is like 10 gallons of gasoline, since internal combustion engines are very inefficient). Thus about 880 such capacitors would store 200 billion Joules.

At an energy density of 280 Wh/kg (1.08 million Joules/kg), each unit would weigh 210 pounds or about 95 kg. 880 units would unfortunately weigh  $880 \times 95 = 84,000$  kg, or 17 times that of Victor's example 5000 kg craft. Another problem is energy conversion efficiency, which is said to be around 95% for these particular devices. That would 10 billion joules of heat to dispose of in the course of a few seconds.

However, all is not lost. Other approaches to supercapacitors include vastly increasing the effective charge storage area of the capacitor plates using carbon nanotubes or carbon aerogels. According to my rough calculations based on stated energy storage, this seems to boost the effective storage area 5 or 6 orders of magnitude, boosting the capacitance and energy storage by an equivalent amount. Thus some hybrid of these approaches (materials with high dielectric values coupled with large effective plate areas) might provide the factor of 10+ improvement in energy density to make this a conceivable energy storage device for our hypothetical flying saucer. The capacitor could be the structure of the craft itself, the walls forming the plates, so the capacitor storage need not add to the weight of the craft.

As an example, a 10 meter diameter thin circular saucer would have over 160 m<sup>2</sup> of surface area. The exterior skin of the craft would thus act as the parallel plate of the capacitor. This could be multilayered to increase surface area. Say use 60+ such layers to increase surface area to 10,000 m<sup>2</sup>, boost this maybe 100,000 times more using carbon nanotube plates. This makes the effective plate area about 1 billion square meters! Separate the carbon nanotube plates by about 80 microns, about hair thickness, and the capacitance in air would be about 1000 Farads. (Note, at only 80 microns, 60 layers would be only 5 mm thick.)

Insert a modest dielectric with a value of 100 between the plates and the capacitance is boosted to 100,000 Farads. Charge these plates to 2000 volts and you've again got 200 billion Joules of energy storage. Energy efficiency unknown, but the very high electrical and thermal conductances of carbon nanotube plates should boost the conversion efficiency beyond 95% and ease the resistive heat disposal problem.

But before ordering your flying saucer sports model, all these schemes would involve the development of the proper supermaterials that could sustain the various stresses of such high energy storage. And there's the problem of what the original energy source is to begin with.

One possibility would be the craft carries no onboard energy



generation but has the energy beamed to it by an orbiting "mothership." Before descending from orbit, the scout ship first recharges its energy storage "batteries" and then gets continual low-level energy resupply while its poking around doing whatever it needs to do near the surface. (It could even conceivably use our own power lines to "top off its tanks.") E.g., the power supplied by something like beamed microwaves could be 1000 times less than the energy storage device itself, or only 200 million watts, about what a Boeing 747 uses every second in cruise mode. Thus the craft could be totally "restocked" with energy every 1000 seconds, enabling it to engage in all sorts of high burst energy mischief, such as flying circles around our missiles or dashing away from approaching jet interceptors.

>By the way, this all alludes to one of my first posts on  
>UFOupdates. This does a better job of explaining it though...  
>let me know?

>Someone can check my math too. : )

I've already noted some problems, the main one being the initial assumptions. Other than that, such thought discussions can be very useful in helping define the physical limits on these high-performance flying devices.

David Rudiak

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 14:04:25 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:31:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 08:10:10 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 11:22:22 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>Polaroid 101 automatic camera. Some photos for people at eBay:

>><http://www.ebay.com.my/viItem?ItemId=7418165983#photo>

>>F.L. 114 mm, aperature f8.0 - f42.0

>>I used to own one in my youth until he got ripped off in a  
>>burglarly 30+ years ago. As can be seen from the photos, there  
>>is an optional manual adjustness for photo lightness, but  
>>otherwise the camera is fully automatic. It was the first  
>>electronic eye automatic exposure system on the consumer market.  
>>I don't know the specifics of the various shutter speeds or what  
>>procedure it used to set f-stops and shutter speeds.

>>I don't remember if it also had a focus adustment. I don't think  
>>so. If it was a typical Cameras for Dummies Edwin Land  
>>production, it used aspheric optics and large f-stops so no  
>>focusing was required. The viewfinder was also on top of the  
>>camera, an issue in Heflin's photo 1 out his windshield when  
>>Hartmann noticed the viewfinder would have been blocked.

>OK, thanks for the info. I have a couple Polaroid 101 cameras in  
>my collection.

>The Polaroid 101 camera does have focus adjustment. In fact you  
>must focus it. You can see in the photo that there are two tabs  
>at the rear of the bellows. You focus by putting one forefinger  
>of each hand on the tab and slide both tabs right or left. This  
>changes the angle of the struts that support the lensboard and  
>moves it forward or backward with respect to the film. The  
>viewfinder on top has a built-in coincidence type rangefinder.  
>You see a double image when something is out of focus, and as  
>you move the tabs you bring the two images together until you  
>see just one. At that point the subject is in focus. It is not a  
>very fast process.

>A simple CdS cell system controls exposure. The CdS cell  
>controls the voltage sent to a capacitor and the amount of  
>charge in the capacitor controls the aperture andhow long the  
>shutter remains open in a programmed sequence. This is similar  
>to the system used on many early automatic cameras.

>According to Collector's Guide to Instant Cameras by Michael J.  
>Posner, the Polaroid 101 has the following specifications:

>Years manufactured: 1963 - 1967  
>Original price: \$ 134.95  
>Film types accepted: Type 107 and Type 108  
>Lens: 114mm f/8.8 to f/42

>Shutter speeds: 1/9 to 1/1200 second, plus up to 10 seconds  
>in time exposure mode

>Bob Shell

Thanks Bob... but please note... In B&W mode the aperture stays fixed at what looks like a fixed F/42 opening that slides into place. The Light to Dark adjust in front changes the tension on the shutter spring coil. The detector further adjusts the shutter speed as describe above. Its important to note that the size of the aperture does not change in Black and White mode. The focus adjustment is meant primarily for Color mode with a wide aperture. It is also important to note that in color mode a set aperture is also slid into place. By sliding back from Color to B&W these two different size apertures slide into place. Since I don't have batteries yet, I'm not entirely certain if the Cds system also adjusts (simulates for) an intermediate sized aperture that might crosses behind the set openings during color mode thus creating the intermediate valued f-stops.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <[jrimmer.nul](mailto:jrimmer.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:19:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:32:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Rimmer

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning  
>

>Indeed, consensus by itself means very little - it's quite  
>possible for a group of people to have a consensus about  
>something which is (probably) completely false, such as the  
>consensus among Creationists about Darwinian evolution.

Oooo! You're only saying that because you know it teases!

Aren't you?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 14:31:41 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:34:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:38:07 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

Thanks David, not disagreeing at all. All of what you said was within the scope of my earlier post. We have to slide the vertex around to see what's available under specific conditions: the big picture. The reason I selected such a short time burst was specifically to simulate that even in a pulsed mode, energy restrictions can apply and limit availability. This conveys my point as I said earlier.

It's also important to add that while fuel contains much potential energy, the chemical reaction regulates the speed at which you can extract that energy. In this way, Energy Density has to further encompass the amount of energy deliverable within a volume of space over a specified time interval. These are all influenced by the ability to convert energy efficiently and without waste: All of which comes under fuel-time-material-design restrictions.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Anderson

From: Paul Anderson <[paulanderson.nul](mailto:paulanderson.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 11:36:54 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:36:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Anderson

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:11:40 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Jun 2006 08:11:40 -0400  
>Subject: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>Source: Sploid.Com - Budapest, Hungary

>[http://www.sploid.com/news/2006/05/drops\\_of\\_alien\\_1.php](http://www.sploid.com/news/2006/05/drops_of_alien_1.php)

>May 31, 2006

>'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>[They call them fingers, but I've never seen them fing!]

>In the summer of 2001, a blood-colored rain fell across India.  
>If that wasn't spooky enough, now some scientists think that the  
>red ooze may in fact be alien life.

><snip>

Thanks for the article. There is a lot more newer information though which is not mentioned. The two research teams at Sheffield and Cardiff universities in the UK have been studying the samples for the past several months now. Preliminary updates have indicated a tentative detection of DNA, but it hasn't been identified through the amplifying of sequences yet (a long process). Both teams agree that the material is definitely biological, cells with "daughter cells" and unusually thick cell walls, etc.. See also the June, 2006 print issue of Popular Science and the March 4-10, 2006 print issue of New Scientist.

More information here:

<http://www.newscientist.com/contents/issue/2541.html>

<http://tinyurl.com/f6ehw> (New Scientist)

<http://tinyurl.com/nh778> (New Scientist - mp3)

<http://tinyurl.com/jjvtk> (Popular Science)

<http://www.astrobiology.cf.ac.uk/redrain.html>

[http://www.bsn.org.uk/view\\_all.php?id=11615](http://www.bsn.org.uk/view_all.php?id=11615)

[http://www.daviddarling.info/encyclopedia/R/red\\_rain\\_of\\_Kerala.html](http://www.daviddarling.info/encyclopedia/R/red_rain_of_Kerala.html)

<http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0601022>

<http://education.vsnl.com/godfrey>

<http://www.panspermia.org/whatsnew.htm#060106>

[http://www.world-science.net/exclusives/060104\\_specksfrm1.htm](http://www.world-science.net/exclusives/060104_specksfrm1.htm)

<http://www.geocities.com/iamgoddard/Sampath2001.pdf>

Some quotes from the New Scientist print article (March 4-10, 2006):

"If they're not living cells, I don't know what they are," said Milton Wainwright, a microbiologist at the University of Sheffield, UK. "Maybe this is the beginning of something amazing."

"They don't look anything like sand, they look biological," says Monica Grady, a meteorite expert at the UK's Open University in Milton Keynes."

"One type of analysis shows their chemical make-up is about 50 per cent carbon and 45 per cent oxygen by weight, along with traces of other elements such as sodium and iron. That's consistent with the components of a biological cell, according to Jeffrey Walker, a molecular biologist from the University of Colorado in Boulder."

"His (Godfrey Louis') new report on the subject, which will appear in Astrophysics and Space Science in the next few months, is impressive in its detail, according to Wainwright.

"Everything in the paper is done correctly, there's nothing wacky about it," he says. Grady says it is "very, very thorough indeed."

And from the next New Scientist print article (March 31, 2006):

"Both teams say microscopy confirms that the particles are biological cells. They are not red blood cells because they do not contain haemoglobin. It's unlikely that they are fungal spores or red algae. They don't contain chitin, a key component of fungal cell walls. Nor do they contain the chloroplasts, the organelles in which photosynthesis takes place, that are typical of red algae."

"But they do, after all, contain DNA. A simple DNA stain test in Sheffield came back positive. However, more rigorous tests in Cardiff that try to amplify specific DNA sequences have so far failed. "That doesn't mean there's no DNA, it means that the DNA is probably unusual," Wickramasinghe suggests."

"The red cells have unusually thick, sturdy walls, and some contain daughter cells that Wainwright says are puzzling. He stresses, though, that the cells could be ordinary, terrestrial organisms he is not familiar with."

Mammalian red blood cells are still possible, although it is noted that blood cells are usually destroyed within minutes in rainwater (Charles Cockell, Open University, UK). And how would they get mixed into rain clouds (at least 50 tonnes at that)?

All the scientists interviewed are cautious, as they should be, and caution against jumping to conclusions, but they are interested in what seems to be a genuine mystery, whatever these things turn out to be.

I'll be posting more on this on the blog, also, which I'm in the process of reformatting to cover planetary exploration and science in general, as well as Mars still of course.

--  
The Meridiani Journal  
<http://www.themeridianijournal.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**

Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Anderson

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:04:02 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:37:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 22:56:38 +0100  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 5 Jun 2006 14:14:45 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>I suggested some time ago that if you rescale the distant  
>>>landscapes, which means reducing #3 by about 6% in relation to  
>>>#2, the UFO in #3 (flange diameter estimated by reference to  
>>>proportionality of #1) still appears to be about 7% larger  
>>>than in #2. On the face of it this seems inconsistent with the  
>>>sequence as reported. It could be consistent with the camera  
>>>moving closer to a small model just beyond the window, since  
>>>the window width has enlarged at the same time by almost 5%  
>>>between #2 and #3. This should be taken as a minimum value for  
>>>the difference in range between lens and window since, as I  
>>>pointed out, there is a very small perspective foreshortening of  
>>>the window width in #3. Allowing for this, it isn't ruled out that  
>>>the proportion change in angular width of the UFO and of the  
>>>window frame have not only the same sign but the same exact  
>>>value.

>>I get the exact opposite result from Martin. Once #3 has been  
>>rescaled so that the distant features match up in size, I end up  
>>with the object in #3 being about 4-5% smaller than in #2.  
>>This would place #3 further away from the camera, which is  
>>consistent with Heflin's account.

>>... I don't understand why we're getting different results  
>>here unless it is because we are using different measurement  
>>methods. I originally got about the same result as you when  
>>attempting to judge the disc diameter on #3 direct from the  
>>(rescaled) photo. But there is some subjective uncertainty about  
>>the gross disc width of #3 because of the limited pixel  
>>resolution and the indistinct edge of the flange where it blends  
>>into the sky tone. (Using the scans in the JSE paper which are  
>>the best I have.) On the other hand the dome is not clearly  
>>shown in #2, so we have to try to compare unlike quantities. To  
>>get around this I used #1 to find the relative width of dome and  
>>flange and used this to generate an overall disc diameter of #3  
>>from the more accurate dome measurement. By this method I still  
>>get about a 7% increase, which I feel sure is larger than the  
>>error bars due to the uncertainty in the poorly-resolved edge  
>>positions.

>I looked at this yet again, using the same procedure and  
>ignoring all previous measurements. I rechecked the landscape  
>rescaling for #3 and conclude I had it pretty exact the first  
>time at 94%. I also remeasured the disc and dome proportions  
>from #1 to get 70.9% (the same as last time). Using 500% blow-  
>ups I then measured the dome of the rescaled UFO #3 ,and  
>applying this proportionality to find the disc width I now get  
>an increase in #3 over #2 of just over 106%, pretty close to  
>last time.

>But squinting for a while at the very coarse pixel resolution  
>you soon realise there's some subjectivity about which pixel  
>edge you choose to represent the slightly blurred edge. I might  
>have been making similar pessimistic assumptions each time. So I  
>did this again making deliberate;y different choices that might  
>tend to favour a closer result. I then got 42.3 mm for the disc  
>width in #3, rescaled to 39.8 mm, compared with 39 mm for #2.  
>This gives a value of about 102% for #3 over #2.

I also went back over my measurements. I used direct measurement of the bottom rim after rescaling photo #3. Photos used were 600% blow-ups from the JSE article. #3 was rescaled 95% (vs. your 94%), which I found gave exact matchup in distant treeline features. I also darkened mid-range grays to better define the edges. Before rescaling, the object rim-to-rim measured 97 pixels wide in #3 vs. 95 in #2. After rescaling it was 92 pixels wide.

I don't find the bottom disc portion in #3 as indistinct as you and think these measurements are fairly reliable. My direct rim measurements make the object in #3 3% smaller than in #2. Your indirect determination makes it larger, which brings up other interesting and frustrating questions discussed below.

>So that's it. I feel fairly confident that the true value - for  
>the pair of scans I am using - is somewhere in the range 102-  
>106%. At the moment I can't see how any better measurement or  
>method will trim between 7 and 11 percentage points off this.  
>Any ideas?

The fact that the width ratios of the top dome and bottom disc seem to vary in photos 1 and 3 raises the very real possibility that the dome and/or disc may not be circular. That would account for the differences in results between my direct measurement of bottom width and your indirect determination. E.g., if the bottom is circular but the dome elliptical, then direct measurement is giving us the true relative sizes of the object in the two photos, whereas indirect determination would give bogus results. However, if the dome was circular and the bottom elliptical, then direct measurement could be invalid and the apparent smaller size of the bottom disc an artifact of perspective. It may only appear to be smaller in #3 because we are seeing the narrow part of the ellipsoidal bottom. Indirect measurement here would probably be a more reliable indicator of relative size.

However, there are all sorts of possibilities. Both dome and bottom disc could be elliptical by varying amounts and in varying directions. Neither measurement technique will be reliable. This leaves us in the unsatisfying position of ambiguous results. Without knowing the actual shape of the object, we can't reliably determine relative distances from relative size. (The only positive here, is that a noncircular shape eliminates such hoax objects as a model train wheel, previously mentioned as the source of Heflin's alleged hoax model object.)

I could argue that my direct measurement result is at least consistent with Heflin's account of what happened. The object was closer in #2 but changed directions and was starting to move away in #3. Furthermore, as I noted in a previous post, the elevation angles of the object in #2 and #3 are the same, which would also be consistent with Heflin's account of the object in #3 not only being further away but also seeming to start to climb. That could cancel the perspective drop in elevation angle caused by moving away.

In a hoax model, as previously you noted, the larger size of your #3 might be accounted for by the camera in #3 being about 5% closer to the car window and some hoax model just outside the window. The simplest hoax would be the model just hanging there barely swinging from a thread and being photographed from two different angles. While that might account for the size difference, it is harder to account for the coincidence of equal elevation angles. If the camera is closer to the model in #3, then the elevation angle should be higher for #3 if the camera height is the same. E.g., if the model was 46 inches from the camera in #2, then the camera would need to be 5.5 inches below the object to get the 6.8 degree elevation angle that I get for #2. If the camera is 5% closer in #3 with the stationary object now 44 inches away and the same distance below the object, the

elevation angle would jump up to 7.1 degrees, about 1/6th of the angular width of the object bottom. To compensate, the camera would have to go up a quarter inch to 5.25 inches below the object.

Heflin would have to be one lucky hoaxer to get everything to go his way and ultimately agree with the details of his back story. However, the clincher for authenticity as far as I'm concerned is still the "smoke" details in photos #2 and #3 that show up only in photo enhancement and tie in these photos with the smoke ring Heflin said was left behind as the object departed and which he photographed immediately afterwards further down the road.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:45:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 14:38:33 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:22:49 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>>Please show me any evidence for these unknown high tech  
>>civilizations on Earth. I have often said there may have been  
>>many different civilizations about which we are totally ignorant  
>>that were here. That doesn't change the fact that very high  
>>performance craft are here now from somewhere else.

>Stan, you can't make the statement "high performance craft  
>are here now from somewhere else" simply because you don't  
>know for sure they're from somewhere else.

>For that matter, you aren't even sure they are high  
>performance craft.

Of course I can make the statement Pilot and radar descriptions  
as well as the physical trace cases establish it. Right angle  
turns, at very high speed, vertical flight, landing and taking  
off from the middle of nowhere without sound or visible external  
engines. Release from and entrance into huge carrier craft able  
to move at speeds of thousands of miles an hour decades ago.

>Older Earth high-tech civilizations may have existed, or may  
>not have. We don't know. I've mentioned ancient artifacts  
>and such that might be evidence. Evidence is no good if the  
>jury dismisses it as evidence.

You have not shown any connection between what may well be  
artifacts from civilizations many thousands of years ago and  
what is being observed today

>Again, I'm not saying older Earth  
>high-tech civilizations are the answer - just a possibility.  
>These artifacts and such might qualify as evidence. You  
>must demonstrate why they're not - you're proclaiming no  
>Earth-based older high-tech civilization is involved and that ET  
>is, remember?

You have provided no evidence that there even might be a  
connection. Craft are flying here and now. That is my concern.  
Let us not mix watermelons and apricots.

>And explain away the blur zone cases, as well as cases

>like the Peter Khoury case with its implications. Then  
>demonstrate how Al Lawson's work is not important.  
>I've done my part and adequately supported why it is proper  
>to question your conclusion. Now you do the same and justify  
>your conclusion. Saying there are a huge amount of cases describing  
>high-tech vehicles that we know aren't from here doesn't cut it.

Of course it does. Simply, if they were not produced from some  
high tech civilization here, and there is no evidence presented  
that they were, they are from some other planet .

>Yet that's all you've been able to do.

>>If they are not produced here on Earth then they were produced  
>>somewhere off the earth. That is what ET means.

><snip>

>>Either clearly manufactured objects behaving under intelligent  
>>control were manufactured here on Earth or someplace other than  
>>on Earth i.e. they are of ET origin. What other choice is there?  
>>A five dimensional parallel universe is still ET. A time  
>>travelled craft is still not from here now.

>Foul, Stan! This is not really true. This is more sleight of  
>hand - more shrewd deception - on your part. Stop trying to  
>confuse the definition of ET. For the intents and purposes of  
>the discussion we've been having, ET means a species that  
>originated and evolved on another planet while from 'here' means  
>a species that originated and evolved on Earth. If it evolved on

I said nothing at all about where they or their ancestors  
evolved. I am saying today's craft are produced somewhere else.

>Earth and travelled (migrated) into outer space it's still an  
>Earth-based civilization, not an ET one. If it's from Earth's  
>future and travelled back in time (but evolved on Earth) it's an  
>Earth-based one - doesn't matter if it's from here now or not. A  
>"time travelled craft" is either from a civilization that  
>evolved on Earth or it isn't. We don't become ETs to ourselves  
>because we learn to time travel.

Of course we do. My grandparents are from Eastern Europe. My  
children are from North America.

>>>It's just that you don't want to acknowledge the  
>>>other possibilities - your reasons for dismissing them are weak,  
>>>at best and, for the most part, don't even exist as valid  
>>>objections. Your logic stands if only the two possibilities  
>>>exist. But tons of blur zone cases, other categories of  
>>>genuinely anomalous UFOs, and valid research results  
>>>suggest other possibilities. Thus, your logic is not logic.

Sorry wrong again. It is like a paternity test. It can show that  
either this man is the father of that child or he isn't. Without  
a huge library of DNA that test doesn't tell us who is the  
father unless he is. If he isn't than it is somebody else.

>>Again who are you to judge? Based on what?

>Based on the fact that you can't use an assumption to make a  
>conclusion, which is what you're doing. And based on you can't  
>just dismiss facts and data with statements like "they're  
>irrelevant" and "people have often misinterpreted Lawson's  
>research." You must show why they're irrelevant. You must show  
>how his work is misinterpreted and then why it's not valid for  
>consideration in conjunction with the phenomenon you're  
>discussing.

>>I asked for specifics about Roswell and about MJ-12, you gave  
>>none. Here you are again making proclamations with nothing behind  
>>them. Should I worry about your respect for me as a scientist? I  
>>take it I should assume that you belong to the American Nuclear  
>>Society, The American Physical Society, the American Institute of  
>>Aeronautics and Astronautics?

>Clever, Stan. But I questioned your conclusion that some UFOs  
>are ET spaceships. That's what our discussion has been about. I  
>told you at the very outset I wasn't interested in discussing  
>Roswell and MJ-12 and I was very specific as to why not (I  
>have little interest in the case, as well as consider it to be

>of little importance). We're dealing with two separate issues  
>here. One is Roswell/MJ-12 and the other is your conclusion that  
>some UFOs are ET spaceships. Let's keep these separate. They  
>have nothing to do with each other. Stop trying to sidetrack the  
>discussion into Roswell and MJ-12 and stop trying to make it  
>look like my refusing to fall for your attempts to distract me  
>in that direction is the same thing as me not being specific.

>If your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships is valid  
>then it should stand on more cases than just Roswell. Either the  
>huge number of high-tech vehicle cases you've been going on  
>about are indeed high-tech vehicles made and/or piloted by ET or  
>they're not. You don't need Roswell. So stop trying to make it  
>look like my refusal to get drawn into a discussion of that one  
>case supports what you are accusing me of and supports your  
>conclusions in any way. We're discussing this huge number of  
>high-tech vehicle cases you've brought up and if (whether or  
>not) they prove your conclusion that some UFOs are ET  
>spaceships. Leave Roswell alone. Let's discuss your conclusion  
>that some UFOs are ET spaceships, as I've been trying to do with  
>you from square one.

My conclusions don't depend on Roswell. I was referring to your claim that my debunking of objections to MJ-12 and/or Roswell wasn't adequate, that you were familiar with the specific critiques I have written, but somehow couldn't be bothered bringing up any of the many that I have put forth and demolished. You still have done the same thing about ET origin.. charismatic handwaving but no specifics. My evidence is the thousands of pilots sightings, the thousands of physical trace cases, the more than a thousand well investigated abduction cases.etc

>No, you shouldn't worry about my respect for you as a scientist.  
>That wasn't the point. The point is, someone with your  
>credentials and your experience in science - which I deeply  
>respect - must know that the type of reasoning you've been  
>providing here is invalid, illogical, and full of fallacy.

Sorry I know no such thing no matter how often you proclaim it.

If

>you don't know it then there is something wrong. If you do know  
>it then 'what gives'? I'm asking myself these questions and, if  
>so, you can be sure that others - those who can think rationally  
>and whose opinion (of you or of anything else) is of value - are  
>asking themselves the same questions. These are some of  
>what a scientist should be worried about - his credibility and  
>perceived motives.

>Do I have to be a member of the groups you mentioned to be able  
>to think logically and reason rationally? Does being a member of  
>those groups guarantee that one always thinks logically and  
>rationally? Or does it guarantee one won't ever be deceptive or  
>use sleight of hand in a discussion? Do I have to be a member of  
>these groups to question your logic? Or, is this more sleight of  
>hand on your part, Stan? More distraction? More of "if you can't  
>make it with facts then make the other guy look bad"?

Sorry, Eugene, but you have provided no peer reviewed or any other evidence of your ability to think logically as perhaps manifested by your work history or professional status. I have. Check my bio or a list of my publications.

>>>Because this is all you have been offering to support your  
>>>premature (unfounded) conclusion that some UFOs are ET  
>>>spaceships. You're just guessing!

>>Deduction is not the same as guessing or proclaiming.

>Correct! But this isn't deduction. It's jumping to conclusions.  
>When you ignore data and research it's not more than a guess.

>>>I'm not advocating any explanation for the UFO phenomenon so I  
>>>don't need evidence to support or prove any particular  
>>>explanation. All along I've simply been saying the ET hypothesis  
>>>should be questioned as the only answer and there are plenty  
>>>of both cases and research results to  
>>>justify questioning it.

>>Only answer to what? Many UFOs are non ET spacecraft. Certainly.

>>Again that is as useful as saying often Barry Bonds doesn't hit  
>>a home run, or many isotopes aren't fissionable, or many  
>>chemicals cure no disease.

>It's very useful if you're really trying to understand the UFO  
>phenomenon. Barry Bonds has nothing to do with it. Your  
>isotopes/chemicals analogy doesn't apply. Whether or not some  
>isotopes are fissionable or whether or not some chemicals don't  
>cure disease (and some isotopes are fissionable and some  
>chemicals do cure disease) isn't the point - the point is  
>whether or not you actually have a fissionable isotope or a  
>disease-curing chemical in your midst. You're just assuming  
>you have a fissionable isotope or a disease-curing chemical.  
>That's the bottom line. Doesn't matter if some do or don't or  
>even which ones do or don't - it's whether or not you have one.

The cases to which I have referred provide the home runs, the  
fissionable isotopes, the drugs that work. They of course do not  
answer the question as to where outside the Earth the craft  
originate, or whether there have been past indigenous or  
colonizing civilizations.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney

From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 20:37:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:49:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney

>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:31:25 -0500  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>The Val Johnson case, which occurred in August 1980 (not 1979)  
>>is one that the late (lamented?) Philip J. Klass wrote about in  
>>his aptly named book, UFOs, The Public Deceived (1983). The book  
>>was aptly named because he deceived the public in several  
>>instances, this being one of them.

>>In his book Klass gave an accurate, straightforward accounting  
>>of the case and then stated that it was either a hoax or the  
>>"real thing" involving aliens that did damage to the car. From  
>>his writing it is clear that Klass "favored" the hoax  
>>explanation.

>Why the scare quotes around favored? Do you mean this to be  
>ironic commentary, or are these just randomly generated quotation  
>marks? Of course Klass favored the hoax explanation. What  
>choice did he have?

He didn't have much choice, did he? Assuming his account of the case is accurate, the damage to the car is not such as could have occurred accidentally. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that Johnson might have done it, for some unknown reason. If he didn't do it, then who did? Of course it is possible that there was someone with him who caused the damage and Johnson was covering up for him. Or the car was attacked by malicious UFO-nauts, as Klass suggested as an unlikely alternative. So far, no one seems to have come up with any other possibilities, plausible or otherwise.

>In doing so, Klass set up the usual strawmen, expressing the  
>idea that the Johnson encounter involved a real UFO in such a  
>preposterous fashion that the hoax explanation - even in the  
>absence of the slightest evidence - had to be the preferred one.

No, he was simply suggesting an explanation which would occur to anyone with a grain of common sense.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:03:27 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:52:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Golubik

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:04:02 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Viktor offered an interesting analysis...

>I think the problem here is that there are way, way too many  
>assumptions that have to be made to draw reasonable conclusions  
>about power requirements and inertia forces because an analysis  
>still has to rely on our current state of knowledge about  
>fundamental forces in the universe. We know quite a bit about  
>how some EM forces work in the 3-4 dimensional space we can  
>easily measure. But we still don't really know how something as  
>simple as a magnet even works. We know a lot about how to  
>measure field strength, but we don't know a lot about what it  
>actually is.

Yes, and I'm not in principle disagreeing... my message also  
contained these same elements... but we have to understand and  
apply some knowledge... something we've learned. Once done,  
there may not be such a huge discrepancy within the grasp of our  
current understanding of things... better observations, better  
tools, and better investigative methods will help unravel some  
of the mystery.

>For all I know, maybe there's a way to work in some of the  
>higher (or lower, depending how you want to look at it)  
>dimension so that something enclosed in a field effectively has  
>no real mass in 4-dimensional space. I don't know why that would  
>be, but there could be a lot of similar unknowns out there that  
>make reaching any kind of conclusion about what UFOs and their  
>occupants might be.

Sometimes what looks mysterious may not be so mysterious.  
Especially if we had a lot of Energy at our disposal to make  
rather fleeting and unnoticeable physical phenomena longer  
lasting, more useful, and on a larger dimensional scale.

>We are, with our little monkey brains, extremely limited in our  
>ability to naturally sense or mechanically measure the range and  
>scope of the universe. Why is the Periodic Table of Elements so  
>lop-sided? Would we find additional elements to fill it out and  
>give it symmetry if we had a better understanding how the  
>elements work in multiple dimensions? Maybe. Maybe they would  
>make more sense if we used a 3-D or 4-D chart. I don't know.

Yes, I like how you think! This is exactly what physics  
specifically tries to accomplish by reaching down into a more  
and more fundamental level of understanding: Finding and  
rearranging the real fundamental building blocks that construct  
our Universe. In other words, finding fewer elements to describe  
the same complex interactive arrangements we're all immersed in:  
Previously assumed to have no interconnection then with a simple

twist and rotation, all line up! But sometimes two plus two isn't four and the total is more than the sum of it's parts and we can't break it down so easily and divide the lines and portion it out the same way each time.

>I don't know what reality is. I can't define it. So all kinds of  
>things might be happening here that I don't even have a start at  
>understanding. Creatures and people living in reversed or skewed  
>time. Material echoes of people's dreams. Mass psychic  
>intrusions from obscure Earth-based entities. Things that sound  
>like the nuttiest kind of bad sci-fi fantasy or wacky  
>philosophies. Delusions that are somehow "real?"

I'm not disagreeing here either. Sometimes we just can't really know... not enough information or growth: Can't get outside our shell. But, let's start somewhere and make progress. The simplest arrangement is usually a good one. I think most types of systems seek lower energy states even when rearranged or designed at a higher order of complexity. Sometimes random isn't so random either and we just haven't looked at it long enough yet.

>In a way, it would be nice and easy if UFOs were just alien  
>creatures from another planet, who interact and work with  
>reality the same way we do, who put their three-legged pants on  
>in the morning pretty much like us. Then their spaceships would  
>be some kind of cool metal or plastic and fly in the same 4-D  
>spacetime we understand. And their feelings and motivations were  
>basically the same as ours. "Alien" but not that different.

>But I'm afraid that "aliens from another planet" just doesn't  
>cover it. This week, I'm leaning toward some kind of Earth-based  
>"thing" maybe entities, maybe... I don't know... that doesn't  
>interact with time as we understand it. I only think that  
>because it's one of the few things that make sense when you  
>consider the number of interactions versus the proof that  
>remains just out of reach. Like something that you grab in a  
>dream but vanishes when you wake up. It could happen if  
>manipulating or moving through time was not a problem. A saucer  
>crashes, it makes the news, another saucer is sent back to make  
>sure it doesn't happen. Or that a certain piece of film gets  
>lost in the mail. Or whatever.

>Next week, I may not feel the same way about it. Either way, I  
>can't just assume an ET source. So I'm still stuck with a good,  
>solid, respectable, "I don't know."

That's not a bad place to be. If we were all honest with ourselves, isn't that where we all are? Maybe the simplest explanations aren't always the most likely too. But, I think we have to start out simple otherwise the whole thing gets out of hand really fast. It's OK to speculate and stretch the mind in new ways and criticize with an open and honest point of view (exasperation). Your attitude is the greatest we have for making new discoveries: the ones that shift fundamental understanding and challenge old news with cool revisions.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 15:07:37 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:55:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Fleming

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 15:14:33 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: Lan Fleming <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
>>To: UFOUpdates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 08:37:50 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 11:24:01 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:56:28 +0000  
>>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>>I established and supervised the NICAP investigation network,  
>>>>which included well-trained teams at NASA centers, numerous  
>>>>scientists, engineers, detectives, professors, etc. We were very  
>>>>thorough and always sought first to find a conventional  
>>>>explanation for each case.

>>>>It seems like the old days had a much higher number of  
>>>>creditable participants than present day. Also, it seems like  
>>>>your journal and other historical preservation efforts are  
>>>>almost like the efforts of monks during the Dark Ages to save,  
>>>>for some future time of Enlightenment or Renaissance, the "old"  
>>>>knowledge of humanity's past golden age of greatness and works.  
>>>>Today, it seems with the huge number of gullible and uncritical  
>>>>thinking folk that we are in a Ufo-illogical Dark Ages.

>>And do you suppose that the present situation can be blamed on a  
>>recent increase in the breeding rates of the UFO nuts that you  
>>enjoy bashing so much?  
>>If so, your knowledge of history is also at a dark age level.

>I do not enjoy "bashing UFO nuts", I've got better things to do  
>than that. Usually I just try to ignore them.

Well, you seem to do pretty it frequently. Perhaps you consider  
it to be a duty, albeit a burdensome one. That's not to single  
you out, since quite a few others on the list seem selflessly  
dedicated to the performance of this odious but presumably  
necessary task.

>I do not claim  
>that there is no useful research being done in UFOlogy currently  
>either. Nor do I claim UFO nuts are breeding like flies. I do  
>claim that the poor state of education in the US (and World of  
>course), the dumbing down of information and entertainment  
>(sound bite summaries of complex topics, reality shows), the  
>desire of an uneducated electorate by government, and the  
>encouragement of employment in non-technical areas (via better  
>salaries in law and sales) all contribute to a populace with  
>reduced critical thinking.

So the government desires an uneducated electorate, does it? What facts do you have to support this conspiracy theory? Not that there couldn't be some truth to that, but I felt somewhat provoked to heavy sarcasm by your use of the "C" word in your previous post. See comment below on the use of the word "conspiracy" in polemics.

>Note that the kind of job growth encouraged by various treaties  
>in the US involve service industries these days, which do not  
>require critical thinking, whereas in earlier days we were in a  
>Cold War against the USSR which pushed the US to emphasize  
>technical and scientific educations and jobs.  
>Remember the  
>tremendous spurt caused by the launch of Sputnik.

Of course I know about Sputnik. I also know that the entire adult population during the "golden age" of UFOlogy was from the WWII and Korean War generations and earlier. They did not benefit from the heightened concentration on the sciences in primary and secondary schools in the late '50s.

>These days,  
>kids are mainly inspired by Grand Theft Auto or Britney Spears  
>or Gangster rap.

Funny you should bring that up. Last night on the Steven Colbert show he had a guy who wrote a book about how the most popular computer games with these darn kids today are simulations of the rise of civilizations, artificial life and other games at a considerably higher level than Grand Theft Auto. According to him, Grand Theft Auto is much less popular as generally thought.

>>By all accounts I've read there were just  
>>as many "gullible and uncritical thinking folk" associated with  
>>the UFO phenomenon in the "golden age" as there are now, perhaps  
>>even more.

>I know about the contactees and gullible folk back then. I am  
>talking about the percentage of such folk compared to the  
>scientists and engineers involved in the field. Perhaps it just  
>seems like there are alot more gullible folk since they now  
>have the luxury of a personal international information  
>distribution system (the Internet).

You do realize, don't you, that the percentage of "gullible folk" goes up if the number of serious researchers goes down? No increase in the legions of the gullible is necessary to explain this phenomenon.

>>The real difference between then and now is that  
>>there are far fewer serious scientists and technical people  
>>investigating UFOs now, not any increase in uncritical thinking.

>You're wrong about the uncritical thinking issue but I'll let it  
>pass for the sake of discussion. And, let's assume its simply  
>due to the fewer scientists and technical people researching  
>UFOs rather than simply fewer such folk in general.

I think that's a safe assumption, although I really can't say what the number of scientists involved is now as opposed to the 1950s.

>>The decline of serious investigative organizations is the direct  
>>result of the government efforts to quell public interest in the  
>>subject as recommended by the Robertson Panel report. As  
>>everyone should know, those efforts reached their successful  
>>culmination with the release of the infamous Condon report - or  
>>more specifically the release of the report's executive summary,  
>>which had nothing to do with the evidence presented in the body  
>>of the report. Since the scientific establishment  
>>enthusiastically accepted Condon's assertion that science had  
>>nothing to gain by studying UFOs, few scientists have wasted  
>>their time on UFO studies that they know cannot get funding and  
>>will never be published in peer-reviewed journals.

>So you are saying that the scientists that supported the team  
>investigation efforts (in NICAP/MUFON/APRO) were solely  
>motivated by publishing?

Where exactly did I say that? Papers on UFOs making it into

scientific journals have always been pretty scarce. Government policies and the attitudes of academic organizations pretty much ensure that they will remain scarce.

>And that they would not have done it  
>without being compensated? I doubt it. I would suspect most  
>performed this work unfunded, in their free time and for the  
>sake of pure science/wonder.

You don't have to suspect it. They did do most of their work without funding.

>The Condon report should have  
>hardly affected them directly. However, I can understand the  
>peer pressure of people making fun of them for continuing to  
>work on something that was discredited by that report. With or  
>without a Condon report, such derision would have occurred  
>throughout the period we are talking about (1950-1980). How many  
>funded technical papers were published each year on the topic?  
>Does it really correspond to the Condon report?

>>Starting in the 1950s, the government and the academic  
>>hierarchies wished to bring the study of UFOs into disrepute.  
>>They succeeded completely, as groups with large amounts of  
>>political power ususally do. The fact that so much time is  
>>spent on this list remarking on how disreputable UFOlogy is  
>>evidence of their great success.

>If this conspiracy has any public facts to document them, then  
>it would be interesting to see.

<sigh>

When rational argument fails, the posturing about "conspiracies" begins. The public facts are quite plainly presented in the Robertson Panel report and other official documents. Ask Richard Hall about how the Air Force repeatedly blocked NICAP's attempts to get Congress to seriously consider the UFO issue in the '50s and 60s. Richard Dolan's UFOs and the National Security State lays out the early history in good chronological order. Mr. Hall may not approve of some of the opinions Dolan expresses in the book; I don't either. But I think Dolan gets the basic facts straight.

>I suspect that such an  
>institutional bias is unwritten and typical of all disciplines  
>where the dogma (paradigm) of the organization is protected  
>against any anomalies. It does not take much to frame the study  
>of UFOs within the acceptable paradigm (bolides, plasma,  
>fireballs, sprites, ball lightning) but whenever one goes  
>outside it one will encounter resistance. Regardless of what the  
>hierarchies state, what the scientist or engineer does in his  
>free time is beyond their perview so should not affect the  
>numbers of these folk involved in UFOs. Yet they seem fewer.

At least I'm relieved to hear that the gullible folk are not breeding like locusts. Now you seem to be saying something similar to what I said to begin with: that there may be fewer scientists conducting UFO research now than in the olden days, although I doubt there really were that many to begin with. But however tiny the number may be, I doubt that loudly wailing about how disreputable UFOlogy has become will attract many new scientists to the 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**

Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Fleming

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:11:28 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:57:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:39:17 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:56:47 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 14:28:29 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>Based on your reply to Dr. Maccabee, Mr. Garza, your "research"  
>team and "research" seem quite flawed. Unless you are operating  
>using some new form of scientific method, you lose all  
>credibility by offering arm-waving claims with no  
>substantiation. We are to just trust you? Well, then why even  
>publish the UFO FLIR video at all? We can just "trust" that you  
>that you have a video of UFOs locked away in a desk somewhere.

>If the Mexican Air Force really made a number flights, then  
>they should provide the confirmatory video that they did so. By  
>matching the flight path on the FLIR video screen and camera  
>angle and magification than we can truly confirm or deny the oil  
>flare claims. If the aircraft flew too far south then they will  
>not see the lights. But no, we have to trust them and you. This  
>is not science.

>Also, the claims you make can be proven false simply by  
>examining the early part of the "UFO" FLIR video prior to any  
>UFOs. The FLIR zooms in on bright lights but the crew makes no  
>comments about them.

>So we must deduce that the crew felt they were not UFOs. But  
>they are unknown bright FLIR lights. So are you telling me  
>that no crew ever saw anything like those objects in future  
>flights?

>This would indicate that either the crews or Mexican Air Force  
>is lying. Yes, just armwave all these early bright FLIR light  
>zooms. I'll bet your team of experts never tried to correlate  
>them with actual objects on the ground as others have. One  
>critical bright FLIR light (prior to the 'UFO' FLIR light  
>groups) is definitely correlated to a gas burnoff flare on the  
>ground (not out in the the Campeche Bay) fairly near the  
>beach/coast. No mention about this from you experts.

Why not read this over again James? Don't you think you are  
being a bit harsh. I don't think there's any need of using words  
like the Mexican Air Force is lying. What do you want to do,  
burn that link? At least they put the stuff out there. Lighten  
up a little.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 20:50:42 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 19:02:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 14:38:07 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 13:44:32 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>Or 200 billion Joules. However, there is a flaw in the  
>calculation somewhere because this is 10 times more energy than  
>the total kinetic energy of the object to brake to a stop and  
>then reaccelerate back to original speed.

The reason for the apparent discrepancy is that with Kinetic energy the average velocity is 1000 m/s acting over 0.001 sec which gives 1 meter. This is 1/10 the distance I chose in one direction. Work and kinetic aren't the same here since I chose an arbitrary distance over which this force acts.

I believe this explains the difference.....

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <[lovolution.nul](mailto:lovolution.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 18:33:35 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 19:04:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair' - Goldstein

>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 19:34:19 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 06:00:02 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 10:09:16 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>>>Subject: Re: 'Drops Of Alien In My Hair'

>>>I am concerned that this discovery of 'alien life' may turn out  
>>>to be a physics experiment that accidentally escaped from the  
>>>lab. Now that it can interact and compete with the indigenous  
>>>life on our planet, the consequences of this accidental (or  
>>>intentional?) release of this alien life could be a threat to  
>>>our survival worse than a real alien invasion.

>>Maybe, Nick, but these "red rains", "rains of blood", etc., have  
>>been happening for thousands of years. See the work of Charles  
>>Fort for many reports. And there have been regular reports of  
>>this phenomenon since Fort. It appears to be a natural, if  
>>uncommon, phenomenon.

>Thanks for your reply Bob!

>Yes, this is true. Although some of these red rain events have  
>been attributed to miracles by God, this is the first time that  
>I'm aware of where scientists have claimed that these red-tinted  
>cell-like structures in water which lack DNA must be of ET  
>origin!

<snip>

>If the incredible claim by physicist Godfrey Louis in the  
>journal 'Astrophysics and Space' that these previously unknown  
>micro-organisms are very likely ET in origin turns out to be  
>>true, this big and important story could have very serious  
>consequences for all life on Earth and should not be overlooked  
>or dismissed.

Aloha Listfolk,

For a great musical rendition of what it is like to have red  
rain falling down on you I suggest that you listen to Peter  
Gabriel's song titled Red Rain. It was released a little while  
after the Chernobyl nuclear disaster. At that time I imagined it  
to be about communist red rain. Now I can identify it with more  
examples of red rain.

Josh Goldstein

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On

From: William Sawers <[ufsyntax.nul](mailto:ufsyntax.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 14:47:05 +1000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 19:07:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 22:03:30 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>I received some response about my comment last week about  
>>apparent dodging I found in the high-resolution  
>>Trent/McMinnville scans I was playing stereo with, so I thought  
>>I'd post this link to clarify what I was talking about:

>><http://img392.imageshack.us/img392/5507/mcmindodge3sz.jpg>

>>One is just a simple brightness/contrast adjustment, the other  
>>is a dreaded embossing (what can I say, sometimes it helps).  
>>Maybe there's some kind of contrast bleed thing happening I  
>>don't understand here. Or hey, maybe it's a force field. I don't  
>>know.

>I don't know what aspect of the photo you are referring to as a  
>"contrast bleed thing"... or "force field".

<snip>

>At my web site you can find - or perhaps have found - the 40x  
>(If I recall correctly) blowup by Hartmann during the heydays of  
>the Condon study. There are also scans of 8 x 10 prints showing  
>the whole scene.

>[www.brumac.8k.com](http://www.brumac.8k.com)

It is an interesting picture. I see how you could think "force  
field" "contrast bleed". It reminds me of a couple of videos  
from Mexico in the early '90s, where there did look to be a  
haze(?) around the object. It looked like the object was  
spinning and displacing, or disrupting the air around it.

Not being an expert... the area outside the "bleed" is cloud  
cover, but when you look at the original pic on Bruces' site the  
"bleed" area doesn't look to be different ie brighter or lacking  
in cloud? I take it you haven't seen this before either?

Interesting

William

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 11:14:47 +0000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:18:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 16:08:27 +0000  
>>Subject: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Robert Hall  
>>To: Dick Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>Subject: Reason's reasoning  
>>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 10:14:15 -0400

>>No matter how many times I review what Ms. Reason is saying, I  
>>am unsure of what she means. Hence I find it difficult to help  
>>you with a reply. It seems to me that the problems here are  
>>primarily ones of the philosophy of science and epistemology,  
>>which are more your field than mine. To suggest cases of issues  
>>resolved, I need to know what constitutes an "issue" and what  
>>constitutes "resolution."

>Ok, let's clarify: An issue is decisively settled when the  
>weight of evidence supporting some position is so great, that  
>there is absolutely no point, in the light of the evidence  
>currently available, in arguing a contrary position.

In other words, a consensus is reached about the weight of  
evidence! You criticize my brother's use of that word below.  
Also, you failed to define what constitutes an issue.

>>If "resolved" means settled permanently with no further change  
>>or refinement, I doubt that we can accept the premise that  
>>physics and chemistry have resolved issues. If "resolved" means  
>>attainment of a temporary consensus (or near consensus), then  
>>there are real differences between physical sciences and  
>>social/behavioral sciences. So she may have a perfectly  
>>legitimate point.

>Now this is really interesting. I'd asked for an example of a  
>controversy which had been decisively settled on the basis of  
>evidence. But the Halls completely evade this question of  
>evidence, and instead focus on the notion of "consensus" - by  
>which they presumably mean, consensus of opinion.

Are you here implicitly defining an issue to be a controversy? I  
could accept that as a working definition.

>In a way this encapsulates the problem of the social sciences -  
>they depend not on evidence, but on opinions about evidence. The  
>Halls appears to be suggesting a model in which what counts is  
>whether there is a consensus of opinion - in other words,  
>whether opinions agree or disagree.

The Halls are not suggesting any such thing (and let's leave my  
brother out of this from here on.) What you say here applies  
equally well to the physical sciences. And science, in fact, is  
about consensus. If physicists disagree about the meaning of

facts and evidence, then nothing has been resolved. You see, there are semantical problems here that my brother pointed out.

>But "consensus of opinion" is the modus operandi of the  
>Humanities, not the sciences. In science what matters is not  
>opinion but evidence, and in particular evidence in the form of  
>testable predictions.

>Indeed, consensus by itself means very little - it's quite  
>possible for a group of people to have a consensus about  
>something which is (probably) completely false, such as the  
>consensus among Creationists about Darwinian evolution.

Of course. No one suggested that facts, evidence, and logic should be left out of the equation.

>>The differences between physical and social  
>>sciences are largely the result of a much later start in the  
>>latter and far less financial support.

>Bingo! And funny that I should have mentioned this on the List  
>only recently. Here is Excuse #1 why the social sciences have so  
>little to show for their existence. I don't think this is the  
>place to offer a detailed critique of this claim (but note that  
>The Halls offers absolutely no evidence to support it) but the  
>social sciences have been in existence now for well over a  
>century. Just how long do they need to show that they're  
>actually capable of achieving something?

I suppose that this is the place to comment on your previous assertion that the social/behavioral sciences have no corpus of knowledge. I beg to differ. Here are a number of examples (presumably they would qualify as examples of issue resolution too): Do you deny that a great deal of knowledge exists about (1) the effects of childhood abuse on personality development and consequences for adult life? (2) What disorders can result from exposure to stressful combat conditions?

(3) How the structure and dynamics of group behavior affects performance (e.g., corporations, military organizations)? (4) Why people buy the particular things that they do (consumer behavior)? (5) And one final example in the area of so-called political science, why people vote the way they do and how their attitudes can be manipulated?

<snip>

Just to maintain some focus I am deleting some of your arguments here and below; feel free to re-introduce them later if you wish.

>I would like to see some evidence, by the way, that "theory  
>construction" in the social sciences has anything whatsoever to  
>do with the scientific method - or even that social scientists  
>have any idea what this would actually entail.

Theory construction has everything to do with scientific method. Hence there would appear to be more semantical confusion. here.

>>However, those considered sociologists or political scientists  
>>include, in addition to the scientific ones, many who are more  
>>in the tradition of humanities. So in these fields you have some  
>>who reject scientific methods and the conclusions drawn from  
>>those methods and some who reject ideas unless they are  
>>supported by scientific evidence. If you use a criterion of  
>>consensus, then those in disciplines such as physics and  
>>chemistry probably do more often attain good consensus on  
>>"issues" (depending on what we mean by "issues").

>Now this is really dodgy, isn't it? We already know that many  
>social scientists claim to be using the scientific method. What  
>matters is whether those claims have any basis in reality, and  
>the Halls provide no evidence that they do.

Seems like a pretty straightforward and accurate statement to me. What sort of evidence do you require?

>>You can still have a good consensus among the scientifically  
>>oriented social scientists on those rare issues that have been  
>>researched carefully and extensively.



>But this is completely circular. If you define a peer group  
>exclusively in terms of people who agree on something, then of  
>course you will always have consensus! This just goes to show  
>what a useless criterion this notion of "consensus" really is.

<snip>.

>>You might note that in subfields such as the >prehistoric  
>archeologists within anthropology, the reliance on >hard science  
>is strong, and I believe that you can find >substantial  
>agreement in areas where there has been much >research.

>Well it's certainly a convenient (if bizarre) redefinition of  
>boundaries to consider prehistoric archeology a "subfield"  
>within anthropology!

I took courses in anthropology and that is indeed the way  
archeology was defined. By the way, Cathy. Are you a scientist,  
and if so in what field? And what is your educational background  
and training? My vita is published on my web site  
([www.hallrichard.com](http://www.hallrichard.com)) and my brother's is readily available in  
the directories. You seem to display disdain toward the social  
sciences which may derive from your own background.

>But archaeology itself is just a method, which is always used in  
>conjunction with other methods. Archeologists will work in  
>conjunction with archivists, specialists in ancient languages,  
>specialists in reconstructing ancient crafts, specialists in  
>modern-day cultures, and of course, plain old historians. For  
>all that, I think the degree of agreement (let alone the  
>reliability of the evidence base) is probably rather less the  
>the Halls are claiming.

What are the Halls claiming now?

>But notwithstanding all that, archeological methods are simply  
>not social science methods. They are so different the comparison  
>is meaningless.

In fact, something you gloss over is that most sciences except  
the narrowly focused ones these days tend to be multi-  
disciplinary. I have a good friend who is in the field of  
archeoastronomy, and he and his colleagues use a wide range of  
social science and physical science techniques. (So for that  
matter do the more sensible ufologists.)

>>Of course you will still find disagreement on specifics, such as  
>>whether a civilization under study occurred 3,000 years ago or  
>>10,000 years ago.

>Only a social scientist could claim that a 7000 year dating error  
>was a mere specific ;-)

>>Sorry that I cannot be of more direct help. I  
>>have the feeling that there is no way to make progress in  
>>understanding Cathy Reason's reasoning short of face-to-face  
>>discussion in which she is forced to answer a lot of questions.

>I'm fascinated that Robert Hall's idea of a face-to-face  
>discussion is a process in which someone else is forced to  
>answer a lot of questions, especially as he seems to have opted  
>not to answer any himself ;-)

>But this is really all rather puzzling. If the Halls really have  
>no notion of what it means for a question to be decided on the  
>basis of evidence, and can't figure it out without forcing  
>someone to answer a lot of detailed questions, one is left  
>wondering what on earth they think the scientific method  
>actually is. And this seems to me fairly typical of social  
>scientists: They talk a lot about scientific method, and make a  
>lot of claims about it, but when challenged on what they think  
>it actually is, they become strangely silent.

I am not a scientist at all and have never claimed to be  
(however, in my experience many scientists operate by rote and  
have no special knowledge of scientific method either except for  
what they are told to do). I have formally studied logic and  
scientific method and think that I have a very good idea of what  
it is - or is supposed to be, though in real life in often  
departs from the ideal.

>By the way, in case anyone is starting to think that none of  
>this has anything to do with Ufology, well I think it does.  
>Because most of what can be said about the social sciences -  
>both good and bad - can probably, it seems to me, be said about  
>Ufology as well.

I agree, except that the physical sciences also can be (and to some limited extent have been) applied to ufology. Further, a strong anti-science vein is visible in ufology, and many of its practitioners seem not to have a clue about scientific method. So this discussion might be educational.

>Ok, enough. I now have to consult my tenth cousin thrice  
>removed, Professor Vernon W Verblondjet (Chair of the Department  
>of Unnecessary and Superfluous Studies at the University of  
>Utter Buckinghamshire) on what to do when charged at by a man  
>brandishing a wet catfish.

I'm not sure whether this final remark was meant to be mockery, a joke, or what, but in any case it seems to be very inappropriate. By the way Cathy, I have had an article published in the Journal of Irreproducible Results. So there. too.

- 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 16:31:35 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:19:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16 - Miller

>From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 16:43:14 -0400  
>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

>>From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 02:29:33 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: UFO Review Issue #16

><snip>

>>As to crop circles, Matt and his team can make any size any  
>>shape with enough people. The most men and women I am aware  
>>of worked on a big circle a couple of years ago had about 40  
>>working together - a gathering of crop artists for the  
>>season's grand finale.

>Without footprints, and with the precise interwoven lay of  
>stalks, and with stalks exhibiting the "exploded nodes"  
>observed, and at the level of precision and complexity clearly  
>evident in the larger glyphs?

>I doubt it. If a large group of people tried at night, they  
>would be stumbling all over themselves and would still not  
>achieve the woven/exploded node evidence.

Hi Eleanor

See:

<http://www.memorologyllc.com/CropCircleInfo/DemonstrationInNewZealand1.htm>

<http://www.busty-taylor.com/cropper/zealand.htm>

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Cameron

From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron.510.nul](mailto:corycameron.510.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 11:50:04 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:22:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Cameron

>From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 14:32:22 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>Bingo! And funny that I should have mentioned this on the List  
>>only recently. Here is Excuse #1 why the social sciences have so  
>>little to show for their existence. I don't think this is the  
>>place to offer a detailed critique of this claim (but note that  
>>The Halls offers absolutely no evidence to support it) but the  
>>social sciences have been in existence now for well over a  
>>century. Just how long do they need to show that they're  
>>actually capable of achieving something?

>Cathy, thanks for doing the hard work - hope to preserve (and  
>use) your full message, it's well worth a re-read for many folk.

>A century-and-a-half ago a wise chap said of contemporary  
>'psychologists':

>"In no other department has there been so much movement, and so  
>little progress.

<snip>

>Under these circumstances, it is impossible to avoid a suspicion  
>that there is some fundamental error in the manner in which  
>these inquiries have been prosecuted"

Social/Human Sciences it can be argued are fluid in nature as  
they depend upon the study of human culture which is always  
adapting, changing. In addition to this, one cannot argue  
however that the Social Sciences don't produce tangible results.

It is true that often times social scientists cannot reproduce  
the same results over and over and over again but is this not  
the nature of these sciences to begin with? And what about the  
traditional sciences like chemistry, biology or astronomy to  
name but three?

It seems that within the last five-hundred years, so-called  
proven scientific theories have given way to more improved, more  
accurate theories have they not?

Lets take theories like our once geocentric view of the  
universe. I think most of us would agree that the prevalent  
heliocentric view is probably more authentic. ;)

My point here is that the traditional sciences seem to be just  
as fluid and changing in their paradigm changes as the social  
sciences. Just a few ideas.

A defence of the social sciences,

Cory

I knew my social sciences degree would come in useful one day ;)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Will Mothman Deaths Return?

From: Loren Coleman <[lcoleman.nul](mailto:lcoleman.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 12:05:16 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:26:16 -0400  
Subject: Will Mothman Deaths Return?

Will Mothman Deaths Return?

<http://www.cryptomundo.com/cryptozoo-news/xmothmanx/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 12:26:36 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:29:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Sandow

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>Now this is really interesting. I'd asked for an example of a  
>controversy which had been decisively settled on the basis of  
>evidence. But the Halls completely evade this question of  
>evidence, and instead focus on the notion of "consensus" - by  
>which they presumably mean, consensus of opinion.

>In a way this encapsulates the problem of the social sciences  
>- they depend not on evidence, but on opinions about  
>evidence. The Halls appears to be suggesting a model in which  
>what counts is whether there is a consensus of opinion - in  
>other words, whether opinions agree or disagree.

>But "consensus of opinion" is the modus operandi of the  
>Humanities, not the sciences. In science what matters is not  
>opinion but evidence, and in particular evidence in the form  
>of testable predictions.

Fine. Here are some things that research in social science and  
psychology has established, creating consensus in areas that  
hadn't been studied before.

1. People will do things they'd normally think were immoral, if they're asked to do them by authority figures. (Stanley Milgrim's famous research at Yale in, I believe, the 1960s.)
2. Hypnosis can't reliably retrieve memories, or at least not under laboratory conditions. (Which means it can't retrieve memories of data people learned during laboratory experiments. Whether hypnosis also can't reliably retrieve real-world memories, of things that happen during normal life, isn't settled. Or at least it wasn't when I looked at this research a few years ago.)
3. False memories can be implanted, under laboratory conditions. People can be induced to believe that they remember things that never really happened. (Elizabeth Loftus's famous research.)

To these I'd add two things that seem well established, but may not be too well known as yet:

1. Decisions made almost instantly, by instinct, prove more reliable than decisions made after much thought. ("More reliable" means more likely to produce the results the person making the decision hoped for. And these results hold true only for decisions about things the person making the decision is familiar with. See Malcolm Gladwell's book "Blink" for details. As I recall, there are many studies of this.)
2. When a millennial cult makes a prophecy, and that prophecy doesn't come true, the members of the cult become more loyal to it. (Research cited from time to time on this List by Jerry Clark.)
3. The presence in any city of an active gay community means

that the city will have strong economic growth. (Richard Florida's research, as set forth in his famous book "The Rise of the Creative Class." Florida doesn't claim that the presence of a gay community directly causes economic growth. But he does think that tolerance for diversity is required for economic progress, and theorized that the presence of an active gay community was a sign of tolerance for diversity. The studies he presents in his book seem to show that his prediction was correct.

There's also a kind of applied social science where reliable results are very important - marketing. Marketers emphatically don't make their decisions by consensus or opinion. They can't afford to. Bad marketing campaigns could put their companies out of business. Marketing research is amazingly detailed. I remember a study done when I was music editor of Entertainment Weekly magazine. EW had two main competitors, the publishers thought: Rolling Stone, and Premiere. Among other things, the marketing study showed which vegetables readers of each magazine preferred. And there were differences! Trivial information, you might say. But maybe not. Maybe the preference for a particular vegetable turns out to be one of a constellation of traits that can predict buying patterns. And certainly information about what kind of cars readers of each magazine drive is important - at least if you're a car manufacturer, and want to know which magazine to advertise your cars in.

Here are some things that marketing research has established:

1. If you play peppy music in a supermarket, people will buy more. (Obnoxious, but true.)
2. Those annoying "blow-in" cards that fall out of magazines - they actually do sell more subscriptions than readers would buy if the cards weren't there.
3. It's a bad idea for public radio stations to play a lot of classical music, at least for the station's bottom line. Classical listeners are intensely loyal (and very vocal), but they're a small minority. Their numbers are also shrinking. And they contribute less money, per capita, than do the people who care most about public radio news and talk shows. Finally, the news and talk listeners almost unanimously change the station when classical music comes on. (Classical music purists hate these findings, but they're solidly established.)

Finally, here's a detailed example of scientific thinking applied to a sociological problem, from a New York Times article in 2001. The subject of the article is an understandably controversial theory, put forth by John J. Donohue III of Stanford Law School and Steven D. Levitt, a professor of economics at the University of Chicago. Their theory was that legalized abortion leads to lower crime rates. The reasoning behind the theory was that abortion lowers the number of unwanted babies, and that unwanted babies, because they're more likely to be neglected, are more likely to end up as criminals.

Here's an excerpt from the article:

Mr. Levitt and Mr. Donohue needed a way to test their hypothesis, a difficult task in the social sciences, where experiments cannot be controlled and repeated as in a laboratory. But the two thought that the way in which abortion was legalized in the United States could provide them with a good comparison.

Five states - New York, California, Hawaii, Alaska and Washington - legalized abortion three years before the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* made it a national phenomenon. "The five states that legalized abortion in 1970 saw drops in crime before the other 45 states," the scholars write. "States with high rates of abortion have experienced a roughly 30 percent drop in crime relative to low-abortion regions since 1985." While caution is necessary in extrapolating results, they continue, "the estimates suggest that legalized abortion can account for about half the observed decline in crime in the United States between 1991 and 1997."

Immediately, scholars began to focus on several potential problems with the thesis. First: was the comparison valid?



Hawaii and Alaska are hardly representative states; moreover, women from all over the country traveled to states like California and New York to obtain legal abortions. Mr. Blumstein points out other problems: "Of the five states that legalized abortion, two of them, New York and California, totally dominate and skew the sample. The crack epidemic started in New York City and Los Angeles. That big city effect could be driving the crime rate up and then down."

In other words, states with large urban populations are likely to show the strongest trends in terms of both abortion rate and crime, and a correlation between them does not prove that one causes the other. Other factors are bound to play a role.

Mr. Joyce agrees: "Crack and the spread of guns are the great confounders. There is no question that the introduction of crack and the spread of handguns among kids 15 to 24 years old between 1985 and 1991 played a role in the rise of homicide. After that, crack begins to decline and there is a major campaign to check the spread of handguns among young people. My concern is that Levitt and Donohue are simply picking up the correlations in the huge downturn in crack and handguns."

In fact, Mr. Joyce said, when he looked more specifically at homicides among young people in the early 1990's in New York, the data showed the opposite of what the Donohue-Levitt thesis would have predicted. "If their theory were correct," Mr. Joyce said, "you would expect to see a drop. Instead, murders hit an all-time high."

Mr. Donohue and Mr. Levitt respond that the high murder rate was just a temporary spike created by the crack epidemic. The fact that the overall crime rate was going down even during the crack epidemic and has continued to do so since crack use abated, they say, suggests that something larger and more long-lasting is at work. Moreover, they say, their research shows a steady decline in places where there was no crack epidemic and where innovative police strategies were not put into place.

Another potential hole, said Mr. Joyce, is that no one can prove that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the number of abortions and the number of unwanted children whose birth was avoided.

But Mr. Donohue argues that the data strongly suggest that a link does exist. He said that the birth rate fell by 13 percent among teenagers, a group whose children are twice as likely to commit crimes, and that the birth rate fell by 12 percent among black women, a group whose children are nine times more prone to commit homicides, according to police and Centers for Disease Control statistics. And he says that the drop in the number of adoptions during the 1970's from 170,000 a year to 130,000 indicates a drop in unwanted children.

But is it really true, Mr. Joyce asks, that unwanted children are twice as likely to commit crimes? "The main study they use," he said, "involves children who were institutionalized for at least four months in their first year of life, which means it's a pretty exceptional pool." Mr. Levitt insists that this is more typical than one might think: "A lot of poor teenage mothers have poor prenatal care and have drug and alcohol problems that lead to birth complications and hospitalization for the children."

Such questions make it nearly impossible to pinpoint the relationship between abortion and crime, other scholars say. "There are a lot of different things going in this period at the same time that plausibly fit these same facts," said Lawrence W. Sherman, a criminologist at the University of Pennsylvania. "The waning of the crack epidemic. A major crackdown on handguns in cities. An improving economy. So while I think Levitt and Donohue are brilliant, no amount of brilliance will overcome a lack of data. So maybe rather than propose new theories, we should spend our money gathering better information."

(Alexander Still, "New Attention for the Idea That Abortion Averts Crime," New York Times, April 14, 2001.)

Note that scholars are - or were in 2001 - still undecided. But also note that the methodology is completely scientific. A

hypothesis is put forth, and researchers test it by making predictions from it, and then seeing if available data proves those predictions true or false. Nobody is willing to settle simply for instinct or opinion.

Greg Sandow

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 12:38:25 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:39:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 14:38:33 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

It is hard to conclude that some UFOs are ET since practically any test could be the result of other causes. For instance, if some UFO debris was found and tested to be an isotope ratio not used in commonly produced metals, it could still have been purposely manufactured to mimic ET-type isotope ratio. Even if the debris included nanotechnology (nanostructures/materials) that we currently do not publicly have, it could exist in classified projects or via "ancient civilizations" or via psychokinesis or whatever. Same for ET DNA.

All that can be said is that it is probable that some UFOs are ET.

I prefer the statement: "it is probable that some UFOs are advanced hardware" (without specifying the point of origin).

The idea of ancient technological civilizations (100000's to millions of years earlier) is fascinating and there are a number of "erratics" that are hard to explain (various objects in coal/rocks/ quartz/geodes) without such civilizations. However, there are other possibilities here too, namely time travel or temporal disaster or non-time travel teleportation via machines or telekinesis. Sadly, we always have to invoke peculiar, unproven stuff to explain these things. I mean, what is the simplest explanation: time travel or a million year old Earth civilization or even ET building a prison colony on Earth way back then?

Again, although one hates to have to mention it, do we know enough about the physics of the Universe to rule out that these apparently hardware based UFOs and occupants are not some sort of tangible manifestation of our own consciousness? It would be simpler if we could ignore the possibility, but until we get better data can we rule it out? If psychic phenomena was conclusively nonexistent, then this could be so. However, we have all experienced such events and much scientific experimentation has been done to show some level of oddity exists that cannot be explained by physics. Perhaps, the apparent evolutionary nature of the UFO phenomena based on the historical point of humanity is related to this.

Finally, and perhaps completely related to the previous paragraph, we have ghosts. These have also been researched and as many or more reports of the phenomena has been gathered as have those for UFOs. Such objects seems to be able to manifest themselves visibly and interact with matter and generate sounds and create field fluctuations. Could some UFOs be a form of ghosts? Well, this is not very satisfying because we must ask then what are ghosts? Are they manifestations of our own

consciousness (i.e. psychic phenomena) or dead people or ETs?

It sure is simpler to assume some UFOs are of ET origin because this more easily fits into an acceptable paradigm (i.e. a giant, old Universe has time to create amazingly advanced civilizations which could easily be able to visit us).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## 'Seeing Is Believing' Video

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 22:10:31 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:43:49 -0400  
Subject: 'Seeing Is Believing' Video

I think the latest physics/astronomy video, Seeing Is Believing, at:

<http://tinyurl.com/le76e>

continues the sycophantic mis-informing that seems typical of western popularizing.

Facts ignored:

Some two and a half thousand years ago early (Ionian) Greeks had a more realistic Solar System theory than later aristocratic Greeks, or indeed the whole western establishment for next 1500 years.

As early as the Han dynasty, (25-220 CE) the astronomer Qi Meng is said to have promoted (or rejuvenated) a cosmic theory that had the planets, the Sun and stars floating freely in "infinite, empty space" and which said these bodies were all "condensed from vapor".

Milton Humason, a Pasadena mule-skinner who got a job at Mt Wilson and worked with Hubble, was the discoverer of Andromeda Galaxy (first knowledge that Milky Way wasn't the whole universe) - but a mule-skinner wasn't posh enough for the text-books so Hubble got the credit.

Cecilia Payne discovered that stars were made from hydrogen but her paper was 'modified' and her later career damaged - because the (male) establishment had thought (and insisted) that the Sun had to be made of Iron!

Halton Arp's work on redshifts:

<http://www.electric-cosmos.org/arp.htm>

will make the experts look silly (most redshifts don't equate to distance/speed as the experts claim) - so is ignored and even censored.

Active mis-info:

Rather desperate invoking of 'black holes', 'big bang', 'big crunch' - which will probably be quietly dropped in some years (think they don't exist).

All in all, thought the only item that made it worth watching was Robert Jastrow of Mt Wilson saying "there are uncounted trillions of planets in the observable universe and two-thirds of them are billions of years older than Earth, so any of their inhabitants will have same relationship to humans that humans have with bacteria, or primitive worms".

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](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## The X-Files Deep Throat

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:51:26 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:51:26 -0400  
Subject: The X-Files Deep Throat

Source: TV Squad.Com - Blog

<http://www.tvsquad.com/2006/06/11/the-x-files-deep-throat/>

Posted Jun 11th 2006

The X-Files Deep Throat  
by Anna Johns

Do not adjust your web browser. You are now entering the Retro Squad, where we are reviewing past episodes of your favorites shows, in order, every week.

(S01E02) The second episode of the series is still focused on UFOs and extraterrestrials. We get deeper into the whole government conspiracy storyline when Mulder and Scully visit an Idaho Air Force base where test pilots are either acting strangely or have disappeared. This is the first of many episodes that suggests the federal government, specifically the military, is controlling information about aliens on earth.

I find it interesting that this episode was called Deep Throat, since we barely even see the guy. He's simply introduced to us at the very beginning, when he warns Mulder not to go to Idaho, and again at the end when he tells Mulder he can help. We see more of Seth Green, as an Idaho stoner/UFO watcher, than we see Deep Throat. The Deep Throat character was reportedly inspired by Donald Sutherland's role as Mr. X in JFK and, of course, by the actual Deep Throat informant in the Watergate scandal.

This is a great episode because it's where Scully starts to join 'Team Mulder'. She sees that the government is obviously hiding something and thugs from the Air Force are bullying Mulder to get him to leave town. She has trouble letting go of her belief in the government's right to keep secrets, but we definitely see her start to crack. The evidence is where Scully points a gun and threatens a guy with an Air Base Security badge. Granted, she does it because she's desperate to get Mulder back, but she's also breaking her own protocol. Unfortunately, for all she knows, Mulder's been beaten up. His memory has been erased so, once again, she's left in the dark. She's still pretty uptight about writing those field reports, isn't she?

Near the end of the episode, we get to see an iconic image of The X-Files where a triangle-shaped UFO hovers over Mulder and shines a light down on him.

Best line:

Mulder: They're here, aren't they?

Deep Throat: Mr. Mulder, they've been here for a long, long 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

### Re: UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge Dies - Burns

From: Chris Burns <[Thurstonoreggae.nul](mailto:Thurstonoreggae.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 00:18:27 EDT  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:53:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge Dies - Burns

>Source: Southeast Missourian - Cape Girardeau, Missouri, USA

><http://www.semmissourian.com/story/1155552.html>

>Tuesday, June 6, 2006

>Area UFO Expert Dr. Harley Rutledge, 80, Dies

List,

I was hoping that someone who knew Dr. Rutledge personally would have written to the list by now, but as no one has I want to make sure it is brought up how tremendous his "Project Identification" is, both as a past organization and effort, and as the resulting book. Outside of Hessdalen, I can't think of another research effort like "Project Identification"; it truly was a rarity in UFO history. The book is one of the most professional books written on the UFO phenomenon, avoiding terminology that conveys an assumption of the mystery's origin--sadly another rarity. For myself, I got my hands on the book at the right time, and the picture it painted of the phenomenon's behavior that differed from much of what is written on UFOs rang true to me. Not the easiest book to get through, but absolutely one of the most valuable. It is well overdue for a reprint.

I was surprised by the article on Dr. Rutledge's passing that he did a number of public appearances discussing his research. Periodically I have searched for interviews with Dr. Rutledge but have come up empty. I hope a family member sees the value in his research and makes available to researchers his archives, perhaps in the way Bill Vogel's material was archived on the web. Even just the sheer number of photographs amassed by the project, especially considering how they were acquired, is astounding.

I have been disappointed that a large number of the current UFO community are not aware of Dr. Rutledge's work. It is painful to talk to someone who gives lectures on the subject of UFOs who has never heard of Project Identification. It's a sad comment when people active in the UFO community know more about Project Serpo and Roswell than about a scientist who successfully took a team of trained observers in the field to amass data on UFOs by direct observation of the phenomenon. Seemingly more people are interested currently in the UFO mythology than trying to understand the actual physical phenomenon.

The group of people who will keep Rutledge's book known are most likely those who find themselves at some point involved with an area like Piedmont was in the early seventies with repeat UFO activity. The "hotspot" as a sub-phenomenon within the subject of UFOs may turn out to be the only thing that lets us gain any significant understanding of the phenomenon beyond what we already know, and certainly Dr. Rutledge's project provides a valuable blueprint on how to conduct a fruitful investigation of an area like Piedmont if the chance ever arises.

Condolences to Dr. Rutledge's family.

Chris Burns

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Bueche

From: Will Bueche <[willbueche.nul](mailto:willbueche.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 23:10:29 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:56:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Bueche

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 07 Jun 2006 16:08:27 +0000  
>>Subject: Reason's Reasoning

>By the way, in case anyone is starting to think that none of  
>this has anything to do with Ufology, well I think it does.  
>Because most of what can be said about the social sciences -  
>both good and bad - can probably, it seems to me, be said about  
>Ufology as well.

Cathy,

Of all the people who post on UpDates, I believe I have saved more of your comments into my reference file than anyone else.

If you have a spare year or two, you could write a book about how different fields could approach alien encounters - where their area of expertise provides insight, and where their area of expertise falls short.

Maybe the concept of the book could be that you've been asked to assemble a blue ribbon panel to examine the alien matter. Each chapter would be a person (an invented person) from a different profession; you'd explain what their strengths would reveal about aliens. And to make the book more than just a fanciful "what if", you could cite where other members of their profession fell short (i.e. Clancy and McNally for example), and explain \*why\*. Ultimately you'd prove that in order to understand aliens, we need many different perspectives working on different aspects. Which may be obvious, but, it's an obvious point worth making, IMO.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Dan Aykroyd On CNN - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 06:40:04 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:58:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Dan Aykroyd On CNN - Shell

On Jun 11, 2006, at 6:04 PM, UFO UpDates - Toronto wrote:

>Unidentified Male: Well I think it's far out. I think it's  
>bizarre. And I wish it had never happened to me. My life would  
>be a lot better.

That wasn't an unidentified male at all, it was my friend Derrel Sims, and his name was clearly supered on the screen while he was speaking.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:02:05 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:59:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 14:04:25 EDT  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>Thanks Bob... but please note... In B&W mode the aperture stays  
>fixed at what looks like a fixed F/42 opening that slides into  
>place. The Light to Dark adjust in front changes the tension on  
>the shutter spring coil. The detector further adjusts the  
>shutter speed as describe above. Its important to note that the  
>size of the aperture does not change in Black and White mode.  
>The focus adjustment is meant primarily for Color mode with a  
>wide aperture. It is also important to note that in color mode a  
>set aperture is also slid into place. By sliding back from Color  
>to B&W these two different size apertures slide into place.  
>Since I don't have batteries yet, I'm not entirely certain if  
>the Cds system also adjusts (simulates for) an intermediate  
>sized aperture that might crosses behind the set openings during  
>color mode thus creating the intermediate valued f-stops.

I dug out a Polaroid Model 101. Actually it appears that there is no diaphragm at all, just that sliding plate with fixed-diameter holes cut into it. So the CdS metering system only controls the shutter speed. It's much simpler than I originally thought.

You have to understand, though, the difference between depth of field and depth of focus. Depth of field is the range of distances from the camera that a subject can be and still appear as acceptably sharp in the photo. Depth of focus is the range of distances from the film that the lens can be and still render acceptably sharp results. To some extent they have an inverse relationship; great depth of field = shallow depth of focus. That being said, the focus adjustment would be just as important for black and white as for color. Heflin would have had to focus the camera or pre-set it to a guessed distance prior to shooting the photos.

I really don't know the technical parameters for determining depth of field and depth of focus data for old Polaroid cameras. I suspect the assumed circle of least confusion would be fairly large.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:22:47 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 08:01:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>I received some response about my comment last week about  
>apparent dodging I found in the high-resolution  
>Trent/McMinnville scans I was playing stereo with, so I thought  
>I'd post this link to clarify what I was talking about:

><http://img392.imageshack.us/img392/5507/mcmindodge3sz.jpg>

>One is just a simple brightness/contrast adjustment, the other  
>is a dreaded embossing (what can I say, sometimes it helps).  
>Maybe there's some kind of contrast bleed thing happening I  
>don't understand here. Or hey, maybe it's a force field. I don't  
>know.

>Anyway, this is what made me think that perhaps the photo  
>showing the saucer underside (#1) was a contact print of some  
>kind. Or maybe that maybe Trent didn't get the original  
>negatives back from the Men In Black.

It looks like a pasteup job to me. The density right around the saucer is quite clearly different from the density in the sky it was pasted into.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Fire In Sky Is Probably Not Man-Made

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 07:44:41 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 07:44:41 -0400  
Subject: Fire In Sky Is Probably Not Man-Made

Source: Anchorage Daily News - Alaska, USA

<http://www.adn.com/life/story/7846922p-7740581c.html>

June 11, 2006

Fire In Sky Is Probably Not Man-Made

Ned Rozell  
Alaska Science

One winter night not too long ago, an Interior musher saw a fireball blazing through the sky "like a flaming Nolan Ryan fastball."

As a baseball fan, I liked his comparison. But that can't be the explanation for the blue flash that lit up the sky. Nolan Ryan retired years ago.

To track down the real cause of the burst of light and the accompanying boom, Fairbanks Daily News-Miner writer Mary Beth Smetzer called the U.S. Space Command at Peterson Air Force Base, Colo. A staffer told her the light show was not the result of anything man-made.

Other space watchers told her a meteorite probably lit up the sky when it entered Earth's atmosphere and glowed from the sudden friction of air molecules. The meteorite, a fragment of some heavenly body, probably caused a sonic boom as it whistled toward Interior Alaska faster than the speed of sound.

That's a good explanation, but I wondered how the people at U.S. Space Command could be so sure our celestial visitor wasn't a piece of old rocket or satellite sucked in by Earth's gravity. Space is crowded with working and nonworking satellites, rocket stages containing empty fuel tanks, electrical controls and other such rubbish. Do the sky watchers at Space Command keep track of it all?

Yes.

"We have a handle on everything (in space) that's man-made," said Lt. Col. Don Planalp, a spokesman for the U.S. Space Command. "We're tracking about 8,000 different objects that are four inches (in diameter) or bigger."

Space Command knows when a large rocket is launched from anywhere on Earth.

Heat-detecting satellites pick up the infrared waves emitted by booster rockets during a launch. Once an object is in orbit, Space Command tracks it with ground-based radar and cameras.

Whatever man lobs into Earth's orbit will someday come down, Planalp said. Of the thousands of satellites blasted into space



since the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, all will eventually return to Earth.

The closer an object circles Earth, the sooner its orbit will meet the atmosphere, a 30-mile thick shell of gases covering the planet. Weather satellites orbit about 300 miles above Earth. Geosynchronous satellites, which carry many of our phone and television signals, are stationed about 22,240 miles away.

Geosynchronous satellites "might be up there for millions of years," Planalp said. Other spacecraft, such as the one used for the Mars Pathfinder Mission, will never return to Earth because they've been blasted beyond Earth's gravitational pull.

Space Command scientists have calculated the orbits of all 8,000 pieces of hardware zooming around the Earth, Planalp said.

Though Space Command scientists can pinpoint where man-made space debris will collide with Earth's atmosphere, Planalp said there is no way to predict whether the junk will skip off the atmosphere like a flat stone on water or whether it will plunge to Earth.

If space junk does reach Earth's surface, it probably won't hit your head, your house or your horse. "There's not much danger," Planalp said. "Seventy-five percent of the earth is water, and much of the remaining 25 percent is uninhabited. The chance of being hurt or of property damage is infinitesimal."

Space Command knows of all the man-made stuff orbiting above us, but the agency doesn't track meteorites, which typically arrive from deep space without pausing to orbit Earth. Along with the aurora, unpredictable meteorites are another good reason to look up when carrying a load of groceries inside on an Alaska winter night.

You never know when we'll be treated to another flaming fastball in the sky.

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Yahoo Mail Security Problem

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 08:13:10 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 08:13:10 -0400  
Subject: Yahoo Mail Security Problem

As many subscribers to UFO UpDates use Yahoo addresses to subscribe, they should be aware of the following:

-----

Source: Information Week - Manhasset, New York, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/zkopa>

Jun 12, 2006

Yahoo Mail Worm Harvesting Addresses

By Gregg Keizer  
TechWeb.com

Jun 12, 2006 11:41 AM

A new worm targeting Yahoo's Web-based e-mail service bent on collecting addresses for a spam database has been spotted in the wild, a security company warned Monday.

The "Yamanner" worm exploits a JavaScript vulnerability in Yahoo's Web mail, Cupertino, Calif. security specialist Symantec said in a Monday morning warning to customers of its DeepSight Threat Management System. Yamanner is spreading, added Symantec, which has assigned the threat a "2" in its 1 through 5 rating system.

The worm targets addresses with the "yahoo.com" and "yahogroups.com" domains, and arrives as an HTML message containing JavaScript. As soon as the recipient views the message, the script automatically runs to spread the worm to other users in the Yahoo address book. The message will have a From" address of [av3.nul](mailto:av3.nul) and a Subject: of "New Graphic Site."

"Harvested addresses from the address book are then submitted to a remote URL, which is likely to be used for a spam database," noted Symantec in its alert.

Yamanner won't execute on the newest Yahoo Mail Beta.

Until Yahoo patches the flaw, Symantec recommended users steer clear of the service or disable the browser's JavaScript capabilities before reading any Web mail.

-----

ebk

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Maybe They Were Too Busy To Look

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 08:19:36 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 08:19:36 -0400  
Subject: Maybe They Were Too Busy To Look

Source: The Toronto Star - Ontario, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/kskys>

Jun. 10, 2006

Maybe They Were Too Busy To Look

Waiting for contact from outer space

Jay Ingram

SETI, the search for extraterrestrial intelligent life, has held a privileged position in science for decades. A discipline without a subject, SETI has nonetheless attracted a talented group of dedicated researchers. But the lack of results is starting to prompt questions and, yes, even doubts.

Why does anyone even think there might be intelligent life out there? It's all about faith and probability. Faith that the processes that led to the origin of life here on Earth should operate anywhere in space where the conditions are right. Probability then takes over, leading to calculations about the number of planets that might eventually host an intelligence at least as acute as that of humans'.

Years ago, Frank Drake, the leader-emeritus of SETI, concocted something called the Drake equation, which was an attempt to estimate just how many intelligent civilizations there might be out there. The starting point was the number of stars in the galaxies (many, many zeroes). Each subsequent term in the equation whittled that gargantuan number down by posing further conditions. Of those stars, how many might have planets? How many of those planets might actually harbour life? And, in the end, how many intelligent civilizations with the technological capacity to signal us arose and are still out there?

You'd think there wouldn't be many, but you'd be wrong. Because the initial number in the equation is so huge, the number of intelligent civilizations was initially calculated to be something like a million in our Milky Way galaxy alone - give or take.

Calling this an equation is to mislabel it slightly, because really only the first term - the number of stars in the galaxies - is even roughly known. Everything from then on is a guess. We are getting closer to an idea of how many planets those stars have, and how many of those planets might be habitable, but that's still a long way from having a good handle on the idea.

Now, some skeptical voices are being heard. In the May/June issue of the Skeptical Inquirer, political scientist Peter Schenkel takes issue with the optimistic numbers yielded by the Drake equation. I don't buy his first argument, that if they were really out there, we should have found them by now. (It's

an old question. The legendary physicist Enrico Fermi actually asked, "Why haven't we heard from them?" back in the 1940s.) But the search is really just beginning.

The fact that it is 46 years and counting since we started listening seems tiny to me compared with the times and distances we're considering.

But Schenkel also suggests that there's evidence that we are pretty special, even in a chemistry/physics way. The sun is just the right age and distance, the outer planets protected us from the asteroid bombardment early in the life of the solar system, and even dramatic extinctions, like that of the dinosaurs, created opportunities for other living things.

But others suggest that the reason we haven't been in contact with others is that they're simply not interested in us. Schenkel finds this unbelievable, claiming that any species that calls itself intelligent must also have that drive and curiosity that leads humans to explore the Earth, travel into space and listen for the signs of others. (We began sending our own messages in the form of music, speech and symbols on spacecraft at least 30 years ago.)

This notion of the curious, out-reaching alien clashes nicely with the ideas of evolutionary psychologist Geoffrey Miller, who suggests in Seed magazine that the tendency to look inward, not out, would actually be bred in technologically advanced civilizations - in fact, it is happening right now with ours. Miller writes: "Aliens don't blow themselves up; they just get addicted to computer games." His point is that technology is able to provide virtual versions of real-life things that we choose because - at least in real life - they promote survival.

But the virtual version is more vivid and compelling. Miller cites tasty foods giving rise to fast food; sexy mates to the porn industry.

He goes on: One hundred years ago, gadgetry enhanced real life: electric lights, air conditioners, zippers. Today, it's all about TV, the Internet, virtual reality.

Miller suspects that alien civilizations that followed roughly the same developmental line as we have eventually disappeared into their made-up worlds and died out, too absorbed in technology to reproduce.

So, we have to work fast. Find one other civilization like us, one that is still interested, before the technological vortex sucks us in, too.

Jay Ingram hosts Daily Planet on the Discovery Channel.

[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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Anonymous

From: [modernherbal@\[address known\]](mailto:modernherbal@[address known])  
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 13:14:45 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 08:59:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Anonymous

[Non-Subscriber Post]

The 'UFO' in the Rex Heflin photos is in fact a toy train wheel. One of your Listers had it correct in a post recently.

May I suggest you contact the folks at Model Railroader or at Classic Toy Trains? A good site is [www.trainsmag.com](http://www.trainsmag.com) Pay special attention to model trains from the 1950s.

Another lister had it correct about the less-shown fourth photo. Check out airshow photobooks from the 60's for donut holes ring formations.

Put it this way- Rex enjoyed trains, models, and airplanes. He also enjoyed having a little fun.

The truth has been known by a few folks in Santa Ana since it all started. There are still a few old-timers left who could still tell the whole story... but then again, there are those who never want to "spoil a good story".

(You may post this to the List as Anonymous)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:43:52 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:03:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson

>From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron\\_510.nul](mailto:corycameron_510.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 11:50:04 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

<snip>

>My point here is that the traditional sciences seem to be just  
>as fluid and changing in their paradigm changes as the social  
>sciences. Just a few ideas.

>A defence of the social sciences,

Hi Corey,

Think your point is valid, establishments of the hard sciences are also subject to fashion-swings and prejudice although they claim impartiality. Try finding the real achievements of Milton Humason, Cecilia Payne, Alice Stewart, Chien-Shiung Wu, Vera Rubin, Beatrice Tinsley, and probably many more (Halton Arp springs to mind).

But the social 'scientists' tend to be even more partial, most often they have a desired conclusion in mind and simply ignore opposing facts. Take the chaos and confusion over 'schizophrenia', which impartial expert opinion now says "probably doesn't exist", yet continues to be used (as a meal-ticket?) by thousands of 'psychiatrists'.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:50:30 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:07:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:11:28 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:39:17 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:56:47 +0000  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Sat, 3 Jun 2006 14:28:29 -0400  
>>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>Based on your reply to Dr. Maccabee, Mr. Garza, your "research"  
>>team and "research" seem quite flawed. Unless you are operating  
>>using some new form of scientific method, you lose all  
>>credibility by offering arm-waving claims with no  
>>substantiation. We are to just trust you? Well, then why even  
>>publish the UFO FLIR video at all? We can just "trust" that you  
>>that you have a video of UFOs locked away in a desk somewhere.

>Why not read this over again James? Don't you think you are  
>being a bit harsh. I don't think there's any need of using words  
>like the Mexican Air Force is lying. What do you want to do,  
>burn that link? At least they put the stuff out there. Lighten  
>up a little.

I did read it carefully. Even accounting for language  
differences, I think Mr. Garza's post was rude to Dr. Maccabee  
and all the work the good doctor did.

The post revealed the lack of critical thinking and blatant  
prejudice of the Garza research team. They entered the  
investigation with one idea, that the FLIR UFOs were alien  
spaceships and anything that dares to explain it is armwaved  
away. The Air Force laughed about the idea of the lights being  
gas flares! This is where I think they are lying! They have the  
stupid FLIR camera for a reason. To spot aircraft. In order to  
do this they need training to differentiate between aircraft and  
non-aircraft. The FLIR video itself showed how they would zoom  
in on something... seem to think about it... zoom in again...  
note it isn't moving... and ignore it. For all we know, these  
zooms could be low level UFOs but matching the flight path,  
camera direction and magnification enables one to match the fact  
that gas flares do show up on the FLIR.

They seem to be lying because it would make them look bad if  
they were deceived and rattled by such prosaic objects/lights.

For the Mexican Air Force to say they never saw any unknown  
lights is impossible. They are either lying or narrowing down  
their statement to mean that they never saw any set of lights



exactly like the FLIR UFO video. Why don't they release the FLIR videos of the non-UFO flights if they are such a great "link"?

I have little respect for them in that they did not apparently try to obtain their own technical experts to solve the problem (and pay them) and preferred to get free advice. But worse, they go to a group with an agenda rather than some objective group of analysts. I would have had much more respect for them if they had said that they concluded that the objects were unknown aircraft encroaching their airspace and then provide a plan for dealing with such encroachments.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <[RB47x.nul](mailto:RB47x.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:40:25 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:16:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Sparks

>From: Greg Sandow <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 12:26:36 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:16:21 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

<snip>

>2. When a millennial cult makes a prophency, and that prophecy  
>doesn't come true, the members of the cult become more loyal to  
>it.

I couldn't let this pass, it is based on the fraudulent book, When Prophecy Fails (1956) by Leon Festinger, another, and then a third co-author the secret CIA mind-controller Stanley Schachter whose CIA connection is unknown to readers to this day, and whose very name is now usually left off the reprints and glowing adulatory discussions of the book.

The authors cleverly enhanced the book's popular appeal by recounting their alleged secret infiltration of a flying saucer cult group that was predicting doomsday, although it is not really known whether that is even true, that they ever infiltrated the group at all. They may have fabricated their alleged insider view for dramatic effect. But academics have all naively assumed the saucer group was indeed infiltrated and some have even raised ethical objections. Such is the wilderness of mirrors that is the CIA.

Some years ago Loren Gross sent me a long newspaper article reporting on the actual group purportedly described in this so-called "classic" book of mass psychology. The book virtually founded the field of "social psychology" and has been used to slander and discredit many churches and religious groups over the years, as well as smear the UFO field (in the notorious Donald Warren article in Science in 1970, which described UFO believers as fruitcake misfits seeking relief from their "status inconsistency" of having high academic degrees or professional accomplishments but working as frycooks while holding wacko beliefs).

I immediately recognized that the Schachter book had grotesquely misrepresented the group supposedly led by an ignorant housewife "Mrs. Marian Keech" who was in reality Mrs. Dorothy Martin, of Oak Park a suburb of Chicago, Ill., and the group was not in fact led by her, she was merely the channeler, but led by a legitimate medical doctor in a respected position at the Michigan State College Hospital (until he was forced to resign because of his beliefs), Dr. Charles Laughead (called "Dr. Thomas Armstrong" in the book) along with his wife Lillian Laughead.

Dr. Laughead was the main spokesman to the press and acknowledged de facto leader of the saucer group, not Mrs. Martin (Mrs. "Keech"), seemed to shy away from publicity. Puts

an entirely different coloration on the situation by concealing the high level of professional status of the actual leader, and instead playing up the supposedly ignorant foolish housewife.

The message of this academically-authoritative hoax book, when the pseudo-intellectual mendacious verbiage is translated into straight talk, is that:

(1) Religious belief is an irrational impulse by the poorly educated and the deluded. Already I've pointed out this was a lie, in this prime case study of the Schachter book, and in no way does the actual flying saucer group represent mainstream religions.

(2) That religious belief in general can be modeled on the examples of crazed cult groups, using argument ad extremum, a powerful (CIA) psychological warfare technique that is highly effective in discrediting any group, person or set of beliefs it is used against and for which there is no effective remedy. Once a disfavored target is discredited by such malicious tactics, the use of guilt by association with persons and propaganda themes of instant disrepute and the generous use of the "giggle factor," there is no recovery.

(3) That when religious groups are confronted by alleged uncomfortable reality or failed prophecies, instead of honestly accepting the implications of the (alleged) "truth," the groups dishonestly seek to deceive new members into believing their delusions so as to help prop up their own beliefs in a time of crisis with the social support of "new blood." Thus they seek relief from their "cognitive dissonance" -- to use the now well-known but bogus pseudoscientific terminology used by Schachter et al. in the book.

(4) That "when prophecy fails," religious groups cling even more tightly to their delusional beliefs, and it takes at least "three disconfirmations" such as prophecy dates of doomsdays coming and going before finally they start losing members, though a core group of fanatical true believers will still survive usually. This is a blatant lie, the actual saucer group never had 3 or more predicted dates of doomsday and an ever-growing crisis of faith. And there never was even ONE "disconfirmation"!

"When Prophecy Fails" has created its own false myth of our times, of a Midwestern religious group with widely-publicized predictions of the end of the world that came and went repeated times, of hoped-for salvation of the cult group by flying saucers on a specific date which comes and goes with nothing happening, of poor slobs of low status fanatically clinging to their foolish beliefs to the very end, in an ultimate fit of pathological loyalty to cultic stupidity and unreason. And the myth of calm, professional scientists in their midst, coolly going about their work, objectively observing their subjects' pathetic antics while silently maintaining their own smug superiority.

There was only ONE date, Dec. 21, 1954, when a great flood was predicted "might" strike the Midwest. Instead of being hunkered down for days or weeks waiting for the end of the world, a small group of 15 gathered in Mrs. Martin's home on the night of the prediction, as I recall from the news coverage.

But there was no "disconfirmation." No overwhelming refutation of crazed religious beliefs. Instead, at 4:45 AM on the appointed date, a message came to Mrs. Martin from "outer space" saying that the "flood" was actually of belief not water. News media flocked to the Martin home for days trying to drum up a story, but seemed to have trouble finding an angle for a story. No ridicule was reported being heaped on the group, forcing a defensive posture for survival of the cult, according to the news stories I read. No one in the group took a defiant or defensive posture.

Contrary to Schachter there was no fanatical proselytizing of new members to prop up their failing belief system. There were no new predictions of new dates of apocalypse. News stories gave the impression the group was disappointed and seemed to be disbanding. They seemed like ordinary people from a variety of backgrounds with no high stakes investment in the group beliefs, almost a casual interest. No one asserted any fanatical defiance

of the "truth." The whole picture painted by Schachter et al. flies in the face of actual contemporary interviews of participants.

What Schachter & Co. have done is choose the most humiliating and degrading anti-religious argument they could find. What could be more ridiculous than a screwball flying saucer religious cult group of low-grade uneducated morons, led by ignorant housewife-types? And that statistically tiny and totally unrepresentative sample of religious persons, groups and beliefs has been mammothly magnified into a culture-wide argument against religion in general, of all types. Interestingly, it is used only against religion, not against politics, not against academia, not against business.

By the way, this is not intended as an academic paper, exhaustively researched to death, and is largely based on memory going back many years, and is subject to refinement and correction as I gather materials from time to time.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:01:01 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:19:40 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 20:37:43 +0100  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:31:25 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>In his book Klass gave an accurate, straightforward accounting  
>>>of the case and then stated that it was either a hoax or the  
>>>"real thing" involving aliens that did damage to the car. From  
>>>his writing it is clear that Klass "favored" the hoax  
>>>explanation.

>>Why the scare quotes around favored? Do you mean this to be  
>>ironic commentary, or are these just randomly generated quotation  
>>marks? Of course Klass favored the hoax explanation. What  
>>choice did he have?

>He didn't have much choice, did he? Assuming his account of the  
>case is accurate, the damage to the car is not such as could  
>have occurred accidentally. Therefore, it seems reasonable to  
>assume that Johnson might have done it, for some unknown  
>reason. I he didn't do it, then who did? Of course it it is  
>possible that there was someone with him who caused the damage  
>and Johnson was covering up for him. Or the car was attacked by  
>malicious UFO-nauts, as Klass suggested as an unlikely  
>alternative. So far, no one seems to have come up with any other  
>possibilities, plausible or otherwise.

>>In doing so, Klass set up the usual strawmen, expressing the  
>>idea that the Johnson encounter involved a real UFO in such a  
>>preposterous fashion that the hoax explanation - even in the  
>>absence of the slightest evidence - had to be the preferred one.

>No, he was simply suggesting an explanation which would occur to  
>anyone with a grain of common sense.

No surprise here, but for some of you neophytes, a translation  
may be in order:

In pelicanese, "a grain of common sense" finds expression in a  
purportedly prosaic explanation for which no shred of evidence  
exists or has ever been demonstrated, or apparently ever will be  
demonstrated, but which nonetheless - because it validates the  
pelicanist's touching faith in the disbelief tradition - wraps  
him in a warm, cozy glow.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 17:19:23 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:21:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:04:02 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 22:56:38 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>I looked at this yet again, using the same procedure and  
>>ignoring all previous measurements. I rechecked the landscape  
>>rescaling for #3 and conclude I had it pretty exact the first  
>>time at 94%. I also remeasured the disc and dome proportions  
>>from #1 to get 70.9% (the same as last time). Using 500% blow-  
>>ups I then measured the dome of the rescaled UFO #3 ,and  
>>applying this proportionality to find the disc width I now get  
>>an increase in #3 over #2 of just over 106%, pretty close to  
>>last time.

>>But squinting for a while at the very coarse pixel resolution  
>>you soon realise there's some subjectivity about which pixel  
>>edge you choose to represent the slightly blurred edge. I might  
>>have been making similar pessimistic assumptions each time. So I  
>>did this again making deliberate;y different choices that might  
>>tend to favour a closer result. I then got 42.3 mm for the disc  
>>width in #3, rescaled to 39.8 mm, compared with 39 mm for #2.  
>>This gives a value of about 102% for #3 over #2.

>I also went back over my measurements. I used direct measurement  
>of the bottom rim after rescaling photo #3. Photos used were  
>600% blow-ups from the JSE article. #3 was rescaled 95% (vs.  
>your 94%), which I found gave exact matchup in distant treeline  
>features. I also darkened mid-range grays to better define the  
>edges. Before rescaling, the object rim-to-rim measured 97  
>pixels wide in #3 vs. 95 in #2. After rescaling it was 92 pixels  
>wide.

>I don't find the bottom disc portion in #3 as indistinct as you  
>and think these measurements are fairly reliable. My direct rim  
>measurements make the object in #3 3% smaller than in #2. Your  
>indirect determination makes it larger, which brings up other  
>interesting and frustrating questions discussed below.

>>So that's it. I feel fairly confident that the true value - for  
>>the pair of scans I am using - is somewhere in the range 102-  
>>106%. At the moment I can't see how any better measurement or  
>>method will trim between 7 and 11 percentage points off this.  
>>Any ideas?

>The fact that the width ratios of the top dome and bottom disc  
>seem to vary in photos 1 and 3 raises the very real possibility  
>that the dome and/or disc may not be circular. That would  
>account for the differences in results between my direct  
>measurement of bottom width and your indirect determination.

David,

Good call. Thanks for rechecking your measurements and for

coming up with a possible answer to a conundrum. I feel something has been successfully demystified here.

>E.g., if the bottom is circular but the dome elliptical, then  
>direct measurement is giving us the true relative sizes of the  
>object in the two photos, whereas indirect determination would  
>give bogus results. However, if the dome was circular and the  
>bottom elliptical, then direct measurement could be invalid and  
>the apparent smaller size of the bottom disc an artifact of  
>perspective. It may only appear to be smaller in #3 because we  
>are seeing the narrow part of the ellipsoidal bottom. Indirect  
>measurement here would probably be a more reliable indicator of  
>relative size.

I still wish other people would check both our sets of measurements independently, but for now I agree with you.

I also think there is another possibility, and this relates to Nathan's idea that the dark band is connected to the "smoke ring" - because presumably a surface sheath of vapour around the dome could be of variable thickness not only from place to place but also from time to time. Thus what appears to be a slightly defocused shadowed solid edge could actually be the soft edge of this vapour of dark "particulates". From contrast-enhanced enlargements I also find a striated microtexture in this band, as mentioned before, possibly the same thing Nathan noticed.

I suggest that this could contribute (along with possible oscillation/rotation) at least part of the anomalous "blur" noted by Kelson as unexplained in the 2000 JSE paper.

Looked at in this way, the "inconsistency" in size becomes positive latent evidence.

>However, there are all sorts of possibilities. Both dome and  
>bottom disc could be elliptical by varying amounts and in  
>varying directions. Neither measurement technique will be  
>reliable. This leaves us in the unsatisfying position of  
>ambiguous results. Without knowing the actual shape of the  
>object, we can't reliably determine relative distances from  
>relative size. (The only positive here, is that a noncircular  
>shape eliminates such hoax objects as a model train wheel,  
>previously mentioned as the source of Heflin's alleged hoax  
>model object.)

Even more so if it is considered as evidence of a vapour or "smoke" ring.

>In a hoax model, as previously you noted, the larger size of  
>your #3 might be accounted for by the camera in #3 being about  
>5% closer to the car window and some hoax model just outside the  
>window. The simplest hoax would be the model just hanging there  
>barely swinging from a thread and being photographed from two  
>different angles. While that might account for the size  
>difference, it is harder to account for the coincidence of equal  
>elevation angles.

I agree.

>If the camera is closer to the model in #3,  
>then the elevation angle should be higher for #3 if the camera  
>height is the same. E.g., if the model was 46 inches from the  
>camera in #2, then the camera would need to be 5.5 inches below  
>the object to get the 6.8 degree elevation angle that I get for  
>#2. If the camera is 5% closer in #3 with the stationary object  
>now 44 inches away and the same distance below the object, the  
>elevation angle would jump up to 7.1 degrees, about 1/6th of the  
>angular width of the object bottom. To compensate, the camera  
>would have to go up a quarter inch to 5.25 inches below the  
>object.

But I still find certain coincidences in displacements relative to the mirror and window disturbing. This is basically Tim Shell's "stereo" coincidence obviously, but let's put some numbers on it.

There is a ~ 12% increase in the angular elevation of the object relative to the top-centre of the mirror between #2 and #3 (rescaled). At the same time the angle between the top of the "model" and the edge of the window above also increases by ~ 20%. Note that both values are significantly larger than the



estimated ~5% enlargement identifiable as due to the reducing lens-window distance and so must be due to real changes in the angular relationships of these objects between #2 and #3. A stationary model further than the mirror is inconsistent with the background parallax as already established, so these changes are together consistent either with

1) a real leftward translation of a large UFO beyond the mirror combined with movement of the lens as Heflin leaned over towards the rear of the right window or

2) a leftward displacement of a model UFO or UFOs beyond the mirror combined with movement of the lens as Heflin leaned over towards the rear of the right window or

3) a small stationary model hanging closer than the mirror showing an altered perspective caused by the lens approaching the window

This last option predicts that the angle between the top left corner of the window and the UFO should increase between #2 and #3 by an amount less than the #120% increase in the angle between the left edge of the window and the mirror mount, but by more than the ~105% due to reducing lens-object distance alone. It does so, by about an additional 2% at 107%.

It also predicts that rightward lateral displacement relative to the mirror will be close to zero or negative. Corrected for the reducing lens-object distance again, it is. Averaged over three points on the mirror, left centre and right, I get 96%. The change in distance from the right side of the mirror is negative at 90 %, indicating a model closer than this. The change from the left, slightly nearer, edge of the mirror is zero. Consistent with a model at exactly this distance from the lens.

In the first two of the above three options the lateral parallax is a free parameter. We can make arguments as to why these angles might turn out to be related, and these are plausible arguments (i.e., 1) The UFO flew to the left and Heflin reacted by shifting to the right, or 2) Heflin moved the model in the direction he'd decided to describe the UFO flying and shifted his camera position as he imagined he would have done in reality), but still there is no natural geometrical relation which enforces the lateral angular changes we see. Option 3) does enforce them, and so to that extent is a simpler and a better theory.

Of course it is only a theory of the angular relationships, and there is more to the case than angular relationships. Just because it is a simpler and better theory of angles doesn't mean that it's necessarily the correct theory. Other facts and arguments come in to play when the whole case is considered. A model hung by the mirror is not consistent with evidence of a vapour or smoke band for example.

>Heflin would have to be one lucky hoaxer to get everything to go >his way and ultimately agree with the details of his back story.

Actually, just to pin this down: Are we certain that Heflin described this back story - the sharp course reversal from S to NE around the position of #2, followed then by a long climb out to the NE - before photogrammetry indicated that this was what the photo sequence implied? Remember that in his 22 Sept 1965 NICAP report statement he said:

"I grabbed the camera... and took the first photograph through the windshield of the truck. The object then moved slowly off to the northeast. I then snapped the second picture" etc.

This is a bit ambiguous. I'd like to know what his very first explicit description of the object's course was. Can anyone quote this?

>However, the clincher for authenticity as far as I'm concerned >is still the "smoke" details in photos #2 and #3 that show up >only in photo enhancement and tie in these photos with the smoke >ring Heflin said was left behind as the object departed and >which he photographed immediately afterwards further down the >road.

Very suggestive, certainly. Maybe where there's smoke there really is some fire :-)

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 12:22:52 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:25:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:22:47 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>I received some response about my comment last week about  
>>apparent dodging I found in the high-resolution  
>>Trent/McMinnville scans I was playing stereo with, so I thought  
>>I'd post this link to clarify what I was talking about:

>><http://img392.imageshack.us/img392/5507/mcmindodge3sz.jpg>

>>One is just a simple brightness/contrast adjustment, the other  
>>is a dreaded embossing (what can I say, sometimes it helps).  
>>Maybe there's some kind of contrast bleed thing happening I  
>>don't understand here. Or hey, maybe it's a force field. I don't  
>>know.

>>Anyway, this is what made me think that perhaps the photo  
>>showing the saucer underside (#1) was a contact print of some  
>>kind. Or maybe that maybe Trent didn't get the original  
>>negatives back from the Men In Black.

>>It looks like a pasteup job to me. The density right around the  
>>saucer is quite clearly different from the density in the sky it  
>>was pasted into.

Before going too far astray I suggest you review the  
McMinnville investigation, including numerous copies of  
the photos, at:

<http://brumac.8k.com>

Click on PAPERS at the left and scroll down to Trent Farm  
Photos.

Everything I worked with using "old fashioned" equipment (Joyce-  
L:oebl scanning microdensitometer) was based on the original  
negatives and/or prints made from the original negatives.

Keep in mind that digitization does 'funny things' like  
sometimes surrounding an image with a faint halo such as you can  
see around the object in the first presentation of said photo at  
the web site. But then, you blow up the picture and the halo  
goes away.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 12:29:32 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:29:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

>From: Lan Fleming <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 15:07:37 -0500  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 15:14:33 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>>From: Lan Fleming <[lfleming6.nul](mailto:lfleming6.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 15:07:37 -0500  
>>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>I do not enjoy "bashing UFO nuts", I've got better things to do  
>>than that. Usually I just try to ignore them.

>Well, you seem to do pretty it frequently. Perhaps you consider  
>it to be a duty, albeit a burdensome one. That's not to single  
>you out, since quite a few others on the list seem selflessly  
>dedicated to the performance of this odious but presumably  
>necessary task.

Less of the "bashing UFO nuts" than the "application of critical  
thinking". And I only do it infrequently based on whether I have  
a personal interest in the topic. It is a waste of time to do it  
more often because of the little payback involved. We all have  
tolerance thresholds for things. I have tried to raise mine in  
order to not waste time.

>>I do not claim  
>>that there is no useful research being done in UFOlogy currently  
>>either. Nor do I claim UFO nuts are breeding like flies. I do  
>>claim that the poor state of education in the US (and World of  
>>course), the dumbing down of information and entertainment  
>>(sound bite summaries of complex topics, reality shows), the  
>>desire of an uneducated electorate by government, and the  
>>encouragement of employment in non-technical areas (via better  
>>salaries in law and sales) all contribute to a populace with  
>>reduced critical thinking.

>So the government desires an uneducated electorate, does it?  
>What facts do you have to support this conspiracy theory?

Logic is all that I have at my disposal. How am I going to get  
facts about this 'conspiracy'? Examination of the US political  
system shows that the elected officials do not want the public  
to be very smart or the elected officials would likely be voted  
out of office. Since so many elected officials get reelected  
time after time regardless of scandal or poor performance on key  
metrics or fulfillment of campaign promises, it seems pretty  
logical that they have a dumb electorate. Also, due to the  
encouragement of illegal immigration of greatly uneducated  
people and the desire to make them citizens, it is obvious they  
wish an uneducated electorate.

>>I know about the contactees and gullible folk back then. I am  
>>talking about the percentage of such folk compared to the

>>scientists and engineers involved in the field. Perhaps it just  
>>\_seems\_ like there are alot more gullible folk since they now  
>>have the luxury of a personal international information  
>>distribution system (the Internet).

>You do realize, don't you, that the percentage of "gullible  
>folk" goes up if the number of serious researchers goes down? No  
>increase in the legions of the gullible is necessary to explain  
>this phenomenon.

Yes. But can and do both contribute to the reduced percentage.

>>You're wrong about the uncritical thinking issue but I'll let it  
>>pass for the sake of discussion. And, let's assume its simply  
>>due to the fewer scientists and technical people researching  
>>UFOs rather than simply fewer such folk in general.

>I think that's a safe assumption, although I really can't say  
>what the number of scientists involvedis now as opposed to the  
>1950s.

Perhaps it could be done by combing the lists of participating  
members and their degrees/specialities/level of participation of  
NICAP/APRO/MUFON over time.

>>So you are saying that the scientists that supported the team  
>>investigation efforts (in NICAP/MUFON/APRO) were solely  
>>motivated by publishing?

>Where exactly did I say that?

I took your statement:

"Since the scientific establishment enthusiastically accepted  
Condon's assertion that science had nothing to gain by  
studying UFOs, \_few\_ (JS' emphasis) scientists have wasted  
their time on UFO studies that they know cannot get funding and  
will never be published in peer-reviewed journals."

to mean that the scientists were motivated solely by publishing.  
You are correct that that I should have said.... "So you are  
saying that \_most\_ scientists that supported the team  
investigation efforts (in NICAP/MUFON/APRO) were solely  
motivated by funding/publishing?"

>Papers on UFOs making it into  
>scientific journals have always been pretty scarce. Government  
>policies and the attitudes of academic organizations pretty much  
>ensure that they will remain scarce.

Of course they are scarce! The institutional paradigms are  
pretty difficult to shake. Reading Corliss' books and you can  
see the struggle of scientists and engineers to get new theories  
heard and considered.

>>>Starting in the 1950s, the government and the academic  
>>>hierarchies wished to bring the study of UFOs into disrepute.

>>If this conspiracy has any public facts to document them, then  
>>it would be interesting to see.

>When rational argument fails, the posturing about "conspiracies"  
>begins. The public facts are quite plainly presented in the  
>Robertson Panel report and other official documents. Ask Richard  
>Hall about how the Air Force repeatedly blocked NICAP's attempts  
>to get Congress to seriously consider the UFO issue in the '50s  
>and 60s. Richard Dolan's \_UFOs and the National Security State\_  
>lays out the early history in good chronological order. Mr. Hall  
>may not approve of some of the opinions Dolan expresses in the  
>book; I don't either. But I think Dolan gets the basic facts  
>straight.

I have gone into the subject before as to why the government  
would be inclined to not want to consider the topic of UFOs  
publicly. Mainly its related to security, I don't need Dolan's  
data. Even so, funding for the topic could be acquired with  
cleverness (e.g. investigating bolides instead of UFOs). The  
government isn't going to dole out money to scientists to  
research aliens or UFOs! As for academia, I think I already said  
that the paradigms of their organizations are purposefully  
conservative and hard to move. It has less to do with UFOs and

more to do with the basic mindset of academia.

>>I suspect that such an  
>>institutional bias is unwritten and typical of all disciplines  
>>where the dogma (paradigm) of the organization is protected  
>>against any anomalies. It does not take much to frame the study  
>>of UFOs within the acceptable paradigm (bolides, plasma,  
>>fireballs, sprites, ball lightning) but whenever one goes  
>>outside it one will encounter resistance. Regardless of what the  
>>hierarchies state, what the scientist or engineer does in his  
>>free time is beyond their perview so should not affect the  
>>numbers of these folk involved in UFOs. Yet they seem fewer.

>At least I'm relieved to hear that the gullible folk are not  
>breeding like locusts. Now you seem to be saying something  
>similar to what I said to begin with: that there may be fewer  
>scientists conducting UFO research now than in the olden days,  
>although I doubt there really were that many to begin with.

Sure there weren't many, but reading the old NICAP and APRO and  
MUFON reports one gets the feeling there were more than today.

>But  
>however tiny the number may be, I doubt that loudly wailing  
>about how disreputable UFOlogy has become will attract many new  
>scientists to the field.

Do we really want the kind of scientists/engineers getting  
involved who are prejudiced and allow others to think for them,  
and are good clique members? No, we want mavericks who simply  
look at the past cases of UFOs and say to themselves "there must  
really be something to this phenomena and it is worthy to look  
at regardless of all the chatter that goes on around it", and "I  
wonder if I could figure out what is going on here if I apply  
myself to the problem".

I suspect the hype and weirdness surrounding Ufology is not the  
best promotional media for such folk (I'd prefer the  
understated, soft-sell), but hopefully they can see through the  
BS to the 'core problem'.

I really don't think such scientists need commentary from others  
to conclude that the field is fairly messed up right now, they  
can easily conclude it by observation.

But I think the best thing, that can't be watered down by UFO  
crackpots and idiots, is the basic fundamental concept/idea of  
UFOs, namely that they are being seen.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:35:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>Of course I can make the statement Pilot and radar descriptions  
>as well as the physical trace cases establish it. Right angle  
>turns, at very high speed, vertical flight, landing and taking  
>off from the middle of nowhere without sound or visible external  
>engines. Release from and entrance into huge carrier craft able  
>to move at speeds of thousands of miles an hour decades ago.

<snip>

Gosh, I hope you all are not relying just on radar-blips as I am  
sure most of the people on this List are old enough to know that  
there has been stealth-technology available for years now that  
can create all kinds of maneuvers and speeds on the radar screen  
- radar screens on the ground and on-board the air craft.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:42:58 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:37:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Tim

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:14:18 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>Perhaps. All that seems to support the reactive paradigm though.  
>I would prefer to eschew that approach and the grounds that its  
>been done and did not reach any conclusions (plus lots of people  
>seem to want to do it that way anyway).

I know exactly what you mean. But what kind of pro-active study are you thinking about? One nice thing that's happened recently is the ready and relatively inexpensive availability of digital cameras and infrared sensing equipment. There have been some interesting images found on volcano cams and the like. But then again, the volume of data is too huge to pick through by hand (and eye).

My own personal predisposition is to try and avoid the "hippies on peyote chanting in the desert to contact UFOs" scenario. That seems like an exercise in ego-stroking and mass self-delusion.

What else could be used? Trained remote viewers, or OOBERS, acting as shock troops to make contact and arrange appearances or information exchanges?

Legislatively, it might be nice to get laws passed so that if people spilled the beans about government involvement they wouldn't lose their pensions. That might help.

Otherwise, I don't know. I'm stumped. Maybe the UFO field needs more people who used to be bounty hunters and detectives.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 14:00:31 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:38:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Tim

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:29:35 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Fourth, you have evidence, I suppose, that rules out "spiritual  
>apparition(s)" as a possible solution to the UFO enigma? You can  
>prove that another form of conscious being or intelligence (less  
>dense physically than us) is not responsible? Because I can't!  
>So, while I don't advocate this as the solution, I don't dismiss  
>it as a possible answer.

I keep thinking of sci-fi writer, Philip K. Dick, and his contact with the alien VALIS intelligence, that he thought was placed in orbit by some folks from Albemuth (Aldeberan). He also experienced "time shifts" that sent him back to an apparently previous existence as a Gnostic Christian. Aliens, demons, the "Watchers" described in the Apocryphal Book of Enoch. The recent Gospel of Judas, with its reference to the entity "Saklas," who insanely thinks it's God.

And what of old Rip Van Winkle (from the old Brothers Grimm story "Karl Katz," who was essentially abducted by "little people" and experienced a memory loss and time shift of 20 years? And Mothman and "Springheel Jack?"

Are these unrelated to the UFO field? Maybe. Or maybe it's just the old brain making connections where there really aren't any.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:09:00 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:10:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Of course I can make the statement. Pilot and radar descriptions  
>as well as the physical trace cases establish it. Right angle  
>turns, at very high speed, vertical flight, landing and taking  
>off from the middle of nowhere without sound or visible external  
>engines. Release from and entrance into huge carrier craft able  
>to move at speeds of thousands of miles an hour decades ago.

Let's break this down! Let's get specific!

You are saying two things here. First, you are saying there are high tech vehicles. Second, you are saying those high tech vehicles are ET spaceships.

Let's begin with the "there are high tech vehicles." You can't start with this as a 'given.' Yet that is what you have done!

If there were only two categories - these two categories being (1) the high numbers of cases describing such vehicles (with or without their pilots) and (2) the other reports of UFOs that consisted of IFOs and misperceived mundanes - you might be able to justify saying that the high number of high tech vehicle cases (with and without observed pilots/occupants) indicates there are such high tech vehicles. However, there are more categories than just these two!

You have a blur zone. To be specific, a zone that contains a large number of cases describing high tech vehicles where these high tech vehicles have characteristics which indicate they may not be high tech vehicles at all. You cannot dismiss these as irrelevant. Yet that is what you have done! That these exist presents the possibility that any or all of your high tech cases (the ones you focus on) could belong in this blur zone too. They may simply not have exhibited the bizarre characteristics, or some weren't noticed, during their manifestation - doesn't mean they didn't have the bizarre characteristics possessed by the anomalies in the blur zone.

Until you prove that the high tech vehicles you focus on don't also have the attributes of the high tech vehicles in the blur zone, you can't say they are a separate category. You can't say the blur zone cases are irrelevant. You also, without evidence to back it up, can't simply say "I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems" These are assumptions. These are proclamations. Yet this is what you have done!

You also have a high category of UFOs that don't look or behave like high tech vehicles but are, none the less, UFOs and do exhibit apparent intelligence behind them. You can't dismiss these from consideration. Yet this is what you have done! You can't arbitrarily pick and choose based on appearance and behaviour - there are plenty of cases where the appearance and behavior you decide as your criteria exists and blends with

characteristics of UFOs that don't look or behave at all like high tech vehicles. You can't dismiss the genuinely anomalous non-high tech vehicle UFOs. Yet this is what you have done!

You can't say there are high tech vehicles, no matter how many reports of same exist, unless you (1) ignore the category of non-high tech vehicle UFOs that are genuinely anomalous and exhibit apparent intelligence behind them, as well as ignore the category of apparent high tech vehicle UFOs that indicate they may not really be high tech vehicles, or (2) present valid arguments - based on fact and evidence - that demonstrates these two categories have absolutely no bearing on the category of UFOs you are focussing on. Saying they are "irrelavent" doesn't show why they are irrelevant and proclaiming "I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems" doesn't justify roping off your special little category of hand-picked and choosen UFOs.

Only by closing your eyes to the majority of the UFO data can you make the statement "there are high tech vehicle UFOs" with absolute certainty. It's a conclusion (really an assumption) that requires ignoring a lot of data to make.

Let's now consider your conclusion that "some UFOs are ET spaceships." To do so, we have to accept as a given (and the above explains why it's not a given) that there are indeed high tech vehicles. But let's just assume along with you that there are.

The only way you can conclude they are of ET origin is to exclude all other explanations. This includes 'older Earth-based technological civilizations' as well as the functionings of our own minds/consciousness, and life forms connected with Earth that may not as of yet be recognized by us, to name but a few.

Ancient artifacts exist that may indicate older Earth-based technological civilizations existed. If you say these artifacts have no connection to older Earth-based technological civilizations and such civilizations have no connection to the vehicles flying in our skies today then demonstrate - through fact and evidence - why there is no such connection. Don't unfairly demand of me to make the connection. You're making the claim, you're making the conclusion, so demolish the connections - based on fact and evidence - so your "some UFOs are ET spaceships" stands glaringly so!

If you say "some UFOs are ET spaceships" and that no Earth-based human agency is involved then explain - based on facts and evidence - why Peter Khoury found a hair with human DNA during his alleged encounter with beings that sound amazingly similiar to the ones in the cases you use for support. Or, demolish - based on fact and evidence - the credibility of this case and its implications. Show why - again based on fact and evidence- it has no bearing on the UFO cases you use for support of your conclusions.

Let's talk about Al Lawson's work! How am I misinterpreting his research? Show me just how - based on fact and evidence - his research is inapplicable to the UFO phenomenon. Demonstrate - based on fact and evidence - how an outside influence or intelligence could not be using processes intrinsic to the human mind to manipulate our perceptions of itself and/or our reality. Sure, his research subjects described 'abductions' that lacked emotional content. But maybe a part of them knew they were safely in a researcher's office while they created the event - unlike an unwilling witness walking along some deserted road in the dead of night when some external (or internal) agency decides to provide a stimulus around which is built a UFO experience. Prove - based on fact and evidence - how this is not to be considered a possible solution.

Prove - based on fact and evidence - that some other Earth-based technological civilization didn't discover, prior to us, the newer physics that we're only now on the verge of discovering, and are not using an advanced understanding of matter, energy, consciousness - or a nexus between same - to manipulate physical reality and our perceptions of same.

It's not for me to prove this is the case! I'm not saying it's so! It's for you to prove it isn't the case! You're the one who

already has your mind made up and is saying "some UFOs are ET spaceships."

I'm not saying anything is so! I'm merely questioning your conclusions. I've been specific - mentioned ancient artifacts that might indicate older Earth-based technological civilizations, mentioned the Peter Khoury case that might indicate humans to be behind the phenomenon, mentioned the hugh category of non-high tech vehicle UFOs that manifest apparent intelligence, mentioned the blur zone of apparent high-tech vehicle UFOs that may indicate they are not vehicles at all, mentioned research such as Al Lawson's that may indicate a process involving the human mind is at work, mentioned the newer physics that may be the basis for allowing an intelligence (doesn't have to be ET) to manipulate our physical surroundings (perhaps temporarily create a manifestation that can throw back a radar return) and/or manipulate our perceptions of itself and of our reality. (So I'm truly puzzled as to why you kept saying I've not been specific.)

I'm not saying any of these are involved. So I don't have to prove any of them. You have to show how they don't apply if you want to say it's not premature to make a conclusion yet. You get specific and rule them out. Use facts and evidence.

While you're at, explain - based on real facts and real evidence - other anomalies peculiar to this phenomenon, such as the numerous cases where the interiors of the alleged craft seem to be way out of proportion to their size as seen from outside the craft (as described by many witnesses). Heck, when you get through explaining all the above - based on fact and evidence - I've got a lot more anomalies that you can explain. But I've been specific enough for now. It's time you start to get specific and explain why none of this justifies questioning your conclusions. Get down to the nitty-gritty. I've heard enough stories about your grandfather, Barry Bonds and Vitamin C.

Facts, Stan, real facts - how about some of those?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:17:31 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:51:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:04:02 -0700  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 22:56:38 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

<snip>

>Heflin would have to be one lucky hoaxer to get everything to go  
>his way and ultimately agree with the details of his back story.  
>However, the clincher for authenticity as far as I'm concerned  
>is still the "smoke" details in photos #2 and #3 that show up  
>only in photo enhancement and tie in these photos with the smoke  
>ring Heflin said was left behind as the object departed and  
>which he photographed immediately afterwards further down the  
>road.

Hi David!

Since all things in nature tend to go from order to disorder,  
for isolated systems at least, are you suggesting that those  
"smoke" details which allegedly show up only in enhancements of  
Heflin's photos 2 and 3 later evolved to form the dark, denser  
and very distinct smoke ring in Heflin's photo 4 that was taken  
last (maybe even on another day?) and from a different location?  
Please elaborate.

If not, then the alleged wisps of smoke cannot be a clincher for  
authenticity as you claim since, to me at least, it would imply  
that Heflin's saucer-shaped craft was propelled by a gasoline  
powered engine - and a polluting one too. Apparently it produced  
smoke rings only whenever the "pedal was put to the metal".

Thanks to feedback I got from others, gasoline powered flying  
saucers, including some which look nearly identical to Heflin's  
craft, were designed in Nazi Germany over two decades earlier.  
Such unusual aircraft would be something RC model aircraft  
enthusiasts would want to build and test fly themselves. I am  
not saying that Heflin who built models like many others did in  
those days, including myself, intentionally created a hoax or  
that he later mistook the pictures of a model he or someone else  
built as the real thing - something very unlikely even under the  
influence of plastic model cement fumes.

That said, a physics colleague of mine (and part of Hynek's  
Invisible College?) who is very much interested in UFOs,  
especially UFO propulsion, disagrees with me. His clincher for  
authenticity is a very similar UFO incident which took place in  
Turkey that also left a dark well defined smoke ring after the  
UFO rapidly departed. He promised to search for and provide me  
with further details, including pictures of this smoke ring.

Just as others have argued, unconvincingly, that the UFO another  
single witness (policeman Lonnie Zamora) saw one year before Rex

Heflin's encounter must have been an experimental aircraft or test spacecraft, I don't think we can rule it out with Heflin's craft, especially since this is what he thought it was. Any such thoughts by Zamora would have been dismissed after he spotted the two non-human entities beside the landed UFO.

Nick Balaskas

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:08:50 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:52:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>origin.

Since you brought up the subject of abductions, I'd like to quote what Thomas Bullard said in 1989 regarding Al Lawson's research results and about the abduction phenomenon. I think Bullard is someone whose opinion counts!

"Imaginary cases thus pose a vexing question - how can non-abductees tell stories even broadly like those of real abductees? For all the differences in frequencies and descriptive specifics, imaginary subjects still bring out unusual details and even extended vignettes of uncanny likeness to scenes from real abduction narratives. Non-abductees have no experiences to draw on, no hidden memories to tap. How can they still imagine a good abduction? More to the point, how can the hypothesis of an objective abduction survive if anyone can tell the abduction story, no experience required?"

Indeed, how can the hypothesis of an objective abduction survive if anyone can tell the abduction story, no experience required? Until you can explain this - and until you can demonstrate it has no bearing on the UFO phenomenon - you are premature in your conclusion that there are actual abductions by ET taking place. I'm not saying there are no actual abductions taking place, only that you haven't cut away the loose strings that may tie in another explanation.

Al Lawson's work shows that the human mind may be extremely active in a UFO event. I'm not saying it's all in the mind - birth memories or otherwise - just that the mind may shape the experience around a stimulus from outside. What that stimulus is, remains the mystery.

The UFO phenomenon itself and the Abduction phenomenon itself supports Lawson's research. The huge number of blur zone cases - apparent high tech vehicle UFOs that exhibit characteristics suggesting they are not high tech vehicles at all - may support the research results that suggest the mind shapes the experience. (A police officer and several witnesses watch a completely silent demonstration of nuts and bolts high tech vehicles over a house for several hours while just next door other witnesses are cowering in fear from the most threatening noise they have ever heard. [Webster/Bedford case] Witnesses describe the interiors of UFOs being out of proportion to the size of the craft as observed from outside. [John E. Mack, Abduction: Human Encounters With Aliens])

You have the imaginary abduction research results of Al Lawson. You have anomalies in the 'real' abduction phenomenon (such as



interiors of craft which seem out of proportion to the craft as viewed from outside). You have anomalies in the nuts and bolts high tech vehicles (such as high tech vehicles that are silent to one group of witnesses but noisy as hell to another group of witnesses a few feet away). They all reinforce each other. It's not just in Al Lawson's imaginary abduction research results! It's not just in the 'real' abduction phenomenon! It's not just in the high tech vehicle cases. You have a common thread linking - running through - all three aspects! (It even runs through the non-high tech vehicle UFO category where it really gets strange!)

Only by cutting away and ignoring the non-high tech vehicle cases (which are a huge part of the UFO phenomenon), by cutting away and ignoring the messy high tech vehicle cases that have characteristics that suggest they are not high tech vehicles at all (another big part of the UFO phenomenon), by cutting away and ignoring those anomalies in the 'real' abductions that don't fit into the picture, by cutting away and ignoring research results such as Lawson's that raises valid questions and points to an alternative process at work, in short, only by cutting away and ignoring the majority of the UFO picture, are you left with the category of UFO reports and abduction reports that fit the picture you are trying to advocate.

Is this what real scientists - you know, the ones in the fancy organizations with professional status and big lists of publication credits - do?

It's what you do, Stan! Then you ignore justifying it when questioned about it. And accuse the other guy of charismatic handwaving and of not being specific! How much more 'not being specific' do I have to do before you start justifying your conclusions with some hard facts?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:34:40 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:54:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:22:47 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>I received some response about my comment last week about  
>>apparent dodging I found in the high-resolution  
>>Trent/McMinnville scans I was playing stereo with, so I thought  
>>I'd post this link to clarify what I was talking about:

>><http://img392.imageshack.us/img392/5507/mcmindodge3sz.jpg>

>>One is just a simple brightness/contrast adjustment, the other  
>>is a dreaded embossing (what can I say, sometimes it helps).  
>>Maybe there's some kind of contrast bleed thing happening I  
>>don't understand here. Or hey, maybe it's a force field. I don't  
>>know.

>>Anyway, this is what made me think that perhaps the photo  
>>showing the saucer underside (#1) was a contact print of some  
>>kind. Or maybe that maybe Trent didn't get the original  
>>negatives back from the Men In Black.

>>It looks like a pasteup job to me. The density right around the  
>>saucer is quite clearly different from the density in the sky it  
>>was pasted into.

More likely somebody's been messing with the pictures. Again,  
for better versions of the photos not so far removed from the  
original negatives, see Bruce Maccabee's website:

<http://brumac.8k.com/trent1.html>

In these, there are no density variations immediately around the  
object compared to the background.

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

Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: The passing of Karl Pflock - Graeber

From: **Matt Graeber** <[Matthewgraeber.nul](mailto:Matthewgraeber.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:48:50 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:57:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: The passing of Karl Pflock - Graeber

To all who knew and admired the man, the ufologist and the friend.

Karl Pflock's memory will nor fade away but, continue to serve as an example of what the study, researching and investigation of the phantoms of the skies is intended to be. That is a heuristic learning experience, not a belief system built upon rumor mongering and sensation-seeking.

Jim Moseley and I were fortunate enough to have worked with Karl and shared in his wisdom, insights and humor concerning the UFO enigma and it's many enthusiasts. But, most of all, we were fortunate enough to be his "saucer pals". Karl was truly one of the "good guys" of UFOria and we will miss his infectious laughter, wit and friendship.

Few knew his courage, and fewer still in saucerdom recognized his humble genius.

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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 22:17:47 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:59:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 20:37:43 +0100  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:31:25 -0500.  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>The Val Johnson case, which occurred in August 1980 (not 1979)

Let me take this opportunity to correct my error. It was 1979.  
My recollection when I wrote that was 1980, but I was mixing its  
date up with the Kirtland AFB landing case which was Aug 1980.

>>>In his book Klass gave an accurate, straightforward accounting  
>>>of the case and then stated that it was either a hoax or the  
>>>"real thing" involving aliens that did damage to the car. From  
>>>his writing it is clear that Klass "favored" the hoax  
>>>explanation.

>>Why the scare quotes around favored? Do you mean this to be  
>>ironic commentary, or are these just randomly generated quotation  
>>marks? Of course Klass favored the hoax explanation. What  
>>choice did he have?

"scare quotes: wry humor.

>He didn't have much choice, did he? Assuming his account of the  
>case is accurate, the damage to the car is not such as could  
>have occurred accidentally. Therefore, it seems reasonable to  
>assume that Johnson might have done it, for some unknown  
>reason. I he didn't do it, then who did? Of course it is  
>possible that there was someone with him who caused the damage  
>and Johnson was covering up for him.

Ahh, yes. Yet another untested Candidate Explanatory Hypothesis  
(CEH): another person was with Johnson. Apparently Johnson  
wasn't aware of it or was covering up. Is there any evidence of  
another person, or is this just another "throw it against the  
wall to see if it sticks" proposed explanation?

Maccabee's Rule #1 for Debunkers:

Any explanation is better than none.

>Or the car was attacked by  
>malicious UFOonauts, as Klass suggested as an unlikely  
>alternative. So far, no one seems to have come up with any other  
>possibilities, plausible or otherwise.>

>>In doing so, Klass set up the usual strawmen, expressing the>  
>>idea that the Johnson encounter involved a real UFO in such a

>>preposterous fashion that the hoax explanation - even in the  
>>absence of the slightest evidence - had to be the preferred one.

>No, he was simply suggesting an explanation which would occur to  
>anyone with a grain of common sense.

No problem with suggesting an explanation. The problem comes when  
a suggested explanation is left untested, as if the fact that one can  
suggest an explanation is equivalent to having explained a sighting.  
Prosaic Explanations(are) the Failure of UFO Skepticism.  
(Oddly enough, that's the title of a paper at my web site).

An explanation in conventional terms uses conventional phenomena  
which have known characteristics. Thus any conventional  
explanation should be "Popper falsifiable" based on the reported  
characteristics of the phenomenon. This includes hoaxes which  
should also be falsifiable (a false hoax is a true unknown if  
not explained some other way). Klass tested his hoax hypothesis  
by calling the police station and asking whomever he talked to  
if Johnson would be likely to try to trick someone. He was  
told Johnson might "hide your coffee cup."

This was apparently a sufficiently hoax-positive answer for  
Klass to feel justified in suggesting in his book that Johnson  
could have damaged his police car.

To borrow your phrase, "anyone with a grain of common sense"  
would know that hiding a coffee cup is not in the same league  
with damaging a police car.

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

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

**UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Civilized Life In The Universe

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:10:18 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:10:18 -0400  
Subject: Civilized Life In The Universe

Source: The Space Review.Com - Rockville, Maryland, USA

<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/637/1>

Monday, June 12, 2006

Review: Civilized Life In The Universe  
by Jeff Foust

Civilized Life In The Universe: Scientists On Intelligent  
Extraterrestrials

by George Basalla  
Oxford Univ. Press, 2006  
Hardcover, 248 pp., illus.  
ISBN 0-19-517181-0  
US\$29.95

One of the most fascinating and controversial endeavors in the history of the study of the universe has been what has come to be known as the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI). For the last few decades, scientists have used radio telescopes (and, in a few cases, optical telescopes) to scan the skies, looking for signals of an artificial, extraterrestrial origin. These searches have failed to identify any such signals, engendering debates on whether there are any other civilizations out there or, at least, civilizations that can be detected with our search techniques (see "The Park hypothesis", The Space Review, May 30, 2006; and "The economic alien", The Space Review, June 5, 2006.) The failure to date of SETI has led some to question the effort in general: is this all just a waste of telescope resources and money? Historian George Basalla fires the latest salvo in that debate in his book *Civilized Life in the Universe*, arguing that SETI is perhaps fatally flawed.

Basalla, a professor emeritus of history at the University of Delaware who studies the history of science, traces the history of the study of, or at least contemplation about, intelligent civilizations on other worlds for most of the book. After an initial discussion of the early (17th and 18th centuries) belief that intelligent beings might live on the Moon, Basalla devotes a large portion of the book to an examination of Mars, whose prospects as the home of an extraterrestrial civilization soared in the 19th century, based on claims by the likes of Percival Lowell that the planet was crisscrossed with canals, and remained high well into the 20th century. (Basalla notes that Carl Sagan obtained a NASA grant to study Viking Orbiter images, looking in vain for features that might be ruins of an advanced civilization.) Later in the book Basalla traces the history of SETI from the early radio searches and the development of the Drake Equation to current efforts.

It is toward the end of *Civilized Life in the Universe* where Basalla is the most controversial, leveling a sharp critique of SETI in general. As he writes in a concluding chapter:

"Two powerful strands run through the scientific search for extraterrestrial intelligence. The first strand is religion. There is religious sanction for populating the heavens with superior beings. The second is anthropomorphism. This is the tendency to describe the intellectual and social lives of those beings in human terms."

The first argument is touched upon earlier in the book, as Basalla claims that those who have believed that intelligent civilizations exist in the universe are invoking, consciously or otherwise, religious beliefs that supported the existence of life on other worlds, in particular =93superior celestial beings=94. However, the argument is not that convincing, at least in the present day: one need not invoke religion to hypothesize that intelligent life may exist on other worlds, a hypothesis that can be tested using search techniques like SETI.

Basalla=92s second point, the anthropomorphic bias of SETI, is a stronger argument. SETI is predicated on a number of assumptions of the scientific and technological capabilities of any extraterrestrial civilizations, as well as their culture; otherwise, they would have neither the ability to nor the interest in broadcasting radio signals into the cosmos. =93Many SETI scientists conclude that alien societies are little more than advanced copies of modern extraterrestrial civilization,=94 he writes. =93If extraterrestrial societies exist, they are not simply million-year-old versions of the industrial civilizations that currently flourish on Earth.=94 Basalla, though, gets trapped in anthropomorphic arguments of his own: he criticizes those who believe that extraterrestrial civilizations might be long-lived by noting that civilizations ultimately become too complex and collapse on relatively short time scales. That, however, is based on the history of civilizations on Earth: why would that also hold true for extraterrestrial civilizations?

While that anthropomorphism may exist in SETI (leading one to wonder, perhaps, if it should be renamed SHETI, for the search for humanoid extraterrestrial intelligence) it=92s hardly clear that this is a fatal flaw in the effort. Basalla argues that anthropomorphism is deeply embedded in science in general, yet we do not give up on other areas of research because of that. Recognizing that anthropomorphism is important so that scientists and the public alike can understand the limitations of SETI, but not discard it entirely.

Jeff Foust ([jeff.nul](mailto:jeff.nul)) is the editor and publisher of The Space Review. He also operates the Spacetoday.net web site and the Space Politics and Personal Spaceflight weblogs. Views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author alone, and do not represent the official positions of any organization or 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Aerial Reconnaissance

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:26:20 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:15:36 -0400  
Subject: Aerial Reconnaissance

Maybe try to get your eye in by tracing some vehicle / foot / animal tracks & small dwellings in Earth's deserts, here's one dubbed 'end of the road' (though if you check dunes to the north and west there's other lighter trails semi-obscured by sand) - << 38.333238,85.223840 >> in Google Earth. Following that 'road' south shows a number of those black oblongs beside the road - roofs? or tents? or caches (one or two show good shadow for estimating height of 'walls')

Maybe also try << 38.369300,85.226800 >> for an isolated 'house and gardens?', although I think there's more to it than that.

After that try Mars - although resolution is much lower, and some people think there's a lot of 'purposeful' camouflage applied to these views (try toggling 'elevation/visible/infrared - & zooms).

<http://tinyurl.com/gso9k>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=16.815057&lon=77.080078&zoom=9&map=visible>

<http://tinyurl.com/hhket>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=77.553940&lon=7.717895&zoom=8&map=infrared>

<http://tinyurl.com/epeeu>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=84.327758&lon=130.764770&zoom=8&map=infrared>

<http://tinyurl.com/feak6>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=16.723015&lon=76.950988&zoom=9&map=visible>

<http://tinyurl.com/e69zz>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=38.784063&lon=80.158996&zoom=9&map=infrared>

<http://tinyurl.com/grr61>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=67.875541&lon=127.199707&zoom=8&map=infrared>

<http://tinyurl.com/h9dl5>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=69.860436&lon=131.292114&zoom=8&map=infrared>

<http://tinyurl.com/h23ud>

<http://www.google.com/mars/#lat=83.103489&lon=-124.403686&zoom=7>

Lots more - and other recommends available on the web.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:37:15 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:20:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shell

On Jun 13, 2006, at 8:59 AM, "Anonymous" wrote:

>The 'UFO' in the Rex Heflin photos is in fact a toy train wheel.  
>One of your Listers had it correct in a post recently.

>May I suggest you contact the folks at Model Railroader or at  
>Classic Toy Trains? A good site is [www.trainsmag.com](http://www.trainsmag.com) Pay  
>special attention to model trains from the 1950s.

>Another lister had it correct about the less-shown fourth photo.  
>Check out airshow photobooks from the 60's for donut holes ring  
>formations.

>Put it this way- Rex enjoyed trains, models, and airplanes. He  
>also enjoyed having a little fun.

>The truth has been known by a few folks in Santa Ana since it  
>all started. There are still a few old-timers left who could  
>still tell the whole story... but then again, there are those who  
>never want to "spoil a good story".

Great. I suppose we're just supposed to take this guy's/gal's  
word for this without knowing who they are or anything about  
them.

An anonymous refutation has absolutely no value. This person  
needs to come forward and put their name on their story.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:37:27 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:30:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

><snip>

>>Of course I can make the statement Pilot and radar descriptions  
>>as well as the physical trace cases establish it. Right angle  
>>turns, at very high speed, vertical flight, landing and taking  
>>off from the middle of nowhere without sound or visible external  
>>engines. Release from and entrance into huge carrier craft able  
>>to move at speeds of thousands of miles an hour decades ago.

><snip>

>Gosh, I hope you all are not relying just on radar-blips as I am  
>sure most of the people on this List are old enough to know that  
>there has been stealth-technology available for years now that  
>can create all kinds of maneuvers and speeds on the radar screen  
>- radar screens on the ground and on-board the air craft.

No, I am not relying just on radar-blips, though it is my  
understanding that Stealth refers to the ability not to show up  
on radar screens whereas spoofing is the creation  
electromagnetically of false targets on radar screens... but not  
on eyeballs.

I was thinking of the RB 47 case and the JAL case, for  
example... Dick Hall collected a lot of radar visual sightings  
in 1952 as I recall, well before stealth technology.

Remember that there has to be a spoofer.....

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:00:29 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:31:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>>Of course I can make the statement Pilot and radar descriptions  
>>as well as the physical trace cases establish it. Right angle  
>>turns, at very high speed, vertical flight, landing and taking  
>>off from the middle of nowhere without sound or visible external  
>>engines. Release from and entrance into huge carrier craft able  
>>to move at speeds of thousands of miles an hour decades ago.

<snip>

>Gosh, I hope you all are not relying just on radar-blips as I am  
>sure most of the people on this List are old enough to know that  
>there has been stealth-technology available for years now that  
>can create all kinds of maneuvers and speeds on the radar screen  
>- radar screens on the ground and on-board the air craft.

Exactly my point! It wouldn't be hard for an intelligence (not necessarily ET aliens) to give the impression of "high tech vehicles flying up, up, and away." And when you look at the whole UFO phenomenon, you see data in the UFO reports and abduction reports themselves (and supported by other research such as Lawson's) that indicates things may not be as simple as "high tech vehicles that fly up, up and away." Of course, if you want to snip away all the data until you just have a nice neat little pile of cases that fits the picture you want to believe and advocate then, I guess, you can do it regardless, eh! You can make the conclusion you want to make if you throw away all the data and research that contradicts what you want to conclude and if you keep only the data that matches what you want to conclude.

You can even call it "logic" and "scientific deduction" too, I guess, if you want to! It's a free country!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:31:51 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:38:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:08:50 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>>origin.

>The UFO phenomenon itself and the Abduction phenomenon itself  
>supports Lawson's research. The hugh number of blur zone cases -  
>apparent high tech vehicle UFOs that exhibit characteristics  
>suggesting they are not high tech vehicles at all - may support  
>the research results that suggest the mind shapes the  
>experience. (A police officer and several witnesses watch a  
>completely silent demonstration of nuts and bolts high tech  
>vehicles over a house for several hours while just next door  
>other witnesses are cowering in fear from the most threatening  
>noise they have ever heard. [Webster/Bedford case] Witnesses  
>describe the interiors of UFOs being out of proportion to the  
>size of the craft as observed from outside. [John E. Mack,  
>Abduction: Human Encounters With Aliens])

>You have the imaginary abduction research results of Al Lawson.  
>You have anomalies in the 'real' abduction phenomenon (such as  
>interiors of craft which seem out of proportion to the craft as  
>viewed from outside). You have anomalies in the nuts and bolts  
>high tech vehicles (such as high tech vehicles that are silent  
>to one group of witnesses but noisy as hell to another group of  
>witnesses a few feet away).

The sound anomaly could be the result of electrophonic hearing,  
namely highly directional radio frequency emissions perhaps a  
result of ET or non-ET based vehicle propulsion systems or some  
other non-vehicle based phenomena. We need proactive data rather  
than retrospective data.

Also, the interior/exterior anomaly could be the result of  
virtual reality-type environments in an ET or non-ET based  
vehicle or, as you say, something else, since we haven't enough  
data.

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



[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:46:10 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:31:21 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:22:47 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>It looks like a pasteup job to me. The density right around the  
>saucer is quite clearly different from the density in the sky it  
>was pasted into.

That's definitely going to mess up my stereo reconstruction and  
make me question what I've seen in it so far. And the photo on  
Bruce's site shows compression artifacts, so I can't use it.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 10:10:44 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:22:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:42:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:14:18 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>Perhaps. All that seems to support the reactive paradigm though.  
>>I would prefer to eschew that approach and the grounds that its  
>>been done and did not reach any conclusions (plus lots of people  
>>seem to want to do it that way anyway).

>I know exactly what you mean. But what kind of pro-active study  
>are you thinking about? One nice thing that's happened recently  
>is the ready and relatively inexpensive availability of digital  
>cameras and infrared sensing equipment. There have been some  
>interesting images found on volcano cams and the like. But then  
>again, the volume of data is too huge to pick through by hand  
>(and eye).

A proactive approach could start with one sensor site which gathers imagery/radio spectra/magnetometer spectra. Rather than force any person to look through the entire data stream, the automated system can be tagged based on threshold changes. For imagery, this of course would be variances of threshold in pixel intensity. UFOCapture software seems to do this well (at least for night imagery) based on pixel illumination changes but clearly the same software exists for surveillance/ security cameras (it only records when there is movement in the video stream). For the other sensors, the threshold can be either a general magnitude increase above the baseline or even specific magnitude changes in specific spectra (real time spectra software does do this).

The goal is to determine the signature of the UFO so that false positives can be reduced and maximum data collection be brought to bear on the remaining positives.

Experience is gathered with this approach will result in improved sensors or other types of sensors could be acquired. What must be determined is the minimum data collection speed and resolution that is required.

The goal is not be to spend large amounts of money since it is desired to make a network of these sensor stations that can be connected via the Internet in a similar manner as the California Earthquake network magnetometers.

With a number of sensor stations and the appropriately designed sensors, triangulation of data can be performed across a large baseline. The ultimate desire is to track the source of the phenomena, which means where they come from and where they go to. With enough sensor stations, they can hopefully be tracked.

But the sensor station must be evolutionary in that we do not know exactly what data we need to detect the UFOs but we can

learn at least from experience and gradually improve the suite rather than dump large amounts of cash into specific instruments that detect nothing.

The best thing is that we have a completely defined and calibrated system that is defined according to the scientific method. If we observe something and gather evidence, others can then build duplicate equipment to do the same. Perhaps they will find flaws in the setup. This is all to the good because it will improve the data collection process and add credibility.

>What else could be used? Trained remote viewers, or OOBers,  
>acting as shock troops to make contact and arrange appearances  
>or information exchanges?

It would be nice to use such concepts however they have not been proven yet. Give me a remote viewer/OOBER that has found a buried treasure and I will believe we can utilize the phenomena. Same for ESP/telepathy/precognition.

>Legislatively, it might be nice to get laws passed so that if  
>people spilled the beans about government involvement they  
>wouldn't lose their pensions. That might help.

I don't trust them or their motives or whether they know the truth or were made to believe their story by others. There are too many ways such data can be false, I personally don't want to rely on it. They may make interesting stories and perhaps point the way to further data collections work however.

>Otherwise, I don't know. I'm stumped. Maybe the UFO field needs  
>more people who used to be bounty hunters and detectives.

Naw, just scientists or those willing to follow scientific methods.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:31:51 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 18:50:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Smith

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:08:50 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>>origin.

>The UFO phenomenon itself and the Abduction phenomenon itself  
>supports Lawson's research. The high number of blur zone cases -  
>apparent high tech vehicle UFOs that exhibit characteristics  
>suggesting they are not high tech vehicles at all - may support  
>the research results that suggest the mind shapes the  
>experience. (A police officer and several witnesses watch a  
>completely silent demonstration of nuts and bolts high tech  
>vehicles over a house for several hours while just next door  
>other witnesses are cowering in fear from the most threatening  
>noise they have ever heard. [Webster/Bedford case] Witnesses  
>describe the interiors of UFOs being out of proportion to the  
>size of the craft as observed from outside. [John E. Mack,  
>Abduction: Human Encounters With Aliens])

>You have the imaginary abduction research results of Al Lawson.  
>You have anomalies in the 'real' abduction phenomenon (such as  
>interiors of craft which seem out of proportion to the craft as  
>viewed from outside). You have anomalies in the nuts and bolts  
>high tech vehicles (such as high tech vehicles that are silent  
>to one group of witnesses but noisy as hell to another group of  
>witnesses a few feet away).

The sound anomaly could be the result of electrophonic hearing,  
namely highly directional radio frequency emissions perhaps a  
result of ET or non-ET based vehicle propulsion systems or some  
other non-vehicle based phenomena. We need proactive data rather  
than retrospective data.

Also, the interior/exterior anomaly could be the result of  
virtual reality-type environments in an ET or non-ET based  
vehicle or, as you say, something else, since we haven't enough  
data.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:47:56 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 18:52:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 12:22:52 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>Keep in mind that digitization does 'funny things' like  
>sometimes surrounding an image with a faint halo such as you can  
>see around the object in the first presentation of said photo at  
>the web site. But then, you blow up the picture and the halo  
>goes away.

Sure. But on your site, the enlargement of the full Trent #1  
print has the blocky JPG artifacts, while your isolated blow-up  
of the saucer itself is cropped inside the area of greater  
brightness evident on the 600 dpi Olmos scan. So the two can't  
be compared to determine if the area of greater brightness is a  
scanning artifact, or inherent in the original image.

Link:

<http://img150.imageshack.us/img150/7075/compare23im.jpg>

Do you have a blow-up of the saucer that includes more of the  
background? Or a scan of the entire picture, but at a higher  
resolution?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 16:45:42 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 19:02:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:37:15 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>On Jun 13, 2006, at 8:59 AM, "Anonymous" wrote:

>>The 'UFO' in the Rex Heflin photos is in fact a toy train wheel.  
>>One of your Listers had it correct in a post recently.

>>May I suggest you contact the folks at Model Railroader or at  
>>Classic Toy Trains? A good site is [www.trainsmag.com](http://www.trainsmag.com) Pay  
>>special attention to model trains from the 1950s.

>>Another lister had it correct about the less-shown fourth photo.  
>>Check out airshow photobooks from the 60's for donut holes ring  
>>formations.

>>Put it this way- Rex enjoyed trains, models, and airplanes. He  
>>also enjoyed having a little fun.

>>The truth has been known by a few folks in Santa Ana since it  
>>all started. There are still a few old-timers left who could  
>>still tell the whole story... but then again, there are those who  
>>never want to "spoil a good story".

>Great. I suppose we're just supposed to take this guy's/gal's  
>word for this without knowing who they are or anything about  
>them.

>An anonymous refutation has absolutely no value. This person  
>needs to come forward and put their name on their story.

I absoutely agree. Unless and until this person and/or the  
alleged other people come forth, identify themselves, and  
explain how they know this, I am going to call him  
Mr. Anonymous Liar.

- Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp



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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:02:58 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 19:06:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:34:40 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:22:47 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

<snip>

>>It looks like a pasteup job to me. The density right around the  
>>saucer is quite clearly different from the density in the sky it  
>>was pasted into.

>More likely somebody's been messing with the pictures. Again,  
>for better versions of the photos not so far removed from the  
>original negatives, see Bruce Maccabee's website:

><http://brumac.8k.com/trent1.html>

>In these, there are no density variations immediately around the  
>object compared to the background.

As I mention elsewhere, the larger photo of the entire scene  
(Trent #1) is not at a high enough resolution to see the area of  
increased brightness around the saucer (although there is a  
faint suggestion of it), and the very nice blow-up of the saucer  
is cropped close and is inside the bright area.

A higher- resolution scan of the blow-up of the saucer, with  
more background, would be nice to determine if the 'glow' is a  
scanning artifact or something inherent in the original  
photos/negatives.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/12/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 14:50:16 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:23:06 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/12/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 69  
June 12, 2006

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

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* AGENCIES PURSUE STANDARDIZED POLICY FOR "SENSITIVE" INFO  
\*\* ARMY MEMO ON OVERSIGHT OF SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES  
\*\* NSA DECLASSIFICATION PLAN  
\*\* PREPAREDNESS FOR A DIRTY BOMB ATTACK IN NEW YORK  
\*\* WHY DOES THE WASHINGTON POST PUBLISH CLASSIFIED INFO?

AGENCIES PURSUE STANDARDIZED POLICY FOR "SENSITIVE" INFO

An interagency report on proposals to streamline controls on so-called "sensitive but unclassified" (SBU) information is due to be presented to the White House this month.

Efforts to promote information sharing among government agencies and others involved in homeland security have been stymied by the growing use of over sixty different types of access controls on unclassified information, such as For Official Use Only, Law Enforcement Sensitive, Limited Official Use, and many more. Such controls are often poorly defined and mutually incompatible.

Last December 16, the White House initiated an ongoing review that began with preparation of an inventory of all of the various SBU access controls used in the federal government, which was completed in March. The next step was to formulate recommendations for standardizing SBU policies related to terrorism, homeland security and law enforcement, which are now due.

See Guideline 3, "Standardize Procedures for Sensitive But Unclassified Information," in the December 16 White House memo here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2005/12/wh121605-memo.html>

As of last week, a report to the President on those recommendations was awaiting the signatures of the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The pending report sets forth principles upon which SBU policy should be based, but stops short of the crucial task of defining exactly how those principles ought to be implemented, government officials said.

One of those principles is that each type of control on unclassified information should have a uniform, public and government-wide definition so that it is employed the same way by all agencies. That is not the case today.

The proposed principles include provisions for oversight of how SBU controls are used, officials told Secrecy News.

They also include a proposed moratorium on the creation of new SBU categories.

The new report to the President has not been released. But a 2005 report prepared for the Department of Homeland Security provides one detailed perspective on the complexity of the information sharing problem and some options for addressing it.

See "Information Sharing and Collaboration Business Plan," Institute for Defense Analyses, June 2005 (205 pages, 1.5 MB PDF):

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/dhs/ida2005.pdf>

#### ARMY MEMO ON OVERSIGHT OF SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES

Some agencies treat oversight of their programs as a burden or a threat to be avoided or evaded. But that is a shortsighted view.

The paradox of oversight is that when properly performed it actually serves the interests of the overseen program by building confidence in its legitimacy and integrity.

Perhaps with that in mind, U.S. Army Secretary Francis J. Harvey recently issued a memo to senior Army leaders stressing the importance of effective oversight, especially when it comes to classified "sensitive" activities.

"I expect my oversight team to have an informed understanding of the Army's conduct of, or support to, sensitive activities," Secretary Harvey wrote.

"Sensitive activities may include intelligence activities and military operations, organizational relationships or processes, and technological capabilities or vulnerabilities."

See "Oversight of Sensitive Activities," May 18, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/army/harvey051806.pdf>

#### NSA DECLASSIFICATION PLAN

"The National Security Agency is committed to declassifying national security information as instructed in Executive Order 12958, as amended," the NSA declared in a 2005 declassification plan.

"The Agency will use all available resources to successfully accomplish the provisions of the E.O. within the required time."

See "NSA Declassification Plan for Executive Order 12958, as Amended," January 13, 2005 (obtained by Michael Ravnitzky):

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/isoo/declass/nsa.pdf>

"The fact that the U.S. Army and Navy mounted a [World War II] effort called Project BOURBON against certain Soviet cryptosystems can be released," according to a newly disclosed 2001 NSA notice on declassification policy.

"Most details beyond this statement, as well as the cooperation with the British in this effort, remain classified."

See selected NSA declassification guidance, released June 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/othergov/nsa/misc.pdf>

Other agency declassification plans, including newly posted plans of the Army and Navy, may be found here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/isoo/declass/index.html>

#### PREPAREDNESS FOR A DIRTY BOMB ATTACK IN NEW YORK

"Is New York City adequately prepared for a 'dirty bomb'?"

attack?" asked John Sudnik, a deputy chief at the New York Fire Department in a recent master's thesis on the prospects of a terrorist incident involving a radiological weapon.

In response to this question, the author provided an assessment of the threat, the consequences of an attack, and the possibilities of mitigating such consequences.

See "'Dirty Bomb' Attack: Assessing New York City's Level of Preparedness from a First Responder's Perspective" by John Sudnik, Naval Postgraduate School, March 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/sudnik.pdf>

WHY DOES THE WASHINGTON POST PUBLISH CLASSIFIED INFO?

"Why does The Washington Post willingly publish 'classified' information affecting national security?" wrote former Post editor Robert G. Kaiser in a Sunday Outlook piece.

"Should Post journalists and others who reveal the government's secrets be subject to criminal prosecution for doing so? These questions, raised with new urgency of late, deserve careful answers."

He proposed some thoughtful answers in "Public Secrets," Washington Post, June 11:

<http://tinyurl.com/hhbop>

---

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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul) with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](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](http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:16:02 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:26:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Tim

>From: modernherbal@[address known]  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 13:14:45 -0400  
>Subject: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>Another lister had it correct about the less-shown fourth photo.  
>Check out airshow photobooks from the 60's for donut holes ring  
>formations.

I suppose it's possible:

<http://img74.imageshack.us/img74/9587/ring2tf.jpg>

But we're a skeptical bunch around here, and if you can't supply specifics, we can't do a whole lot with it. But thanks, anyway!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney

From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 18:47:40 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:32:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 22:17:47 -0400  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 20:37:43 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:31:25 -0500.  
>>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Thu, 8 Jun 2006 13:32:11 -0400  
>>>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>>The Val Johnson case, which occurred in August 1980 (not 1979)

>Let me take this opportunity to correct my error. It was 1979.  
>My recollection when I wrote that was 1980, but I was mixing its  
>date up with the Kirtland AFB landing case which was Aug 1980.

>>>>In his book Klass gave an accurate, straightforward accounting  
>>>>of the case and then stated that it was either a hoax or the  
>>>>"real thing" involving aliens that did damage to the car. From  
>>>>his writing it is clear that Klass "favored" the hoax  
>>>>explanation.

>>>>Why the scare quotes around favored? Do you mean this to be  
>>>>ironic commentary, or are these just randomly generated quotation  
>>>>marks? Of course Klass favored the hoax explanation. What  
>>>>choice did he have?

>"scare quotes: wry humor.

>>He didn't have much choice, did he? Assuming his account of the  
>>case is accurate, the damage to the car is not such as could  
>>have occurred accidentally. Therefore, it seems reasonable to  
>>assume that Johnson might have done it, for some unknown  
>>reason. I he didn't do it, then who did? Of course it it is  
>>possible that there was someone with him who caused the damage  
>>and Johnson was covering up for him.

>Ahh, yes. Yet another untested Candidate Explanatory Hypothesis  
>(CEH): another person was with Johnson. Apparently Johnson  
>wasn't aware of it or was covering up. Is there any evidence of  
>another person, or is this just another "throw it against the  
>wall to see if it sticks" proposed explanation?

There doesn't seem to be any evidence of anything about the  
damage to the police car, apart from the fact that it appeared  
to have been done deliberately. At least, no one has given a  
convincing account of how it could have been produced  
accidentally, or by natural forces. Of course, there does not  
appear to be any way of testing this or any hypothesis, prosaic

or otherwise, so the case remains unexplained.

>Maccabee's Rule #1 for Debunkers:

>Any explanation is better than none.

You cannot debunk anything unless it is bunk, as as been pointed out before on this List. It is unlikely that anyone will ever be able to provide a definitive explanation for this case, but that is no reason why possibilities should not be considered. Also, in view of the fact that it is a single-witness report, its importance has been somewhat exaggerated

>No problem with suggesting an explanation. The problem comes when >a suggested explanation is left untested, as if the fact that one can >suggest an explanation is equivalent to having explained a sighting.

No one has come up with a testable explanation, so presumably you would agree that there is nothing that can usefully be said about the case?

>An explanation in conventional terms uses conventional phenomena >which have known characteristics. Thus any conventional >explanation should be "Popper falsifiable" based on the reported >characteristics of the phenomenon. This includes hoaxes which >should also be falsifiable (a false hoax is a true unknown if >Klass tested his hoax hypothesis by calling the police station and >asking whomever he talked to if Johnson would be likely to try >to trick someone. He was told Johnson might "hide your coffee >cup."

>This was apparently a sufficiently hoax-positive answer for >Klass to feel justified in suggesting in his book that Johnson >could have damaged his police car.

>To borrow your phrase, "anyone with a grain of common sense" >would know that hiding a coffee cup is not in the same league >with damaging a police car.

Not necessarily. We would need to know a great deal more about Johnson in order to consider whether or not such an explanation was plausible. My classification of this case: Unexplained - insufficient information.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 18:56:16 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:33:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Dickenson

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:08:50 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Al Lawson's work shows that the human mind may be extremely  
>active in a UFO event. I'm not saying it's all in the mind -  
>birth memories or otherwise - just that the mind may shape the  
>experience around a stimulus from outside. What that stimulus  
>is, remains the mystery.

Hi Eugene,

Apologies for butting in here, but that statement is  
vitaly important.

We know the human brain needs 'templates', made starting in  
early childhood, to fit later events to.

Lack of a template leaves a human 'seeing' anything at all,  
depending on the individual. This can extend to blind-from-birth  
folk who regain sight later in life. Often they 'see' even loved  
ones as horrible and threatening. Many commit suicide.

High strangeness events might be telling us that humans haven't  
seen such things before.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 14:04:21 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:35:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating - Smith

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:42:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:14:18 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: UFO History Takes A Beating

>>Perhaps. All that seems to support the reactive paradigm  
>>though. >>I would prefer to eschew that approach and  
>>the grounds that its been done and did not reach any  
>>conclusions (plus lots of people seem to want to do it  
>>that way anyway).

>I know exactly what you mean. But what kind of pro-active  
>study are you thinking about? One nice thing that's  
>happened recently is the ready and relatively inexpensive  
>availability of digital cameras and infrared sensing  
>equipment. There have been some interesting images  
>found on volcano cams and the like. But then  
>again, the volume of data is too huge to pick through by  
>hand (and eye).

A proactive approach could start with one sensor site which  
gathers imagery/radio spectra/magnetometer spectra.

Rather than force any person to look through the entire data  
stream, the automated system can be tagged based on threshold  
changes. For imagery, this of course would be variances of  
threshold in pixel intensity. UFOCapture software seems to do  
this well (at least for night imagery) based on pixel  
illumination changes but clearly the same software exists for  
surveillance/ security cameras (it only records when there is  
movement in the video stream). For the other sensors, the  
threshold can be either a general magnitude increase above the  
baseline or even specific magnitude changes in specific spectra  
(real time spectra software does do this).

The goal is to determine the signature of the UFO so that false  
positives can be reduced and maximum data collection be brought  
to bear on the remaining positives.

Experience is gathered with this approach will result in  
improved sensors or other types of sensors could be acquired.  
What must be determined is the minimum data collection speed and  
resolution that is required.

The goal is not be to spend large amounts of money since it is  
desired to make a network of these sensor stations that can be  
connected via the Internet in a similar manner as the California  
Earthquake network magnetometers.

With a number of sensor stations and the appropriately designed  
sensors, triangulation of data can be performed across a large  
baseline. The ultimate desire is to track the source of the  
phenomena, which means where they come from and where they go to.  
With enough sensor stations, they can hopefully be tracked.

But the sensor station must be evolutionary in that we do not know exactly what data we need to detect the UFOs but we can learn at least from experience and gradually improve the suite rather than dump large amounts of cash into specific instruments that detect nothing.

The best thing is that we have a completely defined and calibrated system that is defined according to the scientific method. If we observe something and gather evidence, others can then build duplicate equipment to do the same. Perhaps they will find flaws in the setup. This is all to the good because it will improve the data collection process and add credibility.

>What else could be used? Trained remote viewers, or  
>OOBErs, acting as shock troops to make contact and  
>arrange appearances or information exchanges?

It would be nice to use such concepts however they have not been proven yet. Give me a remote viewer/OOBEr that has found a buried treasure and I will believe we can utilize the phenomena. Same for ESP/telepathy/ precognition.

>Legislatively, it might be nice to get laws passed so that if  
>people spilled the beans about government involvement  
>they wouldn't lose their pensions. That might help.

I don't trust them or their motives or whether they know the truth or were made to believe their story by others. There are too many ways such data can be false, I personally don't want to rely on it. They may make interesting stories and perhaps point the way to further data collections work however.

>Otherwise, I don't know. I'm stumped. Maybe the UFO field  
>needs more people who used to be bounty hunters and  
>detectives.

Naw, just scientists or those willing to follow scientific methods.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 15:38:29 -0300  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:39:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:31:51 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:08:50 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>>>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>>>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>>>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>>>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>>>origin.

>>The UFO phenomenon itself and the Abduction phenomenon itself  
>>supports Lawson's research. The hugh number of blur zone cases -  
>>apparent high tech vehicle UFOs that exhibit characteristics  
>>suggesting they are not high tech vehicles at all - may support  
>>the research results that suggest the mind shapes the  
>>experience. (A police officer and several witnesses watch a  
>>completely silent demonstration of nuts and bolts high tech  
>>vehicles over a house for several hours while just next door  
>>other witnesses are cowering in fear from the most threatening  
>>noise they have ever heard. [Webster/Bedford case] Witnesses  
>>describe the interiors of UFOs being out of proportion to the  
>>size of the craft as observed from outside. [John E. Mack,  
>>Abduction: Human Encounters With Aliens])

>>You have the imaginary abduction research results of Al Lawson.  
>>You have anomalies in the 'real' abduction phenomenon (such as  
>>interiors of craft which seem out of proportion to the craft as  
>>viewed from outside). You have anomalies in the nuts and bolts  
>>high tech vehicles (such as high tech vehicles that are silent  
>>to one group of witnesses but noisy as hell to another group of  
>>witnesses a few feet away).

>The sound anomaly could be the result of electrophonic hearing,  
>namely highly directional radio frequency emissions perhaps a  
>result of ET or non-ET based vehicle propulsion systems or some  
>other non-vehicle based phenomena. We need proactive data rather  
>than retrospective data.

Could be! Could also be that the walls of the house 'stepped-  
down' energies that were present around the 'vehicles' - much  
like the glass walls of a greenhouse affect sunlight - into an  
audible range. Could be a lot of things! That's the point. We  
don't have the answer. So it's premature to make any  
conclusions. At this stage, it's just guessing. Curious that  
when the police officer rapped on the door, the noise stopped,  
yet the high tech vehicles continued their same manouvres over  
the houses.

>Also, the interior/exterior anomaly could be the result of  
>virtual reality-type environments in an ET or non-ET based  
>vehicle or, as you say, something else, since we haven't enough  
>data.

Could be! Could also be the result of virtual reality-type environments created without any vehicles present at all, as in Al Lawson's research results. Could be anything, as you say (and as I say). Any conclusions, at this stage, are premature!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:40:37 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:43:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:00:29 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>>>Of course I can make the statement Pilot and radar descriptions  
>>>as well as the physical trace cases establish it. Right angle  
>>>turns, at very high speed, vertical flight, landing and taking  
>>>off from the middle of nowhere without sound or visible external  
>>>engines. Release from and entrance into huge carrier craft able  
>>>to move at speeds of thousands of miles an hour decades ago.

<snip>

>>Gosh, I hope you all are not relying just on radar-blips as I am  
>>sure most of the people on this List are old enough to know that  
>>there has been stealth-technology available for years now that  
>>can create all kinds of maneuvers and speeds on the radar screen  
>>- radar screens on the ground and on-board the air craft.

<snip>

>You can even call it "logic" and "scientific deduction" too, I  
>guess, if you want to! It's a free country!

I'm probably being officious, but I feel the need to interject:

Logic is never enough.

There is not enough room here for a philosophical debate about  
logic. So, if logic is simplified to a form of reasoning  
approximating "if a and if b, then a and b", then what about  
"c"? In other words, using only logic, we can never get to the  
next idea, any next idea. Logic is not enough.

So we humans take leaps, because we are more than the sum of  
logic. These leaps are shown in many types, including  
conclusions, deductions, assumptions, suppositions, beliefs,  
values, and attitudes, to name a few.

It is not wrong to take these leaps from logic. Logic gives us a  
consensus, a pat on the back so to speak, that our conclusions  
are "on the right track". Logic is a firm starting point. But it  
does not give us promise for any final conclusions. Logic is  
only another tool, like math and "the scientific method."

So how do we get to the next idea? We continue to take leaps,

risks that are calculated mostly, using everything humanly possible. When we risk, we sometimes mistake. (I once thought I goofed, but I was mistaken!) So we get up and brush ourselves off, and our ideas, and we take another leap, maybe a smaller one.

Here are some small leaps that work well for me now:

Some flying saucers are ET in origin.

Some abductions are ET in origin.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:23:47 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:45:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:17:31 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:04:02 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 22:56:38 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>>Heflin would have to be one lucky hoaxer to get everything to go  
>>his way and ultimately agree with the details of his back story.  
>>However, the clincher for authenticity as far as I'm concerned  
>>is still the "smoke" details in photos #2 and #3 that show up  
>>only in photo enhancement and tie in these photos with the smoke  
>>ring Heflin said was left behind as the object departed and  
>>which he photographed immediately afterwards further down the  
>>road.

>Since all things in nature tend to go from order to disorder,  
>for isolated systems at least, are you suggesting that those  
>"smoke" details which allegedly show up only in enhancements of  
>Heflin's photos 2 and 3 later evolved to form the dark, denser  
>and very distinct smoke ring in Heflin's photo 4 that was taken  
>last (maybe even on another day?) and from a different location?  
>Please elaborate.

If the UFO was ionizing the air around it (a common observation), maybe in the smoggy, foggy, hazy conditions of the Heflin site, the ionization was causing sooty particulate matter/dust and maybe water moisture to condense out of the air and collect around the saucer. This is the basic principle of electrostatic air cleaners or scrubbers. See, e.g.:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electrostatic\\_precipitator](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electrostatic_precipitator)

Photos 1-3 may show more than just the "smoke" that seems to be coming off the object that shows up only in enhancement. They also seem to show dark areas around the "dome" that may be related to the smoke ring. If dark particulate matter ("soot") was clinging closely to the dome, maybe a sudden upward departure of the object would be all that was needed to get the updraft in the center of the ring and produce a good stable smoke ring. Alternatively, if the dark ring was being strongly heated, a quick departure may have stripped the ring from the craft and the heating provided the necessary updraft to produce the smoke ring. This is all speculation, but if you want ideas as to how a UFO might generate a smoke ring, I'm simply throwing these out as food for thought.

That Heflin's photo 4 was taken on another day is pure speculation, mostly by those claiming hoax, and further claiming



that Heflin built a hoax around it in photos 1-3, which remarkably enough also have indications of a dark "smoke" (but only when closely analyzed).

Yes, photo 4 was taken at another location, according to Heflin, a little less than a mile down the road, in the direction of where the UFO was departing. Why would the slightly different location invalidate the photo? If anything, the different location is at least consistent with Heflin's account of what happened. However, if it had been taken at the same location as photos 1-3, it wouldn't be consistent. So if Heflin hoaxed the whole thing, he was very meticulous and careful in plotting out the hoax, even getting details such as a change of trajectory from photo 2 & 3 and the UFO seeming to gain elevation in photo 3 to agree with extremely subtle details in the photos and how he took the photos.

Heflin took various researchers to the location where he said he filmed the smoke ring. The photo also shows a power line down near the bottom and some branches of a tree in the lower left corner. The NICAP investigator thought the branches matched those of an orange tree at that location. Investigators Hartmann and McDonald, who went there later, weren't sure (but of course, tree branches don't stay static--Hartmann visited 2 years later). Still, it would be rather remarkable for Heflin to have photographed a large smoke ring at an "air show," also showing a wire and tree branches, that were close enough in detail to another location to have fooled the NICAP investigator who was first taken to the spot.

>If not, then the alleged wisps of smoke cannot be a clincher for authenticity as you claim since, to me at least, it would imply >that Heflin's saucer-shaped craft was propelled by a gasoline >powered engine - and a polluting one too. Apparently it produced >smoke rings only whenever the "pedal was put to the metal".

Please see comments above about how air ionization might precipitate particulate matter (of which there is lots in smoggy Southern California) out of the air. "Smoke ring" doesn't literally mean the ring had to be made of smoke.

>Thanks to feedback I got from others, gasoline powered flying >saucers, including some which look nearly identical to Heflin's >craft, were designed in Nazi Germany over two decades earlier. >Such unusual aircraft would be something RC model aircraft >enthusiasts would want to build and test fly themselves.

Somehow I just knew Nazi flying saucers would eventually work their way into the discussion. Maybe Heflin built his gasoline powered Nazi saucer model from the model train wheel that somebody else claims was the real hoax object. I'm having a hard time keeping all these various hoax scenarios straight.

>I am >not saying that Heflin who built models like many others did in >those days, including myself, intentionally created a hoax or >that he later mistook the pictures of a model he or someone else >built as the real thing - something very unlikely even under the >influence of plastic model cement fumes.

I give up. I have no idea what you're talking about here. Your post is all over the place.

>That said, a physics colleague of mine (and part of Hynek's >Invisible College?) who is very much interested in UFOs, >especially UFO propulsion, disagrees with me. His clincher for >authenticity is a very similar UFO incident which took place in >Turkey that also left a dark well defined smoke ring after the >UFO rapidly departed. He promised to search for and provide me >with further details, including pictures of this smoke ring.

Ahhh, finally maybe we're getting someplace. Yes, please post this information if and when it becomes available. It would be important confirmation of the Heflin photos.

>Just as others have argued, unconvincingly, that the UFO another >single witness (policeman Lonnie Zamora) saw one year before Rex >Heflin's encounter must have been an experimental aircraft or >test spacecraft, I don't think we can rule it out with Heflin's >craft, especially since this is what he thought it was. Any such >thoughts by Zamora would have been dismissed after he spotted

>the two non-human entities beside the landed UFO.

Well, Nick, I remain confused as to exactly what you have been arguing in this post. At first you seem to be debunking the Heflin photos, then you switch gears with arguments about why they might be genuine. Maybe this is a reflection of the ambiguity in your own mind as to whether they are genuine or not.

David Rudiak

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:50:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:50:30 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:11:28 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:39:17 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 16:56:47 +0000  
>>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>>Based on your reply to Dr. Maccabee, Mr. Garza, your  
>>>>"research" team and "research" seem quite flawed. Unless you are  
>>>>operating using some new form of scientific method, you lose all  
>>>>credibility by offering arm-waving claims with no  
>>>>substantiation. We are to just trust you? Well, then why even  
>>>>publish the UFO FLIR video at all? We can just "trust" that you  
>>>>that you have a video of UFOs locked away in a desk somewhere.

>>Why not read this over again James? Don't you think you are  
>>being a bit harsh. I don't think there's any need of using words  
>>like the Mexican Air Force is lying. What do you want to do,  
>>burn that link? At least they put the stuff out there. Lighten  
>>up a little.

>I did read it carefully. Even accounting for language  
>differences, I think Mr. Garza's post was rude to Dr. Maccabee  
>and all the work the good doctor did.

>The post revealed the lack of critical thinking and blatant  
>prejudice of the Garza research team. They entered the  
>investigation with one idea, that the FLIR UFOs were alien  
>spaceships and anything that dares to explain it is armwaved  
>away.

See, again you don't know this. That's just pure assumption.

>The Air Force laughed about the idea of the lights being  
>gas flares! This is where I think they are lying! They have the  
>stupid FLIR camera for a reason. To spot aircraft.

Actually it's for two reasons, the second being the most  
important and that being to spot heat anomalies on the ground,  
large movements of peopl, trucks or vehicles moving at night.

>In order to do this they need training to differentiate between  
>aircraft and non-aircraft. The FLIR video itself showed how they  
>would zoom in on something... seem to think about it... zoom in  
>again... note it isn't moving... and ignore it. For all we know,  
>these zooms could be low level UFOs but matching the flight

>path, camera direction and magnification enables one to match  
>the fact that gas flares do show up on the FLIR.

I think one thing being lost in the translation is that the Comanche oil wells are not showing up now, why would they back then. Now before the barbs come out, that's what I'm getting from the emails posted by Santiago.

>They seem to be lying because it would make them look bad if  
>they were deceived and rattled by such prosaic objects/lights.

Boy you sure are throwing the lying bit around. Where's that coming from.

>For the Mexican Air Force to say they never saw any unknown  
>lights is impossible. They are either lying or narrowing down  
>their statement to mean that they never saw any set of lights  
>\_exactly\_ like the FLIR UFO video. Why don't they release the  
>FLIR videos of the non-UFO flights if they are such a great  
>"link"?

Frankly I find this a bit silly. If these are daily flights there are probably hundreds of videos that would need to be vetted just to make sure police business is not being compromised. It would also mean that the MAF would have to put someone on it. Maybe they just can't afford that or never thought someone would have to. Not all military forces have the resources of the United States forces. I know we don't here in Canada.

>I have little respect for them in that they did not apparently  
>try to obtain their own technical experts to solve the problem  
>(and \_pay\_ them) and preferred to get free advice.

There again, you are assuming that there is money to do that. Free worksd for them if they can get some results. If Santiago and his group are attempting to get some private experts involved it behooves us all to lighten up so that the scientists who might sign on are not scared off like happens north of the Mexican and Canadian borders.

>But worse, they go to a group with an agenda

What agenda? You mean like my agenda or Bruce's agenda or Dick Hall's agenda or Stan Friedman's agenda.....

>rather than some objective group of analysts.

Who may get scared off?

>I would have had much more respect for them if they had said  
>that they concluded that the objects were unknown aircraft  
>encroaching their airspace and then provide a plan for dealing  
>with such encroachments.

What unknown aircraft? American, maybe? What would they be doing in Mexican airspace, unannounced and illegally? Guatemala's air force perhaps?

I don't see any reason why the FLIR event can't play itself out in Mexico then let's see a report from that side. Maybe then the knives can come out. But for me it's too soon.

I don't know what the flight agenda is for the MAF for drug interdiction, and I'm sure that they aren't going to let me in on it, but they probably return to various drug interdiction "hot-spots" on a regular basis, one of those being the area where they had their FLIR event. It's been some time since this event occured and I'm betting that they have been to the area a good many times. I'd like to know if they are picking up the oil well signatures from the Gulf.

One thing I do know if you are using aircraft to smuggle drugs you don't use a squadron of them. One only.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:26:56 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:04:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:37:27 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>>Gosh, I hope you all are not relying just on radar-blips as I  
>>am sure most of the people on this List are old enough to know  
>>that there has been stealth-technology available for years now  
>>that can create all kinds of maneuvers and speeds on the radar  
>>screen - radar screens on the ground and on-board the air craft.

>No, I am not relying just on radar-blips, though it is my  
>understanding that Stealth refers to the ability not to show up  
>on radar screens whereas spoofing is the creation  
>electromagnetically of false targets on radar screens... but not  
>on eyeballs.

>I was thinking of the RB 47 case and the JAL case, for  
>example... Dick Hall collected a lot of radar visual sightings  
>in 1952 as I recall, well before stealth technology.

>Remember that there has to be a spoofer.....

Okay, I'll play. The spoofer I was referring to was Gene Poteat, President of the Association of Former Intelligence Officers and ex-CIA agent who had worked in the Science and Technology Directorate, who was the manager for the development and operation of special reconnaissance systems for the U-2, SR-71, and various other space and naval reconnaissance vehicles. He developed and implemented new intelligence methods to detect low observable (stealth-Gene's word, not mine) aircraft by foreign air defense radars. He was reporting on his technological research during a lecture on the SpyCruise of March 2002.

During lunch on the SpyCruise of March 2002, I had a chat with an individual who had worked for Grumman's experimental craft operations on Long Island. He stated that the EA6B had the capability of "disappearing" from radar after a certain switch was turned on. Gosh, just one spoofer after another. What's a person to 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 22:32:26 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:11:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:02:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:34:40 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 07:22:47 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 11:23:13 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>>Subject: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

<snip>

>>>It looks like a pasteup job to me. The density right around the  
>>>saucer is quite clearly different from the density in the sky it  
>>>was pasted into.

>>More likely somebody's been messing with the pictures. Again,  
>>for better versions of the photos not so far removed from the  
>>original negatives, see Bruce Maccabee's website:

>><http://brumac.8k.com/trent1.html>

>>In these, there are no density variations immediately around the  
>>object compared to the background.

>As I mention elsewhere, the larger photo of the entire scene  
>(Trent #1) is not at a high enough resolution to see the area of  
>increased brightness around the saucer (although there is a  
>faint suggestion of it), and the very nice blow-up of the saucer  
>is cropped close and is inside the bright area.

>A higher-resolution scan of the blow-up of the saucer, with  
>more background, would be nice to determine if the 'glow' is a  
>scanning artifact or something inherent in the original  
>photos/negatives.

To further clarify or mudify the issue (take your pick) I have  
emailed a better picture and two densitomer scans across the UO  
image (one horizontal and one vertical) directly to Tim since it  
is my understanding that Errol won't allow attachments.

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



[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Olmos

From: Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos <[ballesterolmos.nul](mailto:ballesterolmos.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:46:14 +0200 (CEST)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:15:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Olmos

>From: modernherbal@[address known]  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 13:14:45 -0400  
>Subject: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>The 'UFO' in the Rex Heflin photos is in fact a toy train wheel.  
>One of your Listers had it correct in a post recently.

>May I suggest you contact the folks at Model Railroader or at  
>Classic Toy Trains? A good site is [www.trainsmag.com](http://www.trainsmag.com) Pay  
>special attention to model trains from the 1950s.

>Another lister had it correct about the less-shown fourth photo.  
>Check out airshow photobooks from the 60's for donut holes ring  
>formations.

>Put it this way- Rex enjoyed trains, models, and airplanes. He  
>also enjoyed having a little fun.

>The truth has been known by a few folks in Santa Ana since it  
>all started. There are still a few old-timers left who could  
>still tell the whole story... but then again, there are those who  
>never want to "spoil a good story".

>(You may post this to the List as Anonymous)

If this was the crux of the matter, or the ultimate explanation, unfortunately it loses its potential value because there is no person known to back-up it with his/her name. I am fully sure that if the anonymous writer stands up, this statement will recover a credibility that does not have presently.

Anyway, I believe that California researchers should check the statement regarding some "old timers" who allegedly know the real story from the beginning.

Also, the old toy train wheel should be looked upon. Was Heflin fond of trains and models? Can this be verified?

Well, these investigation lines should also be pursued, in addition to the photo analysis.

V-J

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Anonymous

From: **Anonymous** <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:05:21 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:32:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Anonymous

[Non-Subscriber Post]

The truth was posted on UFO UpDates a very long time ago - on September 5, 1997! In a post by Stig Agermose entitled "Heflin's Photos Draw Fresh Fire From Skeptics" he includes the text of a July 22, 1997 article in the Orange County Register by reporter Amy Wilson.

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

In this article, people who know it is a toy train part relate that they have known this for a very long time, and that it was a joke gone out of control. Unlike Anonymous me, one of these people, a retiree in Menlo Park, is named and interviewed.

It amazes me that no one else on the List picked up on this at the time and responded to Stig's post and that no one mentioned the article in this latest discussion on Heflin.

Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

There have to be model train hobbyists on this List who can now find the exact part that Rex used to create the 'craft'.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:48:16 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:37:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO -

>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:17:31 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:04:02 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 22:56:38 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: New 3-D Analysis of 1965 Heflin Top Hat UFO

><snip>

>>Heflin would have to be one lucky hoaxer to get everything to go  
>>his way and ultimately agree with the details of his back story.  
>>However, the clincher for authenticity as far as I'm concerned  
>>is still the "smoke" details in photos #2 and #3 that show up  
>>only in photo enhancement and tie in these photos with the smoke  
>>ring Heflin said was left behind as the object departed and  
>>which he photographed immediately afterwards further down the  
>>road.

>Hi David!

>Since all things in nature tend to go from order to disorder,  
>for isolated systems at least,

Are you trying to suggest that natural systems are thermodynamically incapable of generating order from disorder? This is obviously false. Isolated systems (except possibly at the quantum level) are theoretical abstractions from nature. Throughout nature, in weather systems as elsewhere, phenomena occur all the time which develop increasing local order out of "random" complexity. Think of storm cells and tornados or water vortices.

>are you suggesting that those  
>"smoke" details which allegedly show up only in enhancements of  
>Heflin's photos 2 and 3 later evolved to form the dark, denser  
>and very distinct smoke ring in Heflin's photo 4 that was taken  
>last (maybe even on another day?) and from a different location?

Are you suggesting that technological systems also are incapable of generating effects of increasing local order? This is even more obviously false. Or are you saying that if there were N "particles of stuff" around at time (A) then the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics proves, independently of any other physical or technological variables, that there can only be N particles around at time (B)? This is obvious nonsense.

And what do you mean "from a different location"? Are you implying some inconsistency between the positions where Heflin said he took the "smoke ring" photo and the course of the object which Heflin said emitted it?

>Please elaborate.

Likewise.

>If not, then the alleged wisps of smoke cannot be a clincher for  
>authenticity as you claim since, to me at least, it would imply  
>that Heflin's saucer-shaped craft was propelled by a gasoline  
>powered engine - and a polluting one too. Apparently it produced  
>smoke rings only whenever the "pedal was put to the metal".

Just to recap this argument: a) Because Heflin's "smoke ring" in #4 didn't already appear fully formed in #2 and #3, this contradicts the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics, supporting your view that it is an airshow smoke ring taken on a different day. b) A correlation between load applied and visible effects wouldn't occur with any advanced type of propulsion. c) Therefore the unconnected vapour-like effects on #2 and #3 must be exhaust from an internal combustion engine coughing smoke.

Where do you get this stuff Nick? And BTW, what on earth is the supposedly-irrelevant "smoke ring" doing back in your logic chain at this point?

>Thanks to feedback I got from others, gasoline powered flying  
>saucers, including some which look nearly identical to Heflin's  
>craft, were designed in Nazi Germany over two decades earlier.  
>Such unusual aircraft would be something RC model aircraft  
>enthusiasts would want to build and test fly themselves.

Oh, so there is evidence of the photos' "authenticity" then, but only if Heflin genuinely photographed an amazing self-built gas-powered saucer based on Nazi designs? Totally bizarre!

>I am  
>not saying that Heflin who built models like many others did in  
>those days, including myself, intentionally created a hoax or  
>that he later mistook the pictures of a model he or someone else  
>built as the real thing - something very unlikely even under the  
>influence of plastic model cement fumes.

What exactly are you saying then?

>That said, a physics colleague of mine (and part of Hynek's  
>Invisible College?) who is very much interested in UFOs,  
>especially UFO propulsion, disagrees with me.  
>His clincher for authenticity

Ah, unlike your colleague you now don't think the photos are authentic, again...

>is a very similar UFO incident which took place in  
>Turkey that also left a dark well defined smoke ring after the  
>UFO rapidly departed. He promised to search for and provide me  
>with further details, including pictures of this smoke ring.

Don't they have radio-controlled Nazi gasoline-powered saucers in Turkey?

>Just as others have argued, unconvincingly, that the UFO another  
>single witness (policeman Lonnie Zamora)

Strictly speaking Socorro was not a single witness case. The close encounter part was.

>saw one year before Rex  
>Heflin's encounter must have been an experimental aircraft or  
>test spacecraft, I don't think we can rule it out with Heflin's  
>craft, especially since this is what he thought it was.

It's what he said he thought it was. But surely Heflin is a lying hoaxer who passed off a phony photo as a UFO effect, isn't he? How come his testimony now supports an unknown experimental aircraft?

>Any such  
>thoughts by Zamora would have been dismissed after he spotted  
>the two non-human entities beside the landed UFO.

Actually such thoughts weren't dismissed by Zamora. He said he did think he could be seeing an experimental craft, despite the stature of the occupants; he never said they were "non

human" but "normal", the stature of "small adults"; and he was always scrupulous to correct people who said he saw a flying saucer.

But that aside, you seem to be saying that you think the Socorro object was not an experimental craft. Remember that the blue "exhaust" and roar were associated only with acceleration of this UFO. But how do we square this with the fact that in the Heflin case you say that an association between exhaust and acceleration shows a primitive and "polluting" engine?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:00:49 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:38:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:37:15 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>On Jun 13, 2006, at 8:59 AM, "Anonymous" wrote:

>>The 'UFO' in the Rex Heflin photos is in fact a toy train wheel.  
>>One of your Listers had it correct in a post recently.

>Great. I suppose we're just supposed to take this guy's/gal's  
>word for this without knowing who they are or anything about  
>them.

>An anonymous refutation has absolutely no value. This person  
>needs to come forward and put their name on their story.

I agree. However as I reminded the List recently the original source of this story was an Ed Riddle, who was a technical writer for an electronics firm in Menlo Park in 1997 when he contacted the Orange County Register about it for the second time (first time in 1965). It's a long shot but maybe someone living in the area could try and check this out.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:40:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:47:56 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 12:22:52 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>Keep in mind that digitization does 'funny things' like  
>>sometimes surrounding an image with a faint halo such as you can  
>>see around the object in the first presentation of said photo at  
>>the web site. But then, you blow up the picture and the halo  
>>goes away.

>Sure. But on your site, the enlargement of the full Trent #1  
>print has the blocky JPG artifacts, while your isolated blow-up  
>of the saucer itself is cropped inside the area of greater  
>brightness evident on the 600 dpi Olmos scan. So the two can't  
>be compared to determine if the area of greater brightness is a  
>scanning artifact, or inherent in the original image.

>Link:

><http://img150.imageshack.us/img150/7075/compare23im.jpg>

>Do you have a blow-up of the saucer that includes more of the  
>background? Or a scan of the entire picture, but at a higher  
>resolution?

Tim,

A few months ago Bruce already kindly sent me microdensitometer scans across both axes of the negative through the object and a scan of a print made by himself and Bob Schaeffer in 1975. I can testify that there is no indication on these materials of any halo.

The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Miller

From: **Stuart Miller** <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:48:09 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:42:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Miller

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 16:45:42 +0000  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:37:15 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>On Jun 13, 2006, at 8:59 AM, "Anonymous" wrote:

>>An anonymous refutation has absolutely no value. This person  
>>needs to come forward and put their name on their story.

<snip>

>I absoutely agree. Unless and until this person and/or the  
>alleged other people come forth, identify themselves, and  
>explain how they know this, I am going to call him  
>Mr. Anonymous Liar.

Great. So you just sit back and relax and continue to wallow in the tech talk 'cos it's more fun than actually getting to the reality or even, God forbid, the truth. Safe in the knowledge that an anonymous poster is hardly likely to step forward and volunteer further information. In the old days I suppose, some researcher would have got off his butt and got out and tracked "Mr. Anonymous Liar" down.

Ufology isn't what it used to be, Dick. You could learn a thing or two from the way it used to be done. Errrrr.....

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <[lovolution.nul](mailto:lovolution.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 00:09:04 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:43:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Goldstein

>From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:43:52 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron\\_510.nul](mailto:corycameron_510.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 11:50:04 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

><snip>

>>My point here is that the traditional sciences seem to be just  
>>as fluid and changing in their paradigm changes as the social  
>>sciences. Just a few ideas.

>>A defence of the social sciences,

>Hi Corey,

>Think your point is valid, establishments of the hard sciences  
>are also subject to fashion-swings and prejudice although they  
>claim impartiality. Try finding the real achievements of Milton  
>Humason, Cecilia Payne, Alice Stewart, Chien-Shiung Wu, Vera  
>Rubin, Beatrice Tinsley, and probably many more (Halton Arp  
>springs to mind).

>But the social 'scientists' tend to be even more partial, most  
>often they have a desired conclusion in mind and simply ignore  
>opposing facts. Take the chaos and confusion over  
>'schizophrenia', which impartial expert opinion now says  
>"probably doesn't exist", yet continues to be used (as a meal-  
>ticket?) by thousands of 'psychiatrists'.

Hello Ray,

I don't know the work of any of the scientists you named in your first paragraph. You provided no descriptions or references to their work. Then again, I don't know their fields of research nor how they are viewed in them.

In the second paragraph you presented your personal opinions and named one example of an alleged "impartial expert opinion" on schizophrenia but did not provide any facts to support your opinion. You did not cite any examples of how that opinion is supported or denied in the professional organizations of that field.

As far as I know you are a rank amateur regarding the professions of psychology and psychology. You have shown that in past posts and this latest post with your personal dislike of psychologists and psychiatrists. That is the same unfounded attack on those fields as by scientologists. I sincerely hope you are not one of them.

I also don't see what your amateur opinions have to do with the sciences being discussed nor with the study of UFOs.

Josh Goldstein

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 12:49:24 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:48:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 16:45:42 +0000  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:37:15 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>On Jun 13, 2006, at 8:59 AM, "Anonymous" wrote:

>>>The 'UFO' in the Rex Heflin photos is in fact a toy train wheel.  
>>>One of your Listers had it correct in a post recently.

>>Great. I suppose we're just supposed to take this guy's/gal's  
>>word for this without knowing who they are or anything about  
>>them.

>>An anonymous refutation has absolutely no value. This person  
>>needs to come forward and put their name on their story.

>I absoutely agree. Unless and until this person and/or the  
>alleged other people come forth, identify themselves, and  
>explain how they know this, I am going to call him  
>Mr. Anonymous Liar.

Hi Dick

Yes, but see my other reply to Bob Shell re "Ed Riddle", the electronics technical writer cited as the origin for the train-wheel story. I suggested someone might take the trouble to track down this person. I can now offer some help. Owners of Apple Mac computers will find the gent's very own signature embossed inside the back panel!

Googling the name brings up a pdf book - "Apple Confidential: The Real Story of Apple" by Owen Linzmayer. You can read it at:

<http://oldiz.free.fr/pdf/confidential.pdf>

Go to p.86 in the chapter "Apple Insiders" you will find the following entry describing those involved in the design whose contributions are immortalised inside the plastic case:

"Ed Riddle  
Then: Worked on the design of the keyboard  
Now: Left apple in 1981; writer in the areas of technical, marketing and spiritual issues."

Same guy? I'd bet on it. Elsewhere I found this email and URL c. 2001, apparently now defunct.

ed at linuxcare.com, <http://www.linuxcare.com/>

but he is still around. I found him cited as a reviewer of a brand new document on computer networking dated June 2006 which you can find at

<http://pserver.samba.org/samba/docs/Samba3-ByExample.pdf>

On a site devoted to Love, Understanding and Enlightenment I found the following:

"The best way now to find out about Enlightenment Intensives is to click on the world wide web - Ed Riddle - (who goes by 'Edrid') has a wonderful web site at [www.sandoth.com](http://www.sandoth.com) it lists all the up coming events and has older 'Self and Other' newsletters."

Interesting I thought. Sounds like this has to do with "marketing and spiritual issues". And it does, in a big way. Go to

<http://www.sandoth.com/Events.htm#MtBaldy>

to find out about Ed Riddles's (Edrid, or the Master, to his initiates) "Enlightenment Intensives".

Sadly you've all missed the 7th Annual Southern California Enlightenment Intensive at the Mt. Baldy Zen Center (April 7-9 2006) which would only have cost you \$300. But you can catch up with Ed on his cell phone at

503 654-7807/503 737-5209

or email him at:

[edrid.nul](mailto:edrid.nul)

to confirm if this is the guy and what he may or may not really know. Any takers? I wonder if there's a connection (spiritual or otherwise) to the anonymous alternative-medicine type behind modernherbal.nul?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:59:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:50:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:40:37 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>Here are some small leaps that work well for me now:

>Some flying saucers are ET in origin.

>Some abductions are ET in origin.

"Small leaps"???

Man, you just pole-vaulted the Pacific Ocean!

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <[joe.mcgonagle.nul](mailto:joe.mcgonagle.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 13:43:27 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 09:52:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - McGonagle

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:50:30 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>>But worse, they go to a group with an agenda

>What agenda? You mean like my agenda or Bruce's agenda or Dick  
>Hall's agenda or Stan Friedman's agenda.....

How about Jaime Maussan's agenda (entertain the people, keep  
up the TV ratings)?

I am still perplexed as to why the Mexican Air Force decided to  
release the material to a popular entertainment figure and his  
cohorts, rather than to people like Rafael Navarro, Julio  
Herrera, Armando Arellano Ferro, and Jose de Jesus Franco Lopez  
from the esteemed UNAM, and those named could also not  
understand it. It was suggested to me that it was a political  
decision to deflect attention from politically embarrassing  
media coverage at the time in question, and a rift between the  
Mexican Armed Services and the President, though I don't know  
enough about Mexican politics to offer a valid opinion on the  
suggestion.

>>rather than some objective group of analysts.

>Who may get scared off?

...or just ignored or abused because they don't confirm the  
entertainment channel's perception that this case represents  
extraterrestrial visitation (just as they appear to have  
dismissed Bruce's assessment of the case, and Bruce can hardly  
be considered to be a nasty pelican).

I also notice that since some evidence has emerged about the oil  
field flares, Maussan's "investigations" are now taking place  
behind closed doors. No doubt that makes it easier to perpetuate  
the impression of mystery about this case, and keep the ratings  
up.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Hawking Says Space Colonies Needed

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:01:26 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Hawking Says Space Colonies Needed

Source: The Houston Chronicle -Texas, USA

<http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/ap/world/3965739.html>

June 13, 2006

Hawking Says Space Colonies Needed

By Sylvia Hui Associated Press Writer

2006 The Associated Press

HONG KONG =97 The survival of the human race depends on its ability to find new homes elsewhere in the universe because there's an increasing risk that a disaster will destroy the Earth, world-renowned astrophysicist Stephen Hawking said Tuesday.

Humans could have a permanent base on the moon in 20 years and a colony on Mars in the next 40 years, the British scientist told a news conference.

"We won't find anywhere as nice as Earth unless we go to another star system," added Hawking, who arrived in Hong Kong to a rock star's welcome Monday. Tickets for his lecture planned for Wednesday were sold out.

He added that if humans can avoid killing themselves in the next 100 years, they should have space settlements that can continue without support from Earth.

"It is important for the human race to spread out into space for the survival of the species," Hawking said. "Life on Earth is at the ever-increasing risk of being wiped out by a disaster, such as sudden global warming, nuclear war, a genetically engineered virus or other dangers we have not yet thought of."

The 64-year-old scientist... author of the global best seller "A Brief History of Time"... is wheelchair-bound and communicates with the help of a computer because he suffers from a neurological disorder called amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or ALS.

Hawking said he's teaming up with his daughter to write a children's book about the universe, aimed at the same age group as the Harry Potter books.

"It is a story for children, which explains the wonders of the universe," said his daughter, Lucy, a journalist and novelist. They didn't provide other details.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:28:13 -0400 (EDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:24:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:50:30 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:11:28 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 12:39:17 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>>Based on your reply to Dr. Maccabee, Mr. Garza, your  
>>>>"research" team and "research" seem quite flawed. Unless you are  
>>>>operating using some new form of scientific method, you lose all  
>>>>credibility by offering arm-waving claims with no  
>>>>substantiation. We are to just trust you? Well, then why even  
>>>>publish the UFO FLIR video at all? We can just "trust" that you  
>>>>that you have a video of UFOs locked away in a desk somewhere.

>>>>Why not read this over again James? Don't you think you are  
>>>>being a bit harsh. I don't think there's any need of using words  
>>>>like the Mexican Air Force is lying. What do you want to do,  
>>>>burn that link? At least they put the stuff out there. Lighten  
>>>>up a little.

>>The post revealed the lack of critical thinking and blatant  
>>prejudice of the Garza research team. They entered the  
>>investigation with one idea, that the FLIR UFOs were alien  
>>spaceships and anything that dares to explain it is armwaved  
>>away.

>See, again you don't know this. That's just pure assumption.

No, it is deductive reasoning based on their behavior.

>>The Air Force laughed about the idea of the lights being  
>>gas flares! This is where I think they are lying! They have the  
>>stupid FLIR camera for a reason. To spot aircraft.

>Actually it's for two reasons, the second being the most  
>important and that being to spot heat anomalies on the ground,  
>large movements of people, trucks or vehicles moving at night.

Okay, I can see that. But for the purposes of the UFO FLIR  
video, since it was during the day, the only use could be to  
spot aircraft. They, at several times, zoom in on bright spots  
to, apparently, see if they are moving. If they are not moving  
relative to the rest of the frame then they are pretty much  
ignored. One of these is in a town and likely a roof. One is on  
a river bank and could be sand or a building. A couple others

are hard to identify. One is definitely a gas burn off flare.

>>In order to do this they need training to differentiate between  
>>aircraft and non-aircraft. The FLIR video itself showed how they  
>>would zoom in on something... seem to think about it... zoom in  
>>again... note it isn't moving... and ignore it. For all we know,  
>>these zooms could be low level UFOs but matching the flight  
>>path, camera direction and magnification enables one to match  
>>the fact that gas flares do show up on the FLIR.

>I think one thing being lost in the translation is that the  
>Comanche oil wells are not showing up now, why would they back  
>then. Now before the barbs come out, that's what I'm getting  
>from the emails posted by Santiago.

Well, we are told the Air Force laughed at the idea of gas  
flares being the cause of the FLIR lights. The implication is  
that they have never seen such gas flares on the FLIR video  
before.

Anyway, there are many reasons that it would not show up. 1) too  
many clouds blocking the view, 2) too far South, 3) too much  
haze, 4) gas flare smoke blowing in direction toward airplane  
thus blocking the light, 5) they looked in the wrong direction  
at the wrong zoom, 6) the gas flares operate intermittently for  
some reason.

If this was such a big deal that they got all concerned, then  
they should fly a proper test such as described by Dr. Maccabee  
which would have two reasons. 1) look for drug dealers/drug  
aircraft and 2) add to their apparently limited understanding of  
possible FLIR anomalies that could jeopardize and confuse future  
missions.

>>They seem to be lying because it would make them look bad if  
>>they were deceived and rattled by such prosaic objects/lights.

>Boy you sure are throwing the lying bit around. Where's that  
>coming from.

I will grant you that they might have meant that the  
exact "UFO fleet" of lights never showed up during  
their other flights rather than my interpretation  
that they never saw any unknown FLIR lights.

Still, the whole thing is suspicious. I know you want to keep on  
the good side of the military because they have a bunch of nice  
intercept wing camera imagery of UFOs that you would like for  
them to release. It would have been better if they had released  
those than this FLIR video, though.

I would prefer to think that this FLIR video might have been a  
test to see how such a release is handled by the UFO  
"researchers" and public rather than think the MAF is simply  
incompetent. In the former case, they would know it is gas  
flares otherwise they wouldn't have released it.

>>For the Mexican Air Force to say they never saw any unknown  
>>lights is impossible. They are either lying or narrowing down  
>>their statement to mean that they never saw any set of lights  
>>\_exactly\_ like the FLIR UFO video. Why don't they release the  
>>FLIR videos of the non-UFO flights if they are such a great  
>>"link"?

>Frankly I find this a bit silly. If these are daily flights  
>there are probably hundreds of videos that would need to be  
>vetted just to make sure police business is not being  
>compromised. It would also mean that the MAF would have to put  
>someone on it. Maybe they just can't afford that or never  
>thought someone would have to. Not all military forces have the  
>resources of the United States forces. I know we don't here in  
>Canada.

They started the whole thing. They threw out there a very  
amazing and revolutionary UFO FLIR video with all sorts of data  
on it. If they don't want to play any more, tough. They should  
either fly the one simple flight (and do drug spotting too!) Dr.  
Maccabee proposed, or give us data as I describe above,  
otherwise we can never confirm or deny the gas flare "theory".  
But, perhaps this is what they want?

Sure it would take some work on their part to release their videos, but it will take much more work on OUR part to examine the videos (free of charge), mapping flight paths, calculating distance and camera angles relative to the terrain. Funny how they would be all concerned about the FLIR UFOs but not want to put any more effort in it. Some Mexican air space security!

>>I have little respect for them in that they did not apparently  
>>try to obtain their own technical experts to solve the problem  
>>(and \_pay\_ them) and preferred to get free advice.

>There again, you are assuming that there is money to do that.

If they did not have the money, they should have asked respectable scientists/researchers to do the work for free rather than dump the video in the laps of the media. Or they could have waited until the "fleet" appeared on another flight before raising the flag. It seems very odd. First they thought it a big enough deal to release it rather than wait for some repeated appearance, then second they refuse to fly a joint drug spotting/ gas flare spotting operation starting sort of close to the coast and flying away from it while periodically looking toward the gas flares with the FLIR.

>Free worksd for them if they can get some results. If Santiago  
>and his group are attempting to get some private experts  
>involved it behooves us all to lighten up so that the scientists  
>who might sign on are not scared off like happens north of the  
>Mexican and Canadian borders.

I doubt that anything I say will "scare them off". Also, the experts they are looking for are probably selected to completely eliminate the likely non-causes of the event (meteors, fireballs, ball lightning, whatever) rather than the gas flare explanation. I think these other causes need no further experts. If the best and most logical explanation is gas flares, they should find experts to determine whether this is the case. But no, Mr.Garza throws this out without any consideration! So he can select all the experts he wants...they will all give him data that it cannot be the things in their specialities (but they do not consider gas flares!) and he can say then that it is an ET spacecraft because it is not anything prosaic!

>>But worse, they go to a group with an agenda

>What agenda? You mean like my agenda or Bruce's agenda or Dick  
>Hall's agenda or Stan Friedman's agenda.....

Naw, I mean a group like Mr. Garza's agenda. Why can't we have objective research? Mr. Garza's is very subjective. If he was more open to considering the gas flare theory, then I would not think this. But he chooses to attack people like Captain Franz rather than provide a logical rebuttal against the gas flare theory. No, all we get is armwaving and statements that we must prove it. Well, based on my analysis which I presented for all to duplicate, it is proven. Dr. Maccabee however would prefer a flight test. Fine.

>>rather than some objective group of analysts.

>Who may get scared off?

Why are these folk getting scared off? If the MAF directly worked with such a group, then the prestige of being asked to do a task for them should not be scary, even for free ( but for the good of Mexico!).

>>I would have had much more respect for them if they had said  
>>that they concluded that the objects were unknown aircraft  
>>encroaching their airspace and then provide a plan for dealing  
>>with such encroachments.

>What unknown aircraft? American, maybe? What would they be doing  
>in Mexican airspace, unannounced and illegally? Guatemala's air  
>force perhaps?

Doesn't matter who. Why release a video like this with no game plan for dealing with the cause? It seems so irresponsible to release it with the clear implication that it is a threatening appearance yet have no plan on dealing with future appearances.

If they had analyzed it and released it with a prosaic explanation and then UFO researchers determined it was not that explanation, then that is okay. Everyone makes mistakes. But if they released it "knowing" it was ET crafts, that's pretty irresponsible. If they knew what it was (prosaic) and released it as though they didn't, this would be an interesting experiment on us all.

>I don't see any reason why the FLIR event can't play itself out  
>in Mexico then let's see a report from that side. Maybe then the  
>knives can come out. But for me it's too soon.

But they had to release the video to the world didn't they?  
Couldn't sit on it while they did their analysis? No, its all  
about media hype. Rather than present the video and also the  
"report", they present the video and speculation (which is  
really going to set UFOlogy up for a crash)  
while we wait for the "report".

>I don't know what the flight agenda is for the MAF for drug  
>interdiction, and I'm sure that they aren't going to let me in  
>on it, but they probably return to various drug interdiction  
>"hot-spots" on a regular basis, one of those being the area  
>where they had their FLIR event. It's been some time since this  
>event occurred and I'm betting that they have been to the area a  
>good many times. I'd like to know if they are picking up the oil  
>well signatures from the Gulf.

We will never know any of this since they won't give us any  
confirmatory 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 12:31:21 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:24:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:40:37 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>It is not wrong to take these leaps from logic. Logic gives us a  
>consensus, a pat on the back so to speak, that our conclusions  
>are "on the right track". Logic is a firm starting point. But it  
>does not give us promise for any final conclusions. Logic is  
>only another tool, like math and "the scientific method."

<snip>

I agree with most of what you have said but ...

Do we take those leaps based on cutting away and ignoring a big part of the picture, or are we supposed to consider all the data (including the stuff that doesn't fit our explanation)?

Because that's what's being done to prematurely conclude we're dealing with high tech vehicle-flying, abduction-committing ET aliens!

Is it "not wrong" to ignore research and data that is relevant when taking these "leaps from logic"?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 13:05:37 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:27:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 14:38:33 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>Please show me any evidence for these unknown high tech  
>>>civilizations on Earth. I have often said there may have been  
>>>many different civilizations about which we are totally ignorant  
>>>that were here. That doesn't change the fact that very high  
>>>performance craft are here now from somewhere else.

>>Stan, you can't make the statement "high performance craft  
>>are here now from somewhere else" simply because you don't  
>>know for sure they're from somewhere else.

>>For that matter, you aren't even sure they are high  
>>performance craft.

>Of course I can make the statement Pilot and radar descriptions  
>as well as the physical trace cases establish it. Right angle  
>turns, at very high speed, vertical flight, landing and taking  
>off from the middle of nowhere without sound or visible external  
>engines. Release from and entrance into huge carrier craft able  
>to move at speeds of thousands of miles an hour decades ago.

The best these examples can do is establish there are high-tech  
vehicle UFOs! They do nothing to establish ET as the builders or  
operators. Thus, you can't make the statement.

That's ignoring the fact that other categories of truly  
anomalous UFOs exist, also that a blur zone where high-tech  
vehicle UFOs melt into apparent high-tech vehicle UFOs that  
possess characteristics which indicate they may not really be  
high-tech vehicles exists, and that valid research showing other  
processes may be at work in both UFO and abduction events exist.  
It's also ignoring that ancient curiosities which may indicate  
prior technological civilizations on Earth exist, and that cases  
like the Peter Khoury case where human DNA was apparently  
recovered from an abduction-type event exist. So, first of all,  
you can't even get to the starting point that there are high  
tech vehicles unless you ignore all this. But even if you break  
the rules and do take it as a 'given' then you can't just  
conclude that they're ET because there's a lot of these cases  
and that's what it looks like is going on.

Yet this is exactly what you're doing! You call this logic? This  
is scientific deduction? I need to be a "logic judge" to see  
this as wrong?

I need to be part of a fancy organization, have professional status, a list of publication credits to be able to see this as wrong or to question this? Get real!

>>Older Earth high-tech civilizations may have existed, or may >>not have. We don't know. I've mentioned ancient artifacts >>and such that might be evidence. Evidence is no good if the >>jury dismisses it as evidence.

>You have not shown any connection between what may well be >artifacts from civilizations many thousands of years ago and >what is being observed today

I don't have to show there is a connection. I'm not making the claim there is. You're making the claim some UFOs are ET spaceships and that older Earth-based technological civilizations are definitely not responsible for a portion of UFO cases that support this conclusion. You're the one who has to show there is not a connection.

The artifacts exist. They might be from older Earth-based technological civilizations. If so, those civilizations could be responsible for the high-tech craft you're talking about - even if they went into outer space.

The point is that the connection might exist! Since you're saying certain UFOs are from ET, it is you that has to show how there is no connection between the artifacts and older Earth-based technological civilizations and no connection between such civilizations and the high-tech craft (UFOs) operating here and now. You know what you are doing here, Stan. Stop playing games!

>>Again, I'm not saying older Earth >>high-tech civilizations are the answer - just a possibility. >>These artifacts and such might qualify as evidence. You >>must demonstrate why they're not - you're proclaiming no >>Earth-based older high-tech civilization is involved and that ET >>is, remember?

>You have provided no evidence that there even might be a >connection. Craft are flying here and now. That is my concern. >Let us not mix water melons and apricots.

There is no onus on me to establish the connection. I've pointed out something that could form the basis of an alternative solution to the high-tech vehicle UFOs you're espousing are definitely of ET origin. Until you adequately deal with these objects (artifacts, etc.) and definitely establish they have no connection with an older Earth-based civilization and that such a civilization has no connection to your high-tech UFOs, you can not conclude ET origin for the UFOs you are talking about - you are making a premature conclusion.

You are choosing to simply ignore such artifacts. You are just proclaiming there is no connection. Answer this question: do you know for certain these objects (artifacts, etc.) are definitely not from an older Earth-based technological civilization, and, if so, how do you know? Deal with facts, Stan, and stop resorting to weak analogies over and over again as ways to avoid giving facts when replying to my posts. Vitamin C, pernicious anemia, fissionable isotopes, disease-curing chemicals, Barry Bonds, watermelons, apricots, etc. aren't facts that support your premature conclusion that some UFOs are definitely ET spaceships!

>>And explain away the blur zone cases, as well as cases >>like the Peter Khoury case with its implications. Then >>demonstrate how Al Lawson's work is not important. >>I've done my part and adequately supported why it is proper >>to question your conclusion. Now you do the same and justify >>your conclusion. Saying there are a huge amount of cases describing >>high-tech vehicles that we know aren't from here doesn't cut it.

>Of course it does. Simply, if they were not produced from some >high tech civilization here, and there is no evidence presented >that they were, they are from some other planet .

Of course it doesn't! Here we see the same avoidance techniques you have used throughout this post and throughout every post where you have responded to my writings. You have not provided any data to explain away the blur zone cases which are

high-tech vehicles that possess characteristics which indicate they may not be vehicles at all. You have not even mentioned these "ducks" that, to use your own analogy, "look like a duck, walk like a duck, quack like a duck" but when it comes down to it, just don't break-windt like a duck. You've just completely avoided them.

You've also completely avoided explaining away the Peter Khoury case and the implications the human DNA found in that strong physical trace case present. Yes, just avoided it.

You've not bothered to justify why Al Lawson's work is misinterpreted and not applicable to the class of UFO phenomenon we're talking about. Again, avoided it!

All you offered was an "of course it does" proclamation and mention of watermelons and apricots!

Addressing your response in more detail, you have provided absolutely nothing to establish "they were not produced from some high tech civilization here" but you are trying to slide this off as a 'given' (when saying, "Simply, if they were not produced from some high tech civilization here, and there is no evidence presented that they were")! The crux of the matter is that it is you who has provided no evidence to establish that they're not from here and therefore just can't jump to your conclusion "they are from some other planet."

>>Foul, Stan! This is not really true. This is more sleight of  
>>hand - more shrewd deception - on your part. Stop trying to  
>>confuse the definition of ET. For the intents and purposes of  
>>the discussion we've been having, ET means a species that  
>>originated and evolved on another planet while from 'here' means  
>>a species that originated and evolved on Earth. If it evolved on

>I said nothing at all about where they or their ancestors  
>evolved. I am saying today's craft are produced somewhere else.

So, if an older Earth-based civilization migrated into outer space but maintained its connection with Earth, you call it ET? Sounds like back-paddling to me! If George Bush sent a few of his relatives to live on a secret base on Mars next week, they'd be ET to us, would they? They'd become aliens to his family, would they?

>>Earth and travelled (migrated) into outer space it's still an  
>>Earth-based civilization, not an ET one. If it's from Earth's  
>>future and travelled back in time (but evolved on Earth) it's an  
>>Earth-based one - doesn't matter if it's from here now or not. A  
>>"time travelled craft" is either from a civilization that  
>>evolved on Earth or it isn't. We don't become ETs to ourselves  
>>because we learn to time travel.

>Of course we do. My grandparents are from Eastern Europe. My  
>children are from North America.

But your grandparents and your children are still Earthlings. They are still part of your family. Are you an alien to your grandchildren? Is your grandfather an alien to you? Would George Bush's hypothetical relatives on Mars next week be aliens to him?

>Sorry wrong again. It is like a paternity test. It can show that  
>either this man is the father of that child or he isn't. Without  
>a huge library of DNA that test doesn't tell us who is the  
>father unless he is. If he isn't than it is somebody else.

Why do you keep resorting to these silly analogies that really don't apply? Why don't you respond with facts that support the case you are trying to make? Isn't it better to reply with actual facts that support what you are saying rather than with silly little comparison stories? You've provided absolutely nothing to prove "the man isn't the father" (some other solution isn't applicable). Until you prove "the man isn't the father" (some other solution isn't applicable) you can't say someone else is (ET is the solution). The hugh number of apparent high-tech vehicle cases don't prove themselves ET. You're, in effect, saying: it looks like it, so it is!

Face it, Stan! You haven't ruled out all other solutions based on evidence and you're just accepting the ETH because it looks

like that's what it is! You hand-pick cases from the big pile  
and call it 'gold ore.'

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 17:09:21 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:29:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:05:21 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>The truth was posted on UFO UpDates a very long time ago - on  
>September 5, 1997! In a post by Stig Agermose entitled "Heflin's  
>Photos Draw Fresh Fire From Skeptics" he includes the text of a  
>July 22, 1997 article in the Orange County Register by reporter  
>Amy Wilson.

>See:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

>In this article, people who know it is a toy train part relate  
>that they have known this for a very long time, and that it was a  
>joke gone out of control.

Dear Anonymous

Thank you for reguoting the link I posted to the List a few days ago. It's a shame you didn't read it. In this article \_one person\_, not "people", relates that "some guy" told him that "his neighbour or friend or somebody he knew" had taken the photos for fun. Not even this one person "knew" that it was a toy train wheel. This is Riddle re-telling hearsay from "some guy" about what \_he\_ believed about pictures taken by some \_other\_ unidentified guy may or may not have been Heflin. There were dozens of copies circulating around at this time and no doubt Santa Ana was full of "some guy"s with opinions. You should also read what I posted along with the link.

>Unlike Anonymous me, one of these  
>people, a retiree in Menlo Park, is named and interviewed.

This is Ed Riddle. Read my other post concerning Mr.Riddle.

>It amazes me that no one else on the List picked up on this at  
>the time and responded to Stig's post and that no one mentioned  
>the article in this latest discussion on Heflin.

You are either really obtuse or deliberately trying to stir things up. In your first post you were responding directly to a recent List post about the model train wheel theory, saying that this was the truth. That List post (June 6) was mine, mentioned above. Previously \_nobody\_ else mentioned a train wheel (there is an archive of every post to prove it) and the only subsequent mention prior to your post was a passing reference in a reply to me from David Rudiak - appearing the day before your post and quite possibly posted after you had pressed "send" - casting \_doubt\_ on the train wheel, so his was not the post that "had it right". In that June 6 post, as I'm sure you well know, was the very same link you are recycling here purportedly for the first time.

>Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole

>formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

Well sure, three cheers for Tim Shell. But what a shame he has attracted a dishonest advocate.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 13:30:56 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:34:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 16:31:23 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2006 14:38:33 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Jun 2006 17:26:53 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>My conclusions don't depend on Roswell. I was referring to your  
>claim that my debunking of objections to MJ-12 and/ or Roswell  
>wasn't adequate, that you were familiar with the specific  
>critiques I have written, but somehow couldn't be bothered  
>bringing up any of the many that I have put forth and  
>demolished. You still have done the same thing about EToorigin..  
>charismatic handwaving but no specifics. My evidence is the  
>thousands of pilots sightings, the thousands of physical trace  
>cases, the more than a thousand well investigated abduction  
>cases.etc

Since your conclusions don't depend on Roswell, it is why I felt  
a discussion of Roswell/MJ-12 was not necessary to address your  
conclusion (premature in my view) that some UFOs are ET  
spaceships. You have just made my point! So why did you keep  
trying to make it look like my refusing to discuss Roswell was  
part of me not being specific?

Now you are attempting to do the same thing of my statements  
regarding ET origin. I've not stated anything about ET origin.  
I've not said ET can't be behind the UFOs you are focussing on.  
I've simply said you can't conclude yet they are. I've asked you  
how you can rule out the other possibilities. It's you that  
has to be specific, but you're not doing so in any way, shape,  
or form. You just keep saying, we know this, and we know that.  
How do we know this and that?

Again, Stan, I've been very specific. I've questioned your  
conclusions. I've provided very specific reasons why I question  
them. Deal with them.

Explain away the blur zone cases. Don't just say they are  
irrelevant. Demonstrate why they are irrelevant. Show me why  
those ducks that don't fart like a duck (blur zone cases) don't  
need to be considered. Show me also how you can be sure the  
ducks you see "looking, waddling, and quacking like a duck" (the  
ones you focus on) aren't also breaking wind differently than a  
duck but you just didn't hear them. In plain language:  
demonstrate how you are certain that the nicely-behaving high-  
tech vehicle UFOs aren't able to - if they wanted or needed to -  
suddenly start exhibiting the bizarre characteristics of the  
apparent high-tech vehicle UFOs in blur zone (like the ones in  
the Webster/Bedford case, like the ones in the blur zone).  
Demonstrate why - how you know for sure - they are different



from the ones you focus on.

Or demonstrate how you can be sure "I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems" if this is what you say explains it. Geez, Stan, this is being specific, isn't it?

Show why all the other categories of UFOs - really and truly anomalous ones, not IFOs or misperceived mundanes - are not considered with the category you focus on. Because of their appearance? Because of their behaviour? Why do truly bizarre, strange UFO cases - ones that don't look like your average high-tech vehicle UFO but do seem to indicate intelligence is involved - deserve to get cut off from consideration. Am

I not being specific enough here, Stan?

How is Al Lawson's work misinterpreted by other people? How am I misinterpreting Al Lawson's work? How is it that Al Lawson's work is inapplicable to the UFO phenomenon? You've made a remark regarding Lawson's work pertaining to the lack of emotional content in the imaginary abductions. Never mind the fact that the subjects probably knew in the back of their minds it was all pretend but the "lack of emotional content" is of no importance for another reason. Remember the book 'Stolen Valor' by W. K. Burkett? Well, therein is described a therapist who had veterans relate horrific tales of combat complete with the emotional content by people who never even served in the army, let alone experienced combat. Help me to be a little more specific here, Stan, if I'm not being quite specific enough.

While we're at it, let's see all the evidence you have that rules out those ancient artifacts as belonging to an older Earth-based technological civilization. Show me the evidence you have that rules out earlier human technological civilizations. Earlier hominid technological civilizations. Earlier, say, raptor, technological civilizations. I freely confess I have no evidence to show they existed. But I mention the numerous curiosities that might be evidence. Now you show the evidence you have that rules this all out. That's only fair because you are ruling it out. You're saying it's ET. Does this not count as being specific, Stan?

Oh, that Peter Khoury physical trace case with its human DNA. How come that one isn't as good as the high-tech vehicle cases and abduction cases you're choosing and focussing on? Seems to be the same phenomenon to me. I'm not saying it is but you show me how it's not. Prove to me why human DNA was found in that case and how that connects to ET. Help me to be a little more specific here, Stan.

Those thousands of cases you keep going on about prove only there is a phenomenon that seems to involve intelligence. How do you know - prove this - that it's ET? Prove why it's not anything else. You're making the claims, the conclusions. Don't avoid issues, data, and research and then throw the onus on me. I'm not claiming anything. I am merely questioning your conclusions. Justify them!

>>No, you shouldn't worry about my respect for you as a scientist.  
>>That wasn't the point. The point is, someone with your  
>>credentials and your experience in science - which I deeply  
>>respect - must know that the type of reasoning you've been  
>>providing here is invalid, illogical, and full of fallacy.

>Sorry I know no such thing no matter how often you proclaim it.

Then I repeat my earlier statement that has been excluded from your quote of my writing: "something is wrong." A scientist with your credentials and experience should know that to come to conclusions by ignoring most of the data and research (the stuff that conflicts with your hypothesis) is wrong. But I think you do know this! And you do know you're doing this! That's why you keep avoiding the issues and resorting to silly analogies, while trying to throw the onus on me and accusing me of charismatic handwaving and of not being specific.

>>>I asked for specifics about Roswell and about MJ-12, you gave  
>>>none. Here you are again making proclamations with nothing behind  
>>>them. Should I worry about your respect for me as a scientist? I

>>>take it I should assume that you belong to the American Nuclear  
>>>Society, TheAmerican Physical Society, the American Institute of  
>>>Aeronautics and Astronautics?

>>Do I have to be a member of the groups you mentioned to be able  
>>to think logically and reason rationally? Does being a member of  
>>those groups guarantee that one always thinks logically and  
>>rationaly? Or does it guarantee one won't ever be deceptive or  
>>use sleight of hand in a discussion? Do I have to be a member of  
>>these groups to question your logic? Or, is this more sleight of  
>>hand on your part, Stan? More distraction? More of "if you can't  
>>make it with facts then make the other guy look bad'?

>Sorry, Eugene, but you have provided no peer reviewed or any  
>other evidence of your ability to think logically as perhaps  
>manifested by your work history or professional status . I have.  
>Check my bio or a list of my publications.

This is more of what you did above. Do I need a list of  
publications to my credit or a professional status to be able to  
think logically and reason clearly? Does having some guarantee  
that someone always thinks rationally and logically or won't use  
shrewdness or deception in a discussion? How does this guarantee  
that your conclusion that some UFOs are ET spaceships is not  
premature? How does it invalidate my questioning your  
conclusions? More importantly, how does it invalidate the data  
I've presented to justify questioning your conclusions?

>The cases to which I have referred provide the home runs, the  
>fissionable isotopes, the drugs that work. They of course do not  
>answer the question as to where outside the Earth the craft  
>originate, or whether there have been past indigenous or  
>colonizing civilizations.

They do no such thing! You have not shown you actually have a  
fissionable isotope in your possession, have not shown you  
actually hold a disease-curing chemical in your hand, and have  
not established that you've hit a home run. You're just assuming  
you have and saying you have.

You can say this only because you've ignored a hugh part of the  
genuinely anomalous UFO phenomenon, proceeded to pick and choose  
certain cases and roped off a small category of choosen high-  
tech vehicle cases, and then roped them off even further from  
cases that are similiar but don't behave like you want, and  
ignored data and research that might point to an alternative  
solution.

Guess that answers some of my questions about professional  
status, publication credits, and memberships in fancy  
organizations!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 18:03:17 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:38:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shough

>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:26:56 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:37:27 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0700 (PDT)  
>>>Subject: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Kasten

>>>Gosh, I hope you all are not relying just on radar-blips as I  
>>>am sure most of the people on this List are old enough to know  
>>>that there has been stealth-technology available for years now  
>>>that can create all kinds of maneuvers and speeds on the radar  
>>>screen - radar screens on the ground and on-board the air craft.

>>No, I am not relying just on radar-blips, though it is my  
>>understanding that Stealth refers to the ability not to show up  
>>on radar screens whereas spoofing is the creation  
>>electromagnetically of false targets on radar screens... but not  
>>on eyeballs.

>>I was thinking of the RB 47 case and the JAL case, for  
>>example... Dick Hall collected a lot of radar visual sightings  
>>in 1952 as I recall, well before stealth technology.

>>Remember that there has to be a spoofer.....

>Okay, I'll play. The spoofer I was referring to was Gene Poteat,  
>President of the Association of Former Intelligence Officers and  
>ex-CIA agent who had worked in the Science and Technology  
>Directorate, who was the manager for the development and  
>operation of special reconnaissance systems for the U-2, SR-71,  
>and various other space and naval reconnaissance vehicles. He  
>developed and implemented new intelligence methods to detect low  
>observable (stealth-Gene's word, not mine) aircraft by foreign  
>air defense radars. He was reporting on his technological  
>research during a lecture on the SpyCruise of March 2002.

Kathy

I looked into the CIA's pioneering radar spoof, project  
Palladium, when researching the Lakenheath-Bentwaters radar-  
visual case. The date is one important issue you need to  
consider, second is the exact nature of the classified Palladium  
technology, and third is to apply lessons learned from the  
answers to specific cases with care.

In 1962, about the time when Bud Wheelon became the CIA's new  
head of the Directorate of Science and Technology, a radar  
spoofing programme was developed to be operated in tandem with  
the agency's bi-static Soviet radar mapping programme. This  
mapping programme had begun in 1959 with Project Melody and  
progressed to using radar echoes bounced from the moon. Having

charted the Soviet radar fence in detail and found it unexpectedly forbidding, the CIA, and through them particularly Strategic Air Command, now needed to know how to make spyplanes or bombers with radar cross-sections small enough to squeeze through. This was the beginning of 'stealth', and the CIA's radar spoofing was designed to provoke reactions from Soviet radars so that NSA COMINT intercept specialists could then decrypt their communications and estimate the minimum detectable cross-sections in various conditions. Wheelon dubbed this effort Project Palladium.

You can read Poteat's own "Stealth, Countermeasures and ELINT 1960-75" at:

<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB54/st08.pdf>

Palladium engineers were probably among the few Americans who were delighted when the Soviets installed defences along the Cuban coast in 1962 as it offered a chance for some high-calibre ELINT measurements of their SA-2 missile radar. In this instance the Palladium gear was on the deck of a destroyer stood off Cuba, its antenna just peeking over the horizon, and a simulated jet fighter blip was 'flown' through the Soviet surveillance radar cover towards the island. At the same time a submarine surfaced offshore just long enough to release a callibrated series of balloon-borne metal spheres of different sizes. As expected the phantom overflight caused the Soviets to light up their SA-2 targeting radars, illuminating the test reflectors, and decrypted communications intercepts then revealed the performance of the radars. An interesting report that may conceivably be related to the Palladium programme is an unconfirmed report from 1967 that communications intercept operators of the Air Force Security Service's 6947th Security Squadron at Key West Naval Air Station overheard an attempt by two Cuban MiG 21s to intercept a UFO detected on radar entering Cuban airspace at 33,000'. They allegedly saw a bright "metallic sphere" and were instructed to engage but when the flight leader locked his weapons on the target his jet disintegrated in mid air. The UFO climbed out of radar coverage at 98,000'. An AFSS Intelligence Spot Report to NSA on the incident went unacknowledged; a follow-up report resulted in an order to ship all electronic and other records to NSA. In 1978 researcher Robert Todd requested information from NSA and CIA under FOIA legislation and found himself the subject of investigation by the FBI. An agent reportedly told him that the Bureau was acting on behalf of NSA and that "Some of the information is classified. Most of it is bullshit."

Anyway, similar covert tests were reportedly arranged all over the world. The Palladium gear was portable in a van and went with a CIA operating team, an NSA COMINT decryption team and a military support team. Given the value of Soviet radar defences to Strategic Air Command offensive planners, and the involvement of both CIA and NSA, one might suppose that if an early prototype test of a Palladium-type operation had ever been contemplated in Europe in 1956 then forward-basing of the equipment at a SAC airfield where CIA and NSA had already established a secure presence would be very natural. RAF Lakenheath was a SAC bomber base where in May 1956 the CIA had chosen to deploy one of the first U-2 spyplanes. I wondered if the August UFOs in that area could have been a CIA spoof and concluded this was highly unlikely, based on date, on technical and logistical limitations, and on specific case details.

A more detailed discussion is at:

<http://lakenheath.mysite.wanadoo-members.co.uk/Lak-radar-analysis.htm>

However one example of a technical limitation is that although Poteat says in his article that Palladium could insert a ghost and "fly it along any path [emphasis added]" I don't believe that this should be misunderstood to mean "anywhere in any sector of a surveillance radar scanning through 360 degrees". Palladium was (so far as we know) simply a receiver, a variable delay line and a transmitter, and was dependent on the antenna link of the remote 'host' radar to work. On a surveillance radar, a system like this could only generate a phantom on the main-beam azimuth of the antenna at the time the radar 'hears' the delayed echo returned to it by Palladium, so for a given Palladium transmitter output the scope sector available for spoofing would always be limited by the extreme anisotropy of

the input antenna gain.

The first thing to say is that in this case a deception-jamming signal is faced with (at least) two local receivers with very different bandwidths, S-band (CPN-4) and L-band (CPS-5). Note that the reason two surveillance radars can share the same airspace like this is exactly because they are 'blind' to each other's frequencies; if they were not they would be inoperable due to interference. So the spoofer needs either an extremely powerful out-of-band signal, tuned between the two, strong enough to generate normal-looking echo strengths on both scopes, or two separate transmitters and antenna assemblies (remember this is 1956 analogue equipment).

I have seen no evidence that Palladium had this multi-channel capability, but let's suppose it did. The display products would differ very markedly on the two radars. First the different scan rates of 9 and 15 rpm mean that a ghost 'echo' timed to appear as a stationary target on one scope would appear as a target skittering back and forth between opposite sectors on the other. Second the very different p.r.f. means that a solid-looking target arc on one scope would appear as just a radial scatter of dots on the other. There is just no way that these two radars could be spoofed simultaneously with the same transmitter.

So we start with two Palladium sets and two crews, then. They could handle things maybe - until the interceptor shows up. Then what about the AI radar? That would need a third transmitter - and a highly mobile one too, with some very careful radio coordination with the other teams. Oh, but then there's Neatishead's GCI installation, 40 miles away, where we have not only a combination of surveillance radar outputs at different frequencies with a third different rotation rate, but also Type 13 height-finder radars with a very different pattern of antenna gain and a vertical scan - not to mention Type 7 height-finding by a '3-D' system that calculates the height by comparing the signals reflected from the target by direct and ground-reflected ray paths. Have the spooks thought about that one?

It's easy to form the casual impression that "anything is possible" for spooks, but it isn't. There may have been radar spoofing technology in 1956 that we still don't know about, but there's no evidence of anything that would generate radar blips like these. Even assuming Palladium units hardwired into the various remote installations (this could perhaps have been done under cover of maintenance and upgrade work) it's really hard to make the theory work at all.

So then there's the question of date. What was the likely status of any Palladium-style programme in 1956?

Palladium was started under Bud Wheelon who was DDS&T from 1962. Palladium was certainly the result of a design devised in 1962 by CIA DST electronics engineer Eugene Poteat with assistance from Science Consultants of the CIA's Oxcart Program Office, Oxcart being the U-2 successor (eventually the SR-71). Electronic technology was by 1962 entering the age of miniaturisation, radar was changing fast and probably Palladium took advantage of much recent technology. But there is no indication that Palladium was continuous with a long series of similar prototype developments going back to 1956, and the existence of such a forerunner seems both technically and historically doubtful.

So if you are a sceptic who makes the common sceptical observation that "most of the really interesting radar cases are from the early '50s", where does that leave the case for Palladium spoofing? Out in the cold I'm afraid.

>During lunch on the SpyCruise of March 2002, I had a chat with  
>an individual who had worked for Grumman's experimental craft  
>operations on Long Island. He stated that the EA6B had the  
>capability of "disappearing" from radar after a certain switch  
>was turned on. Gosh, just one spoofer after another. What's a  
>person to do?

The Prowler is a modern ECM tactical jamming platform using five semi-autonomous digital computers in ALQ-99 jamming pods networked with a threat-analysis CPU to perform very sophisticated real-time analysis of signals, match them against a huge threat library, and then independently tailored direct

Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shough

passive/active jamming signals against multiple illuminators.  
There is no comparison whatsoever with analogue gear available  
in 1950, 1952 or 1956.

BTW What is a SpyCruise?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## BBC Newsnight Special On-Line Tonight

From: Joe McGonagle <[joe.mcgonagle.nul](mailto:joe.mcgonagle.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 18:13:27 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:40:09 -0400  
Subject: BBC Newsnight Special On-Line Tonight

This programme will be broadcast live on the BBC web site at  
2230BST/2130GMT via:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/default.stm>

Report fuels spy plane theories

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/5079044.stm>

"Bill Sweetman of Jane's Defence Review has been analysing America's undercover defence projects for fifteen years. We showed him the [Condign] report and he concludes the MoD "identified two separate US 'Black' programmes that might have operated from the UK. It could be something they have reason to know about"."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:30:03 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:41:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 07:59:11 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:40:37 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>Here are some small leaps that work well for me now:  
>>Some flying saucers are ET in origin.  
>>Some abductions are ET in origin.

>"Small leaps"???

>Man, you just pole-vaulted the Pacific Ocean!

Thanks Bob! Let us praise the predictive power of the poll!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:42:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Rudiak

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:50:30 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:11:28 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>I think one thing being lost in the translation is that the  
>Comanche oil wells are not showing up now, why would they back  
>then. Now before the barbs come out, that's what I'm getting  
>from the emails posted by Santiago.

To speculate, infrared is heavily absorbed by moisture, which was one reason I was puzzled that the FLIR sensors could pick up the oil wells at a distance of ~100 miles. Therefore, if it was an unusually dry day over the Gulf of Mexico (if such conditions ever exist), perhaps enough infrared leaked through to be detected by the sensors.

On a very clear day, 90-95% of visible light is transmitted through 1 atmosphere of air, i.e., from the zenith to ground, but less than 50% of infrared (different bands of infrared transmit different amounts). Looking sideways, every 4 miles has as much air as looking straight up to infinity. Because the plane was flying at several thousand feet and looking downwards toward the horizon, maybe we should boost this to 5 miles of air sideways (because of more rarefied air) to equal 1 atmosphere of air straight up.

Therefore, at 100 miles distance there is about an equivalent of 100/5 = 20 atmospheres of air to look through. Visible light in the longer wavelengths transmits (under prime seeing conditions) 95% for each atmosphere, so in 20 atmospheres  $(.95)^{20} = .36$  or 36% of the light would be transmitted (ideally).

But for infrared, the number is, at best,  $(.50)^{20} = .000001 = .0001\%$  or 1 part in a million. The moisture in the air is going to filter out the infrared to a very high degree.

But suppose it was a superdry day and the transmission got boosted to 60%/atmosphere, which doesn't sound like a lot more but has a big effect over long distances. Then  $(.60)^{20} = .000036 = .0036\%$  or 36 times more infrared. Similarly if the transmission was 65%, then  $(.65)^{20} = .00018 = .018\%$  or 180 times more.

Another thing that might improve visibility would be if it was unusually cool that day. That would lower infrared backscatter off the intervening atmosphere and increase contrast between the

oil flames and the background.

Normally, the absorption might work to the systems advantage by limiting the viewing range (it might get too confusing if you see everything out there). E.g., at 50% transmission, you would get similar transmission of infrared only up to about 60 miles or 12 atmospheres:  $(.50)^{12} = .024\%$ . Thus, if atmospheric conditions were very unusual, this is the reason the crew had never seen the oil wells before (and, as it seems, since).

Still, my purely subjective impression is that objects in the FLIR images seem much too bright to be the distant oil wells no matter how many assumptions of super infrared seeing conditions one makes. Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure technical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't know. Perhaps Bruce Maccabee and James Smith would care to comment.

(Not that it proves anything, but last January I flew between Mexico City and Miami, the course of which would have been within 100 miles of the oil wells. It was nighttime and the weather was fairly clear, so I expected to have no problems seeing the giant flames burning off the wells in the Gulf, but I never saw I thing despite looking intently.)

David Rudiak

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:22:09 -0700  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:45:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Rudiak

>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:05:21 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>The truth was posted on UFO UpDates a very long time ago - on  
>September 5, 1997! In a post by Stig Agermose entitled "Heflin's  
>Photos Draw Fresh Fire From Skeptics" he includes the text of a  
>July 22, 1997 article in the Orange County Register by reporter  
>Amy Wilson.

>See:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

>In this article, people who know it is a toy train part relate  
>that they have known this for a very long time, and that it was a  
>joke gone out of control. Unlike Anonymous me, one of these  
>people, a retiree in Menlo Park, is named and interviewed.

>It amazes me that no one else on the List picked up on this at  
>the time and responded to Stig's post and that no one mentioned  
>the article in this latest discussion on Heflin.

>Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole  
>formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

>There have to be model train hobbyists on this List who can now  
>find the exact part that Rex used to create the 'craft'.

Dear "Anonymous",

If you actually have anything to say, then come out of the shadows and provide your name so we all know who you really are. Otherwise I will just write you off as the usual skeptical troll idiot who makes up all his "facts," i.e. a liar.

I am rather suprised that EBK even posted "Anonymous", since I thought the rules for this List were no anonymous posts. That's to prevent exactly this sort of unverifiable post. Mr. Anonymous could be some 12-year-old pretending to have personal knowledge of a 40-year-old case.

How exactly does the "black donut hole" speak volumes for your truthfulness?

As for the "model train wheel" part, perhaps our anonymous troll hasn't read recent discussions between myself and Martin Shough. The ratio of the top "dome" to the bottom disc rim varies between photos 1 and 3. The likely explanation is that the object isn't round but elliptical. Non-round "train wheels"? That would make for a very bumpy ride.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: State Of The Art - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 23:29:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:50:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: State Of The Art - Dickenson

List, apologize if I got provoked earlier - here's an answer to a recent skeptic (informed readers skip this).

=46rom time to time we get dogmatists saying -

- a) some witness evidence is 'impossible' - based on present psychology/psychiatry;
- b) some reported occurrences are 'impossible' - based on present (mathematical) physics;
- b) some reported performances/attributes are 'impossible' - based on present technology.

Psychology  
Psychology/psychiatry are mostly collections of opinion only, most having zero repeatable experiments or verifiable predictions. See:

<http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/medicalnews.php?newsid=3D30195>

"Schizophrenia' may not exist"]. In other words - they get it wrong most of the time, and cannot make a priori determinations of 'sanity' or 'insanity'.

Mathematics  
Kurt G=F6del showed that mathematical statements can be made that cannot be proven or dis-proven by human mathematicians. So human mathematics, at times cannot make a priori determinations of mathematical 'truth' or untruth'.

Physics  
At the moment human science cannot even solve the three body problem, like the mutual orbits of Earth - Sun - Moon. They have to cheat by doing 3 two-body problems and then approximating. In quantum physics they have no real grasp of events. This is show by the 'causality vs. locality' paradox of Bell's Inequalities: either causes don't precede effects or some information travels instantaneously throughout the entire universe - and they haven't decided yet. So human physicists cannot make a priori determinations of physical 'possibility' or 'impossibility'.

Technology  
Quote - "We've gone from punched cards to voice operated software and the relatively huge processing power of even a domestic computer well within one human lifetime. So it's hard to see why people balk at the "magic" technology which could be available to us in a thousand years or so, or available now, to other folk a thousand years ahead of us. Make that a billion years and we might as well think of 'gods'".

And Robert Jastrow of Mt Wilson Observatory recently - in 'Seeing is Believing' video:

<http://tinyurl.com/le76e>

said:

"there are uncounted trillions of planets in the observable

universe and two-thirds of them are billions of years older than Earth, so any of their inhabitants will have same relationship to humans that humans have with bacteria, or primitive worms".

So human technologists cannot make a priori assessments of technological 'possibility' or 'impossibility'.

Unfortunately most of us can have little knowledge of reality. 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." But most folk still think that the real world is the 'world of the senses' and nothing else.

We are like a person walking through a funfair but only allowed to see surfaces which happen to be a particular shade of puce, only allowed to hear tones that happen to hit 9 KHz exactly, and only allowed to sense contact if with the fur of a Siamese cat. Could that person hope to describe the funfair accurately? That might be about the range of our senses and our instruments compared to the possible input from the universe. For one thing we're made of the wrong sort of matter (protonic) and secondly, more than 99% of the universe's available data is unknown to us.

Einstein's remark - "It is possible that there exist emanations that are still unknown to us. Do you remember how electrical currents and unseen waves were laughed at?" maybe hinted at that, but more significantly he made a flat statement - "In a reasonable theory there are no dimensionless numbers whose values are only empirically determinable."

In other words, if we actually knew how the universe worked, we would automatically know the values of those ratios we call 'constants of nature'. We don't. In fact we don't even know, from empirical measurements, if they're all really 'constants' or not.

All above is in the public domain - just not pushed by mainstream media. Can you wonder?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 18:41:01 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:54:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 18:47:40 +0100  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 22:17:47 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

<snip>

>>>He didn't have much choice, did he? Assuming his account of the  
>>>case is accurate, the damage to the car is not such as could  
>>>have occurred accidentally. Therefore, it seems reasonable to  
>>>assume that Johnson might have done it, for some unknown  
>>>reason. I he didn't do it, then who did? Of course it it is  
>>>possible that there was someone with him who caused the damage  
>>>and Johnson was covering up for him.

>>Ahh, yes. Yet another untested Candidate Explanatory Hypothesis  
>>(CEH): another person was with Johnson. Apparently Johnson  
>>wasn't aware of it or was covering up. Is there any evidence of  
>>another person, or is this just another "throw it against the  
>>wall to see if it sticks" proposed explanation?

>There doesn't seem to be any evidence of anything about the  
>damage to the police car, apart from the fact that it appeared  
>to have been done deliberately. At least, no one has given a  
>convincing account of how it could have been produced  
>accidentally, or by natural forces. Of course, there does not  
>appear to be any way of testing this or any hypothesis, prosaic  
>or otherwise, so the case remains unexplained.

Smashed glass is not hard to "explain": something hit it  
(what?). However the antennas are difficult to explain, assuming  
the report is correct, that the "bug tar" coating the front  
(leading edge) side of each antenna was unbroken... only  
stretched... at the bend. Have you ever tried to permanently bend  
a steel whip antenna? it takes some strength and you have to  
exert considerable grasping force on the antenna. This force  
would smear or remove the insect matter coated on the antenna.  
Each of two antennas, both of which were mounted on spring  
support, as bent by 30-40 degrees, if I recall correctly... not  
a small bend. Hard to imagine how a person could have bent  
either antenna without disturbing the coating of insect matter.

You say there is no way of testing "this or any hypothesis,  
prosaic or otherwise..."

I say, let a person try to bend a similar antenna wire with his  
bare hands or any other way compatible with the hypothesis that  
Johnson or a proposed unknown "passenger" did it, without  
disturbing the coating of insect residue.

>>Maccabee's Rule #1 for Debunkers:

>>Any explanation is better than none.

>You cannot debunk anything unless it is bunk,

Skeptics and debunkers often act as if they thought sightings were "bunk". They propose explanations and let it go at that even if the explanations make no sense.

Take the JAL 1628 Japan airlines case of 1986 for example. CSISOP debunkers (Klass) publicized the "extreterrestrial explanation" before the investigation had been completed. The ET explanation? Extraterrestrial bodies were the cause of the sighting: Jupiter and Mars.

When it became apparent after the investigation was complete that Jupiter and Mars made no sense, an alternative, no doubt "just as scientific," explanation was proffered: moonlight reflected from clouds. This, too was rejected as a "bunk explanation." when compared with the reported facts of the sighting (see my web site). Whether or not a particular sighting is bunk, debunkers and skeptics act as if UFO sightings in general are bunk.

>as as been pointed  
>out before on this List. It is unlikely that anyone will ever be  
>able to provide a definitive explanation for this case, but that  
>is no reason why possibilities should not be considered. Also, in  
>view of the fact that it is a single-witness report, its  
>importance has been somewhat exaggerated

Somewhat exaggerated? Just how important should it be? A policeman on duty is not just any witness.

Plus, there was damage to the witness and "hard evidence" damage to the police car, including damage to the antennas that is "difficult," if not impossible to explain in a conventional matter. (Not bent by human hands, so far as we know.) This goes beyond the typical "single witness report."

>>No problem with suggesting an explanation. The problem comes  
>>when a suggested explanation is left untested, as if the fact  
>>that one can suggest an explanation is equivalent to having  
>>explained a sighting.

>No one has come up with a testable explanation, so presumably  
>you would agree that there is nothing that can usefully be said  
>about the case?

Agree? No.

What is there about the implications of "no explanation" that you don't understand?

This is the doorway to new phenomena. If all sightings were convincingly explainable in conventional (if unusual) terms, then there would be no need to contemplate the possibility of new phenomena (such as ET). Any time a sighting cannot be convincingly explained in terms of conventional phenomena it should be studied even more intensely to find out if anything new can be learned (such as how to bend steel antenna wires without rubbing off insect matter)

NOTE: it is not always possible to determine whether or not a proposed conventional explanation is the actual explanation. However, it is possible to determine whether or not, in the context of a sighting (history, witnesses, physical effects, etc) a particular explanation is convincing.

>>An explanation in conventional terms uses conventional phenomena  
>>which have known characteristics. Thus any conventional  
>>explanation should be "Popper falsifiable" based on the reported  
>>characteristics of the phenomenon. This includes hoaxes which  
>>should also be falsifiable (a false hoax is a true unknown if  
>>Klass tested his hoax hypothesis by calling the police station and  
>>asking whomever he talked to if Johnson would be likely to try  
>>to trick someone. He was told Johnson might "hide your coffee  
>>cup."

>>This was apparently a sufficiently hoax-positive answer for  
>>Klass to feel justified in suggesting in his book that Johnson  
>>could have damaged his police car.

>>To borrow your phrase, "anyone with a grain of common sense"



>>would know that hiding a coffee cup is not in the same league  
>>with damaging a police car.

>Not necessarily. We would need to know a great deal more about  
>Johnson in order to consider whether or not such an explanation  
>was plausible.

What more would need to know? Perhaps you think that the police  
department knew next to nothing about Johnson? we know that the  
police department trusted him. How much more do we need to know?

>My classification of this case: Unexplained - insufficient  
>information.

But, of course!

The American Air Force would be proud of you.

When presenting the statistical information regarding sightings  
over the years '47-'69, the Air Force claimed to have explained  
something like 13,000 but they claimed that they couldn't  
explain about 700. However, they also claim they could have  
explained the remaining 700 "if there had been more  
information."

For the skeptic/debunker, any case that has no conventional  
obvious or convincing explanation must be a case of  
"Insufficient Information (II)."

Note that II was separate class of sighting when the Battelle  
Memorial Inst studied 3201 sightings that had occurred between  
June 1947 and Dec 31, 1952. The other general classes were Known  
(K) and Unknown (U). The point is that the U cases were a  
separate class of sightings that had credible information that  
caused the analysts to reject all conventional explanations.

The II cases did not have sufficient information to allow either  
a positive identification of a positive "rejection" of a  
conventional explanation.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

### Paintsville UFO/Train Collision Case

From: Frank Warren <[frank-warren.nul](mailto:frank-warren.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 16:41:09 -0700  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:57:08 -0400  
Subject: Paintsville UFO/Train Collision Case

Fellow Listerions,

Recently, as most of you know Peter Davenport received an interesting report from an individual claiming to be a railroad employee in some capacity involved with "operating" the train, e.g., engineer, brakemen etc.; this individual recounted an alleged "collision with his train and a UFO." He described them (there were 3) as "Metallic silver in color with multiple colored lights near the bottom and in the middle, no windows or openings of any kind that we could see. Approximately 18 to 20 feet in length and probably ten feet high."

This report intrigued me, and following some quick research I found that whomever penned the missive was indeed knowledgeable of the area via the train tracks, as well as railroad protocol etc. I asked Peter if he wouldn't mind me posting the report, and he graciously gave me the go ahead; shortly thereafter, I located one "Robby Vaughn" a self-admitted railroad buff/photographer and an individual that is very familiar with the area.

He was already familiar with the story, and I asked him for his opinion of the alleged events; he replied with a very detailed analysis of the event (in his opinion) and also provided a photograph of an engine with damage to the cab, although careful not to say that this was the engine in question (in fact he pointed out quite the opposite, as the damage didn't match the description from the original account); he did say that the picture was taken around the same time frame, however.

After reading Robby's missive I must admit, I was leaning towards the original account being a hoax, done by someone very knowledgeable about the area, and railroad operations etc.; either an employee (I believe Peter mentioned that the e-mail originated from a railroad company IP address) or someone very intimate with an employee, having detailed knowledge of the route. AT that time an individual claiming to be an engineer for twenty years and working that area wrote in and reprobated Robby's missive, corroborated the original story and (saying they hit "something") and admitted he knows the men, and remembers the "coal spill" from the incident.

Since that time Robby has recently replied to the "engineer's" missive. In any event, the original account is back in my "gray basket" (thanks Stan) and methinks this story is certainly worth further investigation. Peter, has invited Mark Rodeghier (CUFOS) to get involved given his geographical location.

All the pertinent details can be found here:

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

\*<http://tinyurl.com/gxhma>

\*\*<http://tinyurl.com/l3a7o>\*

\*<http://tinyurl.com/fttae>\*

\*<http://tinyurl.com/z4h2o>

Cheers ,

Frank\*

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 01:04:13 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:58:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 11:14:47 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

A few days ago I wrote a long reply to this email, kept it for a few days, and decided the content didn't justify its length. So this is an edited, amended version which I hope deals with most of the points raised, although it's still rather longer than I'd hoped. Never mind:-

>In other words, a consensus is reached about the weight of evidence! You criticize my brother's use of that word below.  
>Also, you failed to define what constitutes an issue.

<snip>

>Are you here implicitly defining an issue to be a controversy? I could accept that as a working definition.

To the best of my knowledge, Dick, "controversy" was the word I originally used, and you substituted the word "issue".

I think there are real problems with this notion of consensus, as you appear to use it. The most obvious is that it simply fails to distinguish between science and other areas of academic activity, and indeed many non-academic areas of activity. It matters very much that the consensus, to the extent that it exists, is wholly determined by evidence and is not something that has to be "decided" upon.

Secondly, I don't think it's necessarily true that an overwhelming weight of evidence produces consensus. It's rather more the case that dissenters either go silent or disappear into the woodwork.

Thirdly, I think this notion of consensus covers up a good deal that is unsatisfactory in the way the social sciences operate. For one thing, it's open to abuse, because the definition of who counts as part of the consensus can be manipulated, and frequently is. If consensus is genuinely the result of evidence, then it shouldn't be necessary to manufacture artificial consensus in this way.

>The Halls are not suggesting any such thing (and let's leave my brother out of this from here on.) What you say here applies equally well to the physical sciences. And science, in fact, is about consensus. If physicists disagree about the meaning of facts and evidence, then nothing has been resolved. You see, >there are semantical problems here that my brother pointed out.

My hardline position on this, which comes from first-hand experience, is that if scientists disagree about the meaning of facts and evidence, then it means the evidence isn't good enough and you need more and better evidence.

>No one suggested that facts, evidence, and logic should be left out of the equation.

I don't think it's good enough that evidence should not be left out of the equation. In science, evidence is the beginning, the end and everything in between.

>I suppose that this is the place to comment on your previous  
>assertion that the social/behavioral sciences have no corpus of  
>knowledge. I beg to differ. Here are a number of examples  
>(presumably they would qualify as examples of issue resolution  
>too): Do you deny that a great deal of knowledge exists about  
>1) the effects of childhood abuse on personality development  
>and consequences for adult life?

As it happens this is a subject I've had quite a lot to do with. I think we know quite a bit now about the effect child abuse has on human beings, some of which may manifest in various ways during adult life (though I'm not sure that it necessarily has anything to do with "personality development"). I just don't believe that this knowledge owes much to the social sciences, which for much of their history have been a major obstacle to understanding the consequences of child abuse - check out Anna Salter's "Transforming Trauma" (sorry, don't have the publication details to hand right now) - which illustrates how for decades, social sciences orthodoxy underplayed or outright denied that child abuse caused any long-term consequences at all.

Current social sciences work on child abuse is at best a rationalization of knowledge that was originally obtained by much more direct means, such as encounter groups and consciousness raising, and much of what you'll read in the social sciences literature about child abuse is still either misleading, incomplete or just downright dubious. Have you ever heard of victim marketing, for example? That's the process whereby victims feel obligated to present a stereotyped list of symptoms and personality characteristics in order to be taken seriously by clinicians and law enforcement agencies. You won't find much about that in the social sci literature.

>(2) What disorders can result  
>from exposure to stressful combat conditions?

We know something about the symptoms that can result from stressful combat conditions. ("Disorders" themselves are clinical constructs.) But this knowledge certainly didn't arise from the application of any social sciences theory or knowledge-base. If indeed the social sciences had anything to do with it (which is doubtful) it was by the direct application of a research methodology which was both atheoretical and wholly empirical - in other words, what I described at the outset of this discussion as "applied social science". (And I did say at the time this was a misnomer.)

>(3) How the structure and dynamics of group behavior affects  
>performance (e.g., corporations, military organizations)? (4)  
>Why people buy the particular things that they do (consumer  
>behavior)? (5) And one final example in the area of so-called  
>political science, why people vote the way they do and how their  
>attitudes can be manipulated?

I think these are all very bad examples, and yes, I dispute that we have a great deal of knowledge about any of these - though I agree there is a lot of assumption, guesswork and faddism passed off as knowledge.

>Theory construction has everything to do with scientific  
>method. Hence there would appear to be more semantical  
>confusion. here.

I think there's a hell of a lot more than semantic confusion here.

There's a good reason why I say that theory construction is not part of the scientific process. It's the testing and application of theory which is part of the scientific process. Without testing and application, theory is just a mathematical fairy tale.

I don't think social science theory is scientific because when it is tested at all it's usually only tested by the originators of the theory themselves (or their friends) and never accounts for more than a fraction of the available data. It's almost

never subject to genuinely independent replication. Social science theories are often so malleable that it's often not clear what they actually predict, if they predict anything at all. On top of which, the types of statistical methods used in the social sciences make it almost impossible to publish negative findings because no significance can be attached to a null result (the notorious "file-drawer" problem).

>>Now this is really dodgy, isn't it? We already know that many >>social scientists claim to be using the scientific method. What >>matters is whether those claims have any basis in reality, and >>the Halls provide no evidence that they do.

>Seems like a pretty straightforward and accurate statement to >me. What sort of evidence do you require?

How do you decide which social scientists are genuine scientists and which aren't?

I think this is probably the greatest problem of all. There's an inherent informality underlying every science. One can have the most rigorously worked out theory, based on axioms which are clearly and explicitly spelt out, but at some point one has to match those axioms up with observations from the real world, and there is absolutely no formal way of doing this. In the social sciences this is open to massive abuse. It means there is ultimately no control of the extent to which observations are subject to arbitrary interpretation on the basis of opinion or prejudice.

I really don't know why this is so much more of a problem in the the social sciences than it is in the physical and biological sciences. I only know that it is. There are evidently controls of some sort operating in the latter that don't apply in the former.

Another, related problem - no social scientist ever controls for every variable. You have to make a judgement call on what variables to leave out. On what basis do you decide this? By consensus? How reliable is this consensus? How do you assess its reliability?

>I took courses in anthropology and that is indeed the way >archeology was defined.

It certainly isn't in the UK but I probably shouldn't comment on the details of US academic bureaucracy.

>By the way, Cathy. Are you a scientist, >and if so in what field? And what is your educational background >and training? My vita is published on my web site >(<[www.hallrichard.com](http://www.hallrichard.com)>) and my brother's is readily available in >the directories. You seem to display disdain toward the social >sciences which may derive from your own background.

It may do and it may not. I was in the final stages of a doctoral project examining the possible role of synchronized neural oscillations in visual attention (after a BSc psych degree and research work/teaching in a number of psychology departments) when I had to stop due to ill health. But my cynicism about psychology goes way back.

>I am not a scientist at all and have never claimed to be >(however, in my experience many scientists operate by rote and >have no special knowledge of scientific method either except for >what they are told to do). I have formally studied logic and >scientific method and think that I have a very good idea of what >it is - or is supposed to be, though in real life in often >departs from the ideal.

You may be entirely right, but to me this sounds awfully like someone saying: "I have no experience of combat, but I have studied strategy and I believe I know how wars should be won".

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 21:43:11 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:03:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

>From: Joe McGonagle <[joe.mcgonagle.nul](mailto:joe.mcgonagle.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 13:43:27 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:50:30 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

><snip>

>>>But worse, they go to a group with an agenda

>>What agenda? You mean like my agenda or Bruce's agenda or  
>>Dick Hall's agenda or Stan Friedman's agenda.....

>How about Jaime Maussan's agenda (entertain the people, keep up  
>the TV ratings)?

So in effect then, if someone writes a book about UFOs their  
opinions are not worth considering and their motives suspect?

>I am still perplexed as to why the Mexican Air Force decided  
>to release the material to a popular entertainment figure and  
>his cohorts, rather than to people like Rafael Navarro, Julio  
>Herrera, Armando Arellano Ferro, and Jose de Jesus Franco  
>Lopez from the esteemed UNAM, and those named could also not  
>understand it.

It's my understanding that that unit released the information.  
Perhaps they didn't know or realise the existence of the above.  
Cohorts is a desparaging word.

>It was suggested to me that it was a political  
>decision to deflect attention from politically embarrassing  
>media coverage at the time in question, and a rift between the  
>Mexican Armed Services and the President, though I don't know  
>enough about Mexican politics to offer a valid opinion on the  
>suggestion.

You don't have to. A politician is a politician.

>>>rather than some objective group of analysts.

>>Who may get scared off?

>...or just ignored or abused because they don't confirm the  
>entertainment channel's perception that this case represents  
>extraterrestrial visitation

Maybe but can't see that as entrenched.

>(just as they appear to have



>dismissed Bruce's assessment of the case, and Bruce can hardly  
>be considered to be a nasty pelican).  
>I also notice that since some evidence has emerged about the  
>oil field flares, Maussan's "investigations" are now taking  
>place behind closed doors. No doubt that makes it easier to  
>perpetuate the impression of mystery about this case, and keep  
>the ratings up.

I'm not sure I understand your reasons against the publicising  
of this and other Mexican cases, Joe, when that was done. If  
that is not being done now, you reason that that is to keep the  
ratings up. That's having it both way. Nice if you can get it.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 21:49:29 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:05:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:16:02 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: modernherbal@[address known]  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 13:14:45 -0400  
>>Subject: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>Another lister had it correct about the less-shown fourth photo.  
>>Check out airshow photobooks from the 60's for donut holes ring  
>>formations.

>I suppose it's possible:

><http://img74.imageshack.us/img74/9587/ring2tf.jpg>

>But we're a skeptical bunch around here, and if you can't  
>supply specifics, we can't do a whole lot with it. But thanks,  
>anyway!

Probably the gas filled garbage bag type explosions used at some  
of the airshows to duplicate a bombing from the air. I don't  
see the Heflin ring as a big deal when a craft is travelling  
through air or haze. Seen it often enough from regular aircraft.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 22:05:40 -0700  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:07:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>A few months ago Bruce already kindly sent me microdensitometer  
>scans across both axes of the negative through the object and a  
>scan of a print made by himself and Bob Schaeffer in 1975. I can  
>testify that there is no indication on these materials of any  
>halo.

I understand.

>The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact  
>just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a  
>B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around  
>other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As  
>Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by  
>others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the  
>Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

I believe you. All the more reason for me to try to get a better  
image for my stereo experiments, then. If color scanning a  
black-and-white photo, like the photo on Olmos's page, will give  
me a large white space around dark objects, then I guess I need  
to get a good high-res grayscale scan of the black and white  
photo. Odd that it would do that, though. And such a large area  
around the saucer.

Now I'm curious to see if the same photo I'm working with will  
show those lighter areas around dark objects like the mid-  
distance phone line pole, like you say. Just out of curiosity.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Gates

From: Robert Gates [RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 03:58:29 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:19:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Gates

>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:48:09 +0100 (BST)  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 16:45:42 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:37:15 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>On Jun 13, 2006, at 8:59 AM, "Anonymous" wrote:

>>>An anonymous refutation has absolutely no value. This person  
>>>needs to come forward and put their name on their story.

<snip>

>>I absoutely agree. Unless and until this person and/or the  
>>alleged other people come forth, identify themselves, and  
>>explain how they know this, I am going to call him  
>>Mr. Anonymous Liar.

>Great. So you just sit back and relax and continue to wallow in  
>the tech talk 'cos it's more fun than actually getting to the  
>reality or even, God forbid, the truth. Safe in the knowledge  
>that an anonymous poster is hardly likely to step forward and  
>volunteer further information. In the old days I suppose, some  
>researcher would have got off his butt and got out and tracked  
>"Mr. Anonymous Liar" down.

>Ufology isn't what it used to be, Dick. You could learn a thing  
>or two from the way it used to be done. Errrrrr.....

>Stuart Miller

Lets consider all the great info we get from anonymous people,  
at least in UFOs.

In 1996 so called anonymous intel community informants were  
blathering so called "top-drawer", very reliable information  
that UFO mass landings were going to happen in the desert south  
west on April 24th. They didn't.

Other anonymous informants were leaking information about how  
the government was going to announce ET reality before the  
1996 elections. When that didn't happen, we heard it would be  
before Christmas 1996...that didn't happen.

We had nameless, faceless informants blabbering to a well known  
UFO researcher that ET was going to land on a mountain top in  
Arizona in December of 2000. That didn't happen

Not to mention many others over the years.

Fast forward to our time. Some nameless, faceless dude hands a bunch of documents to a guy in Texas, who shows/gives them to Dan Rathers producer Mary Mapes, who allows Dan to vomit them all over the air waves.

We had the recent leak to ABC investigative reporter Brian Ross on alleged indictments...which ABC put on air and when they turned out to be bogus, ABC still didn't retract.

People were reporting that Karl Rove would be indicted, that it was absolute, no question about the information. Well the information was totally wrong.

I would suspect that all this so called anonymous person did is toss out a solution that tickled his fancy, and has absolutly zero, zip, nada evidence to back up his claim.

Thus far on this run around the theorists suggest:

- 1) Model... not based upon anything concrete, just theory
- 2) Model train wheel... again not based upon anything concrete, just the theories of people who may not have even personally known Heflin, and Heflin isn't around to defend himself.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 09:36:53 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:20:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 12:49:24 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>Yes, but see my other reply to Bob Shell re "Ed Riddle", the  
>electronics technical writer cited as the origin for the train-  
>wheel story. I suggested someone might take the trouble to track  
>down this person. I can now offer some help. Owners of Apple Mac  
>computers will find the gent's very own signature embossed  
>inside the back panel!

Dear List

Brief update: I have established that the Ed Riddle identified  
is indeed the same guy and I am in correspondence with him. He  
has already offered two quite interesting additions to his story  
which I will pass on to the list ASAP.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [ufoupdateslist.com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Condign Fuels Spy Plane Theories

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:27:58 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:27:58 -0400  
Subject: Condign Fuels Spy Plane Theories

Source: BBC News

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/5079044.stm>

14 June 2006

Video at:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/help/3681938.stm>

Report Fuels Spy Plane Theories  
By Meirion Jones  
BBC Newsnight

The UK knows more than it is saying about top secret American aircraft projects, recently declassified documents reveal.

Deep inside a previously secret Ministry of Defence report are a few pages which will reignite one of the biggest internet conspiracy questions - Is the US Air Force building secret spy planes which can cross the sky at 3,000mph?

The plane, which is often referred to as Aurora, is supposed to be a follow on from the U2 spy plane and the 2,000mph SR71 Blackbird, both of which were first developed and flown in secrecy as 'Black' projects.

The MoD report from 2000 says the USAF plans to produce "highly supersonic vehicles at Mach 4 to 6" and hypersonic unmanned craft which will fly in the upper atmosphere and in space. In 2003, the USAF revealed it had been working on a hypersonic unmanned craft - the Falcon - but denied building an Aurora-like Mach 4 to 6 aircraft.

The Aurora has 100,000 web pages devoted to it - a lot for an aircraft which may not exist.

According to Jane's Defence Review a third of USAF spending on research and development and procurement goes on classified projects. Some of that helps pay for the development of spy satellites and intelligence activities. But a sizable proportion goes on the development of secret manned and unmanned aircraft.

Area 51

of the world's most exotic aircraft have been developed at Groom Lake in Nevada - otherwise known as Area 51 - where the appearance of strange shapes in the sky - planes which officially did not exist - led to rumours that captured UFOs were being flown out of there by the US military.

The U2 first took to the sky at Groom Lake in 1955 and stayed secret for five years till the Russians shot one down over

Svedlovsk and captured the pilot Gary Powers.

The Blackbird SR71 spy plane also secretly flew from Groom Lake in the early 1960s and the F117 Stealth Fighter and its prototypes flew from there for ten years before they were publicly revealed.

Huge projects have been hidden from public gaze. The USAF spent \$20 billion in developing the B2 stealth bomber before revealing it.

Millions were spent upgrading Groom Lake ten years ago and all the surrounding high ground which overlooks the base has been fenced off to keep out curious onlookers but apart from a couple of stealth prototypes there is no sign of what the USAF has been working on there since.

'Black' projects

The MoD report which was produced in 2000 and originally classified "Secret - UK eyes only" deals with UFOs - or UAPs (Unidentified Aerial Phenomena) in MoD jargon - and concludes that there is no evidence for the existence of alien visitors.

But it includes a working paper on 'Black' projects which says "it is acknowledged that some UAP sightings can be attributed to covert aircraft programmes". The report lists three Western programmes.

The first is the SR71 Blackbird which it refers to by its little-used code name 'Senior Crown'. A 14-line description of Programme 2 and a ten-line description of Programme 3 are both withheld.

Even the names of the programmes have been redacted on the grounds of 'international relations'. There are pictures of stealth fighters and bombers, the Blackbird and the new American F22 fighter but two photographs have been withheld. Could one of these be a picture of Aurora?

Bill Sweetman of Jane's Defence Review has been analysing America's undercover defence projects for fifteen years. We showed him the report and he concludes the MoD "identified two separate US 'Black' programmes that might have operated from the UK. It could be something they have reason to know about".

Imagination

The blanked out sections might well contain a reference to Aurora but that does not mean the plane definitely exists. Sweetman says the blanked out sections "could be speculation but then why would they need to withhold it?"

Elsewhere in the document in a section on exotic technologies is another intriguing line. The DIS say "The projected (USAF) priority plan is to produce unpiloted air-breathing aircraft with a Mach 8-12 capability and transatmospheric vehicles." but it then continues "as well as highly supersonic vehicles at Mach 4 to 6".

The MoD report will be seen by Aurora chasers as another clue to put with unexplained sightings and mystery sonic booms but the Pentagon still insists that Aurora is a figment of their imaginations.

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

### Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 16:04:40 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 05:54:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: **Greg Sandow** <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 12:26:36 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>Fine. Here are some things that research in social science and  
>psychology has established, creating consensus in areas that  
>hadn't been studied before.

>1. People will do things they'd normally think were immoral, if  
>they're asked to do them by authority figures. (Stanley  
>Milgrim's famous research at Yale in, I believe, the 1960s.)

I think Milgram's experiment, along with Zimbardo's prison experiment and the Asch conformity experiments, are potentially among the most important in psychology. But the key word is "potentially" - because it's actually very hard to know what we can conclude from them. The very thing that makes Milgram's experiment so compelling - its apparent ecological validity - also makes it unethical to repeat. Asch's experiments have been repeated many times, but they lack ecological validity, and they don't produce a clear, consistent pattern of results. Zimbardo's experiment couldn't be repeated within a present-day academic context, but BBC Television did attempt a replication with the explicit intention of obtaining a different pattern of results - which they accordingly got.

And even the experiment Milgram actually performed is not as clear-cut as is sometimes claimed. It's true that many more people in the experiment complied with the (apparently) immoral orders than was expected. But some people didn't. And to this day no-one knows why.

>2. Hypnosis can't reliably retrieve memories, or at least not  
>under laboratory conditions. (Which means it can't retrieve  
>memories of data people learned during laboratory experiments.  
>Whether hypnosis also can't reliably retrieve real-world  
>memories, of things that happen during normal life, isn't  
>settled. Or at least it wasn't when I looked at this research a  
>few years ago.)

There are so many uncertainties about what hypnosis is and how it operates, or even whether it exists at all (according to an extreme view which regards it as merely an extreme form of social compliance) that I think it's very difficult to justify such a categorical assertion. On top of which, we know so little about the properties of "normal" memory that it's very hard to make a comparison.

>3. False memories can be implanted, under laboratory conditions.  
>People can be induced to believe that they remember things that  
>never really happened. (Elizabeth Loftus's famous research.)

But Loftus herself does not admit the important qualification you include here, that these results apply specifically under laboratory conditions. One can also question whether the whole concept of "false memory" is itself an unnecessarily elaborate interpretation of the experimental data - if someone remembers seeing a red Audi instead of a blue VW, is that a "false

memory"? Or is it just evidence that human memory is an organic, biological system and not a computer?

In fact according to a strict Gibsonian perspective, "memory" simply does not exist as a specific biological system at all. What we call "memory" arises from changes in the nervous system which take place in response to patterns in the environment.  
>From this perspective, the whole notion of "false memory" is simply a nonsense.

>To these I'd add two things that seem well established, but may >not be too well known as yet:

>1. Decisions made almost instantly, by instinct, prove more >reliable than decisions made after much thought. ("More >reliable" means more likely to produce the results the person >making the decision hoped for. And these results hold true only >for decisions about things the person making the decision is >familiar with. See Malcolm Gladwell's book "Blink" for details. >As I recall, there are many studies of this.)

It may be the case that the more you agonize over a decision, the less likely you are to make it on the basis of evidence, but I wouldn't call this well-established.

>2. When a millennial cult makes a prophecy, and that prophecy >doesn't come true, the members of the cult become more loyal to >it. (Research cited from time to time on this List by Jerry >Clark.)

I'm not up-to-date with the gospel according to Jerry Clark, but I assume this is a reference to Festinger's "When Prophecy Fails". (I'm not familiar with the information Brad Sparks recently posted on this, by the way, and neither am I in a position to assess it.)

But at most what this research can tell us is that this particular cult behaved in this particular way at this particular time, not that every cult will behave in this way at every time. And that's assuming the research was indeed conducted in the way described - the rule that methodology should always be open to independent scrutiny seems to have been well and truly flouted in this case.

>3. The presence in any city of an active gay community means >that the city will have strong economic growth. (Richard >Florida's research, as set forth in his famous book "The Rise of >the Creative Class." Florida doesn't claim that the presence of >a gay community directly causes economic growth. But he does >think that tolerance for diversity is required for economic >progress, and theorized that the presence of an active gay >community was a sign of tolerance for diversity. The studies he >presents in his book seem to show that his prediction was >correct.

Ok, this is one I hadn't come across before (or maybe I did and forgot about it).

The obvious question is, has this research been independently replicated? But this type of research problem clearly belongs to the applied social science paradigm I described earlier - it involves the direct application of a methodology to a specific problem, independent of any supposed theory or knowledge base.

I've snipped your marketing examples, because these are clearly examples of an atheoretical, purely methodological approach (whether the methodology is rigorously empirical is another question). The same goes for your abortion example. I agree this is a fairly typical example of debate within the social sciences. What is also fairly typical is the lack of any definite conclusion.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Scheldroup

From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 14:01:50 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:21:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Scheldroup

>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:05:21 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>The truth was posted on UFO UpDates a very long time ago - on  
>September 5, 1997! In a post by Stig Agermose entitled "Heflin's  
>Photos Draw Fresh Fire From Skeptics" he includes the text of a  
>July 22, 1997 article in the Orange County Register by reporter  
>Amy Wilson.

>See:

><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

>In this article, people who know it is a toy train part relate  
>that they have known this for a very long time, and that it was a  
>joke gone out of control. Unlike Anonymous me, one of these  
>people, a retiree in Menlo Park, is named and interviewed.

>It amazes me that no one else on the List picked up on this at  
>the time and responded to Stig's post and that no one mentioned  
>the article in this latest discussion on Heflin.

>Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole  
>formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

>There have to be model train hobbyists on this List who can now  
>find the exact part that Rex used to create the 'craft'.

IMO, Probably 1/32 scale drive wheel of a model steam  
locomotive. Notice in the enhanced image, you can just make out  
the wheel hub protruding off the face of wheel.

This is shown on the diagram as feature P to face A.

<http://tinyurl.com/r6l74>

Manufacturers and Suppliers

<http://www.nmia.com/~vrbass/steam/steammfr.htm>

Making Model Locomotive Wheels

<http://www.nmia.com/~vrbass/steam/castwheel.htm>

<http://tinyurl.com/qf8a6>

John

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

### Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

From: **Richard Hall** <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:35:21 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:25:42 -0400  
Subject: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

Here is some background information on the Rex Heflin photo case, which was investigated from August 1965 on by the Los Angeles NICAP Subcommittee (LANS). NICAP was fortunate to have many meticulous investigators (including Ray Fowler, Walt Webb, and Fran Ridge) who intensively researched cases of this potential importance.

The leader of LANS was an unheralded woman, Idabel Epperson, who was a superb and articulate leader, organizer, recruiter of high-level scientific and analytical talent, and a shrewd judge of character. She was thorough, discreet, diplomatic, and as skilled an investigator as there was.

Over the years she and I stayed in touch, and I have just gone through a thick file of correspondence with her. What it shows is that even 10-12 years after 1965, through the demise of NICAP and the rise of the Mutual UFO Network (we both later became active in MUFON), the LANS personnel remained in touch with Rex Heflin and continued to gather pertinent information about the case.

The record also shows that the first hypothesis to be fully investigated was the possibility of a suspended model. Further, there have been previous "re-investigations" of the case (notably in 1977) ordinarily consisting of someone deciding that the photos were faked, but offering no real evidence of that and betraying ignorance of the thorough NICAP investigation which, to us, removed all doubt about the authenticity of the photos and the integrity of Rex Heflin.

For the benefit of those currently re-examining the case and attempting new analysis of the photographs, here are some excerpts from my Epperson file:

August 1967; LANS report and taped interview transcript of witnesses to a disc with dome seen in Santa Ana, California, during the first week of August in 1965 (the exact date could not be pinned down). While driving along the Santa Ana freeway a family saw a disc with dome hovering just above electric power lines. It was night and the object was glowing brightly. It appeared to be about 40 feet in diameter. As they slowed to a crawl to observe the object, it moved back and forth above the power lines for a distance of about 60 feet in the vicinity of the Broadway Street overpass. Other motorists also were stopped and looking at the object.

C.E. (Bud) Miller to Idabel Epperson, Nov. 10, 1973; annotated copy to Richard Hall. Miller reports that his sister hired a surveyor by the name of Mike Boehm to map out some parcels on her property. When the subject of UFOs came up in his presence, Boehm said that "he and his crew of surveyors who were working on the Santa Ana Freeway that day saw this disc out in a field and were watching it when it suddenly took off." Regrettably, Boehm was killed in an automobile accident soon after this chance encounter.

Idabel Epperson annotation on copy to Richard Hall: "Rex told us in the beginning that there had been a surveyor crew working near the Santa Ana Freeway - and that he wondered why they had

not seen the UFO - and reported it. He was right - they were working near the Freeway - not on it. We did not locate them at the time, but we are going to try very hard (at this late date) to locate some of them."

In 1976 William Spaulding of Ground Saucer Watch issued a report based on computer enhancement analysis techniques charging that the Heflin photographs were fakes, alleging that a line was discovered about the object. Supposedly the analysis was based on four different sets of the photographs, but the origins and generations of the photographs were never determined. This generated a new round of controversy.

Various LANS and NICAP personnel responded to queries about this charge. In a letter to David A. Schroth dated July 29, 1976, John R. Gray (engineer) stated: "It would seem that Mr. Spaulding has become victim of the same pitfalls encountered by previous skeptics of this particular sighting - namely, unfamiliarity (or gross disregard?) with the intrinsic peculiarities of the images in the photos. =85As one of the original NICAP field investigators involved in researching this case, I have only the highest regards for Mr. Heflin. Having the privilege of becoming acquainted with him in the ensuing years, I cannot conceive his character as ever permitting the perpetuation of a hoax."

Idabel Epperson to David A. Schroth, Aug. 10, 1976, reporting on the analysis by Dr. Robert Nathan at Jet Propulsion Laboratory, whom she protectively identifies only as Dr. A. "At first he was extremely reluctant to become involved - he said the pictures looked like a 'straw hat.'" =85[After discussing the case with him over a period of several months] finally he agreed to examine the photographs=85. With the type of equipment that he had to work with it was only natural that he should discover much detail that had not been visible to the others.

"He phoned me one day and seemed excited and exclaimed, 'This object is unearthly!' I asked why, and he answered '~There is a shimmering surrounding it.' =85Another time when he phoned me he told me the object had a dome and that the black band around it was 'particulate matter'; in other words, smoke or smog and particles. =85I wasn't too surprised when he announced to me a few days later that he was going to conduct his own investigation of the Heflin case. I was delighted. Of course he was going over ground that we had covered but that was all to the good. I had given him all of John Gray's calculations=85.

"Dr. A. telephoned Rex and talked with him and called Rex's supervisor and talked with him. =85 to the Chief of Police in Newport Beach, who had known Rex for many years. Dr. A. told me that the Chief of Police said, 'Rex Heflin is the last man on this earth who would perpetrate a hoax.' By this time Dr. A was completely convinced, by scientific examination of the UFO photos that they were real and not a hoax and that Rex Heflin was an honest man=85."

At this point Nathan decided to tell Brian O'Brien, a prominent Air Force advisory board scientist, his convictions about the Heflin case. Afterwards he told Epperson that he was "shocked and angry" when "O'Brien was not receptive and extremely sarcastic." Colorado Project (Condon Committee) personnel began to take Nathan along on UFO investigations in the area, and gradually Epperson noticed that his attitude toward UFOs was changing, and he appeared to lose interest. "He can't be blamed for putting his career first," she concluded.

Epperson then quotes a number of statements supportive of Heflin and the photographs made by Capt. Charles F. Reichmuth, investigating office for the Air Force Systems Command in a lengthy report based on a 3-1/2 hour interview with Heflin and on-site investigation. Heflin had reported seeing a rotating band of light on the underside of the object. Reichmuth (p. 138) noted:

"In photo Nr. 2 there is a faint indication of such a line running from the center outward at a relative bearing of about 280 degrees. Officials in the G-2 office at El Toro [Marine Air Station] stated that the line was clearly visible in the original photo." Reichmuth also quotes positive character statements about Heflin obtained from his co-workers and based on his own interview, concluding, "It appeared that he was a



normal, upright and tolerant citizen. From all appearances he is not attempting to perpetrate a hoax."

Later in her lengthy and cordial letter to Schroth, Epperson says: "Mr. Schroth, this is a small part of the story=85. one which we lived with for a long time - and apparently it isn't over yet. But we can't let something that is so patently false go unchallenged. This latest attack upon Heflin (eleven years late), with no attempt to check with the original investigators seems very curious."

Idabel Epperson to Richard Hall, May 24, 1977, re: the Spaulding hoax charge and the renewed controversy:

"Well, I could not stand by and watch is [Heflin's] name dragged through the mud by an individual that doesn't know what he is talking about at all, and whose motives are certainly questionable. Dick, I'm not one of those investigators who become subjective after getting acquainted with the witness. Even though I felt from the beginning that Heflin was honest, for several years afterwards I listened carefully to everything he said for any slip of the tongue that might give something away - but there was never even the slightest thing=85. Incidentally, he is still with the Orange County Road Dept. and has promotions and has a very important job now."

Idabel Epperson to Richard Hall, Aug. 17, 1977:

(Pop-schlock newsstand UFO magazines with almost non-existent editorial standards sprung up like mushrooms in the 1970s. One of them, Argosy, published a 1977 annual including an article by Hayden Hewes and William Spaulding. ) "As you can guess," Epperson said, "Rex Heflin takes a beating. This sentence is interesting (and infuriating);

`This case became a cause celebre in ufological circles due to some visits Heflin claimed to have received from alleged Air Force personnel, and their confiscation of the original prints.'

"The prints were NOT confiscated - and there were no threats of confiscation - and at no time did Heflin ever say or hint of such a thing. Heflin gave them free and unhesitatingly when men appeared with identifications of one of the military branches. He was bitterly criticized for doing just that and no one knew why he did it.

"Later when Rex became more acquainted with us he confided in me and told me the reason for this.=85 Since he did not believe in flying saucers and felt so certain that he had taken pictures of one of our own government's experimental craft - and then suffered pangs of guilt for having taken the pictures and felt that he had no right to have them - he gave them to members of the military readily because as he told me in confidence, `I felt that they had more right to them than I did.'=85

"Rex explained to me that the government owned all that land where the El Toro Marine Base was and in fact also included the land where the UFO appeared. Each side of Myford Road was lined with tall grass, highly inflammable, and Orange County Road Dept. had notified the Marine Base several times to clean it up. Everyone else in the area had cleaned up their dry grass - but not the government. And it was a hazard.

"Rex was driving slowly down Myford Road feeling quite resentful and thinking to himself that they thought they were above the law and refused to obey it even though it was a very bad hazard. It was in this mood of pique when he saw the object that he thought belonged to the Marine Base, and in a `split second' he reacted with the thought that he was `getting back at them' by taking pictures of their experimental craft. By nature Rex is a very conscientious person, and also patriotic too. So it was quite natural that he had second thoughts when he had `cooled off' and decided that he had done the wrong thing."

In a P.S. to her Aug. 17, 1977 letter, Epperson added: "In the first part of our investigation of the Heflin case it took us several weeks to finally convince Rex that UFOs really did exist. I don't know if you remember or not that during the first weeks of our investigation that Ed Evers was visiting Rex almost every night or at least phoning him.

"He lived quite close so it was easy for him to run over and see Rex for a while. Then Ed phoned me every day to report=85. If you remember, Dick, at that time I was writing you short notes about every week to keep you posted of everything that was happening. That seems like such a long time ago!"

In late summer of 1977 both Jerry Clark and Bruce Maccabee wrote to Robert J. Kirkpatrick of the Santa Ana Register, who had covered the story for his newspaper and had cooperated fully with the NICAP investigators. Both letters were stimulated by the Spaulding allegations. Phil Klass also got into the act, offering to pay for a polygraph examination of Heflin. (Letters and replies on file, from which the following excerpts are taken).

Kirkpatrick to Jerry Clark, Aug. 20, 1977: "As one of several people in this area intimately familiar with the details of Heflin's sighting and photos, it distresses me to see this Johnny-come-lately Spaulding's dictum that the Heflin photos are a `hoax' go unchallenged.

"I had the good fortune to be working on the news desk at The Register in Santa Ana when our chief photographer Clay Hiller printed the blow-ups of the Heflin photos and we broke the news story of his sighting and the Polaroid pictures he snapped. During the ensuing `flap' - involving a heated dispute with the U.S. Air Force - I became more and more interested in the subsequent developments in the Heflin case and kept thorough documentation of what occurred.

"Having talked with Heflin myself and having studied the authoritative testimonials supporting his character and the legitimacy of his photos, I am compelled to rush to his defense . =85 I'm submitting here some cogent facts - all documented - which I feel support the genuineness of the Heflin case=85. The Heflin photos were studied by Marine officials at El Toro Marine Corps Air Station. No suggestion of hoax was made. In fact, their findings substantiated some of Heflin's sighting observations=85"

Kirkpatrick to Bruce Maccabee, Sept. 5, 1977: "To be quite blunt about this belated controversy regarding the legitimacy of the Heflin UFO photos, I find it most annoying - 12 years after the photos first appeared - to find detractors, whose professional credentials and expertise I know nothing about, drawing conclusions (and publishing them) in such an irresponsible manner - and using copy photos of undetermined generation."

Following the new accusations and controversy in 1977, Epperson reported to me in an Oct. 10, 1977 letter that she had re-established cordial relations with Robert Nathan at JPL, who was extremely dubious of Spaulding's claims. He decided (in September of 1977) to conduct a new, complete computer enhancement study of the Heflin photos using the very latest equipment. The results again found no evidence of a hoax, and Nathan said: "The film was clear; there was no scratch whatsoever."

Robert Kirkpatrick to Phil Klass, Oct. 14, 1977, acknowledging the proposed polygraph test offer: "There is only one difficulty confronting us: Rex recently [several months previously] sustained a serious back injury while mountain climbing [in Colorado where he fell 60 feet down a mountainside], is suffering excruciating pain and is about to be hospitalized. However, he has indicated that he is willing to go along with your proposal after he is discharged from the hospital=85.

"I wish to point out that Heflin volunteered to take a polygraph test back in 1965=85but arrangements for the test were dropped when a polygraph expert [a professor at University of Southern California] insisted that the results of such a test would be inconclusive =85You must recognize that we are dealing with a very embittered man. While cooperating to the fullest with military authorities and the various news media back in 1965, he was subjected to intensive interrogation, was repeatedly maligned, ridiculed and often horribly misquoted.

"Heflin has not made a Roosevelt dime through his famous photos, yet both his detractors and defenders have used copy prints of his pictures, and profited thereby, in publishing a plethora of newspaper and magazine articles as well as books on the subject

of UFOs. It should be understandable=85that Heflin is embittered to see, at this late date, [new people] enter the scene to make irresponsible claims and attack him libelously, while he has no public forum through which to defend himself.

"But in view of your own stature as a nationally known UFO skeptic, Heflin is favorably inclined toward a polygraph session=85."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:27:44 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:28:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 15:38:29 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 12:31:51 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:08:50 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Tue, 6 Jun 2006 18:48:14 -0300  
>>>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>>>I can't follow your logic. Thousands of abductees and physical  
>>>>trace case witnesses from all over the world describe beings  
>>>>that don't look like Earthlings and vehicles that look and act  
>>>>like no known Earthling produced vehicle. Therefore they were  
>>>>produced somewhere other than earth which means they are of ET  
>>>>origin.

>>>>The UFO phenomenon itself and the Abduction phenomenon itself  
>>>>supports Lawson's research. The high number of blur zone cases -  
>>>>apparent high tech vehicle UFOs that exhibit characteristics  
>>>>suggesting they are not high tech vehicles at all - may support  
>>>>the research results that suggest the mind shapes the  
>>>>experience. (A police officer and several witnesses watch a  
>>>>completely silent demonstration of nuts and bolts high tech  
>>>>vehicles over a house for several hours while just next door  
>>>>other witnesses are cowering in fear from the most threatening  
>>>>noise they have ever heard. [Webster/Bedford case] Witnesses  
>>>>describe the interiors of UFOs being out of proportion to the  
>>>>size of the craft as observed from outside. [John E. Mack,  
>>>>Abduction: Human Encounters With Aliens])

>>>>You have the imaginary abduction research results of Al Lawson.  
>>>>You have anomalies in the 'real' abduction phenomenon (such as  
>>>>interiors of craft which seem out of proportion to the craft as  
>>>>viewed from outside). You have anomalies in the nuts and bolts  
>>>>high tech vehicles (such as high tech vehicles that are silent  
>>>>to one group of witnesses but noisy as hell to another group of  
>>>>witnesses a few feet away).

>>>>The sound anomaly could be the result of electrophonic hearing,  
>>>>namely highly directional radio frequency emissions perhaps a  
>>>>result of ET or non-ET based vehicle propulsion systems or some  
>>>>other non-vehicle based phenomena. We need proactive data rather  
>>>>than retrospective data.

>>>>Could be! Could also be that the walls of the house 'stepped-  
>>>>down' energies that were present around the 'vehicles' - much  
>>>>like the glass walls of a greenhouse affect sunlight - into an  
>>>>audible range. Could be a lot of things! That's the point. We

>don't have the answer. So it's premature to make any  
>conclusions. At this stage, it's just guessing. Curious that  
>when the police officer rapped on the door, the noise stopped,  
>yet the high tech vehicles continued their same manouvres over  
>the houses.

>>Also, the interior/exterior anomaly could be the result of  
>>virtual reality-type environments in an ET or non-ET based  
>>vehicle or, as you say, something else, since we haven't enough  
>>data.

>Could be! Could also be the result of virtual reality-type  
>environments created without any vehicles present at all, as in  
>Al Lawson's research results. Could be anything, as you say (and  
>as I say). Any conclusions, at this stage, are premature!

Sorry, Eugene, but I can't follow your logic nor accept your  
conclusions.

For those interested in Al Lawson's experiment and  
the serious problems with his and Eugene's conclusions, I would  
refer you to pages 756-759 of Volume 2 of Jerome Clark's UFO  
Encyclopedia. The detailed excellent article is Psychosocial  
Hypothesis.

I have already spent far too much time on this  
discussion. Those who don't have a copy can email me and I will  
send one or fax one.  
Sorry, Eugene, but I can't follow your logic nor accept your  
conclusions.

For those interested in Al Lawson's experiment and the serious  
problems with his and Eugene's conclusions, I would refer you to  
pages 756-759 of Volume 2 of Jerome Clark's UFO Encyclopedia.  
The detailed excellent article is Psychosocial Hypothesis.

I have already spent far too much time on this discussion. Those  
who don't have a copy can e-mail me and I will send one or fax  
it.

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: Brad Sparks <[RB47x.nul](mailto:RB47x.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:32:05 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:29:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:47:56 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 12:22:52 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>Keep in mind that digitization does 'funny things' like  
>>>sometimes surrounding an image with a faint halo such as you can  
>>>see around the object in the first presentation of said photo at  
>>>the web site. But then, you blow up the picture and the halo  
>>>goes away.

>>Sure. But on your site, the enlargement of the full Trent #1  
>>print has the blocky JPG artifacts, while your isolated blow-up  
>>of the saucer itself is cropped inside the area of greater  
>>brightness evident on the 600 dpi Olmos scan. So the two can't  
>>be compared to determine if the area of greater brightness is a  
>>scanning artifact, or inherent in the original image.

>>Link:

<http://img150.imageshack.us/img150/7075/compare23im.jpg>

>>Do you have a blow-up of the saucer that includes more of the  
>>background? Or a scan of the entire picture, but at a higher  
>>resolution?

>Tim,

>A few months ago Bruce already kindly sent me microdensitometer  
>scans across both axes of the negative through the object and a  
>scan of a print made by himself and Bob Schaeffer in 1975. I can  
>testify that there is no indication on these materials of any  
>halo.

>The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact  
>just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a  
>B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around  
>other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As  
>Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by  
>others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the  
>Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

I told Bruce in March 2006 that his own microdensitometer scans  
seemed to show the brightened region around the object in Photo  
1, which was not visible in Photo 2 and not on his scan for  
Photo 2 either.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## The U.S. Army's \$213.30 "Mistake"

From: Larry W. Bryant <[overtci.nul](mailto:overtci.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 23:10:17 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:34:11 -0400  
Subject: The U.S. Army's \$213.30 "Mistake"

Update on U.S. Army's \$213.30 "Mistake"

By Larry W. Bryant

Well, I guess the Army might fall short of the next annual FOIA "Rosemary Award" (under the negative-recognition program administered by the George Washington University-based National Security Archive).

Thanks to Virginia Senator George Allen's intervention on my behalf, the FOIA managers at Army headquarters have brought their counterparts at Fort Leonard, Mo., to their senses.

Here's the text of the June 8, 2006, mea culpa letter to Allen from one Robert Dickerson, chief of the U. S. Army Freedom of Information and Privacy Office:

---

Dear Senator Allen:

This is in response to your inquiry dated May 19, 2006, on behalf of your constituent, Mr. Larry Bryant, regarding his Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, for information concerning the rejection of his whistle-blower advertisement and for records pertaining to psychic detection.

We have contacted Fort Leonard Wood and have researched the circumstances of Mr. Bryant's FOIA requests. Upon reviewing the FOIA fee calculation pertaining to Mr. Bryant's FOIA request he submitted in 2004, it was discovered that a mistake was made when assessing the FOIA fee. Since the fee is invalid, we have decided in the best interests of your constituent and the Army, to waive the prior amount of \$231.30 and Mr. Bryant is no longer responsible for this fee. We have directed the FOIA Officer at Fort Leonard Wood to process Mr. Bryant's current request for psychic detection records. For the purpose of assessing FOIA fees, in accordance with Army Regulation 25-55, the department of the Army Freedom of Information Act Program, Mr. Bryant is considered an 'all others' requester. As such, he is required to pay for search fees exceeding two hours and cost of copies in access [sic] of 100 pages. If a FOIA fee is likely to result from processing his request, he will be notified in advance by the Fort Leonard Wood FOIA Officer. Mr. Bryant is invited to provide detailed justification to Fort Leonard Wood for consideration of commercial news media FOIA fee status.

I trust this will prove helpful to your constituent. If this office can be of further assistance, please contact Mr. Gary Hargrove at the above address on the letterhead or at (703) 428-6504.

Sincerely,

Robert Dickerson

---



On the same date as Dickerson's response, Wood's Sherry Barnes wrote me to announce her decision to lift her unpaid-debt-bar to processing my FOIA request sent to Wood on April 12, 2006 (re any records generated by the Wood-based U. S. Army Military Police School as regards psychic detection).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:08:53 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:49:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 12:31:21 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:40:37 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>>It is not wrong to take these leaps from logic. Logic gives us a  
>>consensus, a pat on the back so to speak, that our conclusions  
>>are "on the right track". Logic is a firm starting point. But it  
>>does not give us promise for any final conclusions. Logic is  
>>only another tool, like math and "the scientific method."

<snip>

>I agree with most of what you have said but...

>Do we take those leaps based on cutting away and ignoring a big  
>part of the picture, or are we supposed to consider all the data  
>(including the stuff that doesn't fit our explanation)?

>Because that's what's being done to prematurely conclude we're  
>dealing with high tech vehicle-flying, abduction-committing ET  
>aliens!

>Is it "not wrong" to ignore research and data that is relevant  
>when taking these "leaps from logic"?

Thanks Eugene! You know I have to answer you based on my own  
point of view. That's what it always comes down to, doesn't it,  
a person's own point of view, after all the facts they can  
review.

Right now I am satisfied with the conclusions of people like  
Stanton Friedman and Dr. David M. Jacobs, and many others on  
this list and off. I wasn't always this way, the proof is in my  
previous posts. But now I take those conclusions seriously.

That said, I still acknowledge 'truth' based on preponderance of  
evidence, meaning about 51%, with the scales of reason, my  
scales of reason, just slightly tipping one way or the other. I  
think most people do this, though they might admit it  
grudgingly! I see the limits of logic, math, the scientific  
method, objective reasoning, and the like. We humans are  
incapable of a "pure science". We can't be counted on to be that  
objective and scrupled, because we're hard-wired with feeling,  
and we have to pay the bills. I actually thank God for that!  
That subjectivity is one reason we use computers. But garbage  
in, garbage out, because while figures don't lie, liars always  
figure. So even accurate calculations have limits.

My preponderance is different than "beyond a reasonable doubt."  
That's why I kept asking for your list of infallibles, in my  
past posts. In my experience, beyond reasonable doubt has to be

reserved for the domain of each individual, and some small groups, like small groups on this list. These doubtless notions are rules to live by, and paradigms, using those tired old expressions because none else do.

You're not wrong for wanting any other explanation than an ET origin, especially a malevolent ET origin. But the preponderance seems to leave no other. As discouraging as that conclusion is, I still have faith in humanity. I like our company best, including the nasty among us, because with all our faults, we're still better than any other people, from my point of view!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 04:45:50 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:55:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>Still, my purely subjective impression is that  
>objects in the FLIR images seem much too bright to be  
>the distant oil wells no matter how many assumptions  
>of super infrared seeing conditions one makes.

>Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure  
>technical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't  
>know.

Besides we have the radar readings detecting also the objects to  
the right and in front of the airplane. An important element  
that Mr. Amateur Debunker conveniently has never mentioned, why?

Because to argue that radar can detect oil field flames would be  
nonsense and destroy the oil field hoax scheme unless he has a  
new Guinness record.

>>(Not that it proves anything, but last January I flew  
>>between Mexico City and Miami, the course of which  
>>would have been within 100 miles of the oil wells.  
>>It was nighttime and the weather was fairly clear,  
>>so I expected to have no problems seeing the giant  
>>flames burning off the wells in the Gulf, but I  
>>never saw I thing despite looking intently.)

Same as the Air Force to date using FLIR and Radar all the time  
and nothing like the March 5, 2004 phenomena. The case has been  
extensively researched and remains unexplained. The mexican UFO  
Disclosure lives.

Santiago

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 05:53:00 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 06:58:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

>From: Joe McGonagle <[joe.mcgonagle.nul](mailto:joe.mcgonagle.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 13:43:27 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:50:30 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>I am still perplexed as to why the Mexican Air Force  
>>decided to release the material to a popular  
>>entertainment figure and his cohorts, rather than to  
>>people like Rafael Navarro, Julio Herrera, Armando  
>>Arellano Ferro, and Jose de Jesus Franco Lopez from  
>>the esteemed UNAM, and those named could also not  
>>understand it.

>It's my understanding that that unit released the  
>information. Perhaps they didn't know or realise the  
>existence of the above. Cohorts is a desparaging word.

This is the correct information also released on Mexican  
television and radio:

Fact: Those UNAM scientists were indeed upset at that time for  
not being themselves the choosen ones to handle this case.

Fact: Just after the international press conference by Jaime  
Maussan releasing the SEDENA case to the world those UNAM  
scientists gave also their own press conference and announced  
that the lights recorded by the FLIR camera were just ball/  
spark lightning and claimed that a ball lightning could last  
even for half hour. In response to this statement the official  
research team under Jaime Maussan presented on national  
television and radio an exclusive interview with Mr. Robert  
Golka from Project Tesla who made an analysis to the footage and  
concluded the luminous objects were not in any way ball  
lightning.

Fact: At the same time an interview with Mr. Alberto Hernandez  
sub-manager of the National Meteorological Services, Mexico's  
official meteorological center was presented and Mr. Hernandez  
declared that according to the satellite images the conditions  
registered in the observatories and the satellite radar images  
showed stable conditions in all the Campeche zone for March 5,  
2004. There were no conditions for an electrical storm or any  
ball lightning on that zone that day and time.

Fact: Some days later a meeting was finally arranged among those  
UNAM scientists and the Air Force officials to preview the FLIR  
footage and discuss the incident. The scientists accepted and  
after the meeting they declared that they were wrong about the  
ball lightning explanation and these lights were certainly not

ball/spark lightning. This was an historic conclusion for the case from the scientist group.

Fact: In June 2005 Jaime Maussan presented Dr. Rafael Navarro on national television as a guest of honour paying tribute to him for being invited by NASA to collaborate in the search for life in Mars, certainly an honor for a mexican scientist. A very cordial interview between Maussan and Dr. Navarro cleared any difERENCE that may have existed due to the MAF case.

We have a huge database on the SEDENA/MAF case and just a small percentage is known outside Mexico therefore those outsiders ignoring so much facts on this major case instead of requesting updates with us prefer to disseminate disinformation on this case to serve their own pro-cover up/anti-UFO Disclosure interests and this is also a fact.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 08:51:11 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 07:04:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 09:36:53 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>Brief update: I have established that the Ed Riddle identified  
>is indeed the same guy and I am in correspondence with him. He  
>has already offered two quite interesting additions to his story  
>which I will pass on to the list ASAP.

List

As advertised, h/w the info on Ed Riddle, who turns out to be (IMO) neither a rabid debunker, nor a joker, nor a trouble-maker, but a reasonable and courteous gent. He admits some ambiguity in his story and in the end is trying to be honest about the limitations of his testimony. The bottom line seems to be that he was beyond reasonable doubt shown hoax photos, but there is a reasonable doubt that the hoax photos he was shown were taken by Heflin.

On 14 June I emailed him and got this reply:

---

"Yes, I'm the Ed Riddle who was mentioned in the Register. What I recall is pretty much what I said in the article. You're right, it was a long time ago and memories do fade.

The one thing that might be different from what I reported in the more recent article was who did it.

For a while my dim memory gave me my co-worker at the phone company as the one that took the pictures. However, it might have been his neighbor. I really don't remember.

In any case, the co-worker showed me the photos while we were at coffee break and we had a good laugh. You could clearly see that the "saucer" was a little train wheel, once it was mentioned.

He showed me pictures of the wheel hanging from the eaves of a garage and some out on the highway, hanging from a car window.

The wheel was suspended on thin mono-filament fishing line so you couldn't see it in the pictures.

It was sometime later, I don't remember how long, that I saw the same pictures in the Register. We had another laugh. Then, I thought that I should call the Register and tell them the truth.

The person I talked to, instead of thanking me for the information, was gruff and told me I'd have to prove what I was saying, as if I was trying to hoax them! I didn't pursue it any further, though.

"Heflin sounded like he wished never to be bothered again by people bringing it up. I guess I can see his point. I'm hoping that we don't embarrass him any more about it. You might want to



consider his wishes on this.

Ed

---

On Jun 15, I replied saying:

"There are measurements that do suggest a very small nearby model (like a 'train wheel') but other features that possibly don't. So I'm personally still undecided. But I wanted to get your take on these bits of Devil's Advocacy."

Ed replied with answers embedded in my text. Here I've reconstructed the exchange (MS = me, ER = Ed Riddle)

-----

MS. 1) The paper's strict standard of proof (as applied to you) seems a bit rich coming from a paper that has just published a man's amazing story of photographing a flying saucer. But on the other hand your story was really hearsay. You didn't know Heflin. Might the paper (perhaps hearing many opinions and counter-claims at that time) have reasoned this way: That what you were offering was third-hand, an impression formed by you about the opinion formed in turn by "some guy" (your informant) regarding pictures given him by "somebody he knew" who may or may not have been Rex Heflin himself?

ER. I didn't know why the reporter dissed me. I assumed at the time that it was because it would be embarrassing to the paper to have bought into a hoax, but I never pursued it so I don't really know. Unless you were to actually talk to the person I talked to, it's just speculation on my part.

MS. 2) According to the Air Force file many copies of the pictures were in circulation that August. Within days, friends made copies and "handed [these] out to various friends of friends, until most of Santa Ana was saturated with the UFO pictures." No doubt the town was also awash with rumours and opinions about them. The paper could have given your informant the benefit of the doubt in the context of an outrageous saucer claim. But perhaps if he had called the paper himself they would? Could we infer that he didn't?

ER. I didn't hear anything about whether he ever called the paper. I was on temporary assignment to the El Toro office. I may have left by the time the story broke.

MS. 3) Interestingly you now make two new points. The fact your colleague also showed you photos of the thing hanging from a garage roof seems the clincher that you saw hoax photos, and you mention a prior memory (prior to the 1997 Register story) of it having been your colleague who hoaxed the photos, which I infer may be the same thing you told the Register back in 1965. So let me suggest the possibility that you were shown copycat photos hoaxed by your colleague (if not your colleague's neighbour) in response to the Heflin photos that were circulating at that time. To falsify this we would need you to be certain, hand on heart, that a) your prior memory of your colleague having been the hoaxer was a mistake, and that b) what you saw in the Register maybe a month or so later (Sept 20) was definitely the exact same UFO in the same car window on the same highway.

ER. My memory about whether it was my colleague or his neighbor is not reliable. In fact, I may have never gotten it clear in the first place. My best recollection is that I had entered the discussion in the break room after my colleague started showing the pictures to another person (there were just 3 of us in the office). I assumed all this time that it was my coworker who made the pictures, but upon reflection, I realize I really don't know. I was focused on the pictures at the time.

However, I certainly did see a couple of pictures of the "train wheel" in a different context, where it looked like it was suspended from the eaves of a building. At the time, the

colleague said it was hanging from a mono-filament line attached to the edge of the garage, so that's how I took it. As I recall, there were 2 or 3 such pictures. If it is any help to you, I can assure you I did see such pictures. My memory is clear about that much, at least.

When I saw the pictures in the Register, I thought they were the same as the ones I had seen earlier; I immediately "recognized" them. However, to put a fine edge on it, I couldn't swear to it. Obviously, if someone wanted to create fake pictures that looked very similar to the originals, they could have. Since I didn't have the pictures in front of me, I couldn't make a detailed comparison.

MS. I apologise if all this seems like an imposition but your opinion here is important. I will pass on your reactions to the others involved if you have no objection.

ER. It is no imposition at all. I wish I could be more helpful. Good luck with your project.

-----

I hope this information helps to put the train wheel story into perspective.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/15/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 14:19:00 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 07:06:42 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/15/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 70  
June 15, 2006

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

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* "CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE IS BROKEN"  
\*\* AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND ON SATELLITE OPERATIONS  
\*\* IN OTHER NEWS  
\*\* SOME MORE CRS REPORTS

"CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE IS BROKEN"

Congressional oversight of intelligence is "dysfunctional," according to a new report from the liberal Center for American Progress.

Some of the most urgent and fundamental policy issues facing the nation are matters of intelligence policy: What are the proper boundaries of domestic intelligence surveillance? What is the legal framework for interrogation of enemy detainees? Why haven't the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission been effectively implemented?

But at a moment when intelligence policy is relatively high on the public agenda, the intelligence oversight committees in Congress seem to have little to contribute.

Even on specific intelligence questions such as the conduct of warrantless domestic surveillance by the National Security Agency, the public can gain more insight from the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has held several public hearings on the subject, than from the Senate Intelligence Committee, which has held none.

The new Center for American Progress report provides a useful survey of the history of intelligence oversight and its current failings, along with a prescription for improvement.

"Correcting the problems that plague congressional oversight of intelligence will not require dramatic changes in the existing oversight structure. Congress has all the tools it needs to conduct its oversight responsibilities effectively....it is simply not using them. It must."

See "No Mere Oversight: Congressional Oversight of Intelligence is Broken," June 13, 2006:

<http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=1761097>

Some of the limitations of intelligence oversight are implicit in the structure of the process.

For an earlier (1992) self-critical account by a staff member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, see "Congressional Oversight of Intelligence: One Perspective" by Mary K. Sturtevant, American Intelligence Journal, Summer 1992:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/sturtevant.html>

A recent study of Romania's intelligence apparatus finds that "legislative control of intelligence in Romania can be estimated on a low-medium-high scale as 'medium to high'."

Furthermore, in Romania "the budgets of the intelligence agencies are transparent," which is more than can be said about U.S. intelligence.

See "The Intelligence Phenomenon in a New Democratic Milieu: Romania -- A Case Study" by Valentin Fernand Filip, Naval Postgraduate School, March 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/world/romania/filip.pdf>

#### IN OTHER NEWS

The National Security Archive filed suit against the Central Intelligence Agency after the CIA began imposing costs to process Freedom of Information Act requests that it said were not "newsworthy" and therefore not entitled to a fee waiver.

By interposing its own editorial judgment in the FOIA process, the CIA in effect is "trying to close off use of the FOIA by journalists," said Archive General Counsel Meredith Fuchs.

See "CIA Claims the Right to Decide What is News," June 14:

<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20060614/index.htm>

The ACLU filed suit against the Pentagon seeking disclosure of information about the TALON (Threat and Local Observation Notice) database, which has been used improperly to store information on domestic political activities.

See "ACLU tries to force Pentagon to turn over records on peace groups" by Drew Brown, Knight Ridder Newspapers, June 14:

<http://www.realcities.com/mld/kriwashington/14818782.htm>

In almost every lawsuit against the government in which an agency invokes the "state secrets" privilege, the courts end up dismissing the entire case.

"But that's not the way it has to be," wrote constitutional scholar Louis Fisher of the Law Library of Congress in a new op-ed. "Judges have a constitutional duty to function as neutral referees to allow each side to present its case fairly."

See "Give judges a peek at secrets" by Louis Fisher, Los Angeles Times, June 14:

<http://tinyurl.com/govb5>

"The Pentagon has stopped releasing its assessment of the number of Iraqi army units deemed capable of battling insurgents without U.S. military help," in what appears to be a clear instance of politically-motivated secrecy.

"The decision to stop making the information public came after reports showed a steady decline in the number of qualified Iraqi units."

See "U.S. mum on strength of Iraqi troops" by Eric Rosenberg, Hearst Newspapers, June 12:

<http://tinyurl.com/rsxbv>

#### AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND ON SATELLITE OPERATIONS

The organization and management of U.S. Air Force space activities from pre-launch to post-operational disposal are

described in a new AF Space Command Instruction on "satellite operations."

"The objective of satellite disposal is to reduce the potential for spacecraft collisions and frequency interference, to mitigate the creation of additional space debris and to open orbital slots to newer SVs [satellite vehicles]."

"Therefore, de-orbiting or removing a non-mission capable satellite from its operational orbit and placing it into an established disposal region is of paramount importance."

See "Satellite Operations," U.S. Air Force Space Command Instruction 10-1204, 1 June 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/usaf/afspci10-1204.pdf>

#### SOME MORE CRS REPORTS

Some random reports of the Congressional Research Service that are not otherwise readily available in the public domain include the following:

"Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education Issues and Legislative Options," May 22, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL33434.pdf>

"Australia: Background and U.S. Relations," April 20, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/row/RL33010.pdf>

"China's Impact on the U.S. Automotive Industry," April 4, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL33317.pdf>

"The Congressional Charter of the American National Red Cross: Overview, History, and Analysis," March 15, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/misc/RL33314.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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul) with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](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](http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 07:07:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 01:04:13 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 11:14:47 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>Theory coinstruction has everything to do with scientific  
>>method. Hence there would appear to be more semantical  
>>confusion. here.

>I think there's a hell of a lot more than semantic confusion  
>here.

>There's a good reason why I say that theory construction is not  
>part of the scientific process. It's the testing and application  
>of theory which is part of the scientific process. Without  
>testing and application, theory is just a mathematical fairy  
>tale.

Hi Cathy,

Excuse the intervention, but isn't it little strong to say that theory construction is not part of the process? It surely is, else there would be no process. Pure experimental induction is (or would be if it existed) just the accumulation of lists of data and science could be done by machines. Isn't the hard bit, and the bit that transforms botanical lists into bodies of knowledge, the theory construction? Testing is the historical crux of a scientific process, yes, but a crux is a point of intersection rather than a stand-alone thing. After all, if you don't have a theory you can't test it.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Matt's Pollen Out

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 07:14:41 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 07:14:41 -0400  
Subject: Matt's Pollen Out

Source: The Mirror, London, UK

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/n4h3>

15 June 2006

Matt's Pollen Out  
By Graham Brough

Crop circle king Matt Williams has been forced to quit - because he has hay fever.

Matt, 35, is giving up his controversial hobby after being laid low by high pollen levels.

He sniffed yesterday: "I'll not be out this year - the hay fever is getting too bad. After a night in the fields, it takes me at least a day to recover." Matt, of Devizes, Wilts, is the only person ever convicted of crop circle-making.

He was fined =A3100 in 2000 for damaging crops after setting out to debunk claims that the complex circles could only be made by aliens.

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## So Where Are All The Crop Circles?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 07:24:58 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 07:24:58 -0400  
Subject: So Where Are All The Crop Circles?

Source: The Western Daily Press, Bristol, Devon, UK

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/s94k>

14 June 2006

So Where Are All The Crop Circles?

By Tristan Cork  
<[t.cork.nul](mailto:t.cork.nul)>

Hay fever, different crops, tragedy, emigration and yet more argument. Yes, the 2006 crop circle season is now under way... or is it? The rumours spreading around the wacky crop-circle world of Wiltshire are that there might not be as many of the mysterious formations this year as in previous summers.

While some people who claim to make the crop circles say they are hanging up their planks and ropes to have time out, others in the furtive world of the circlemakers pledge that this year will be the biggest yet.

And then, of course, there are the crop-circle devotees. They scoff at such planks-of-wood nonsense and say the more other-worldly circle-makers are sure to carry on.

One thing is certain, the possibility that there will be fewer, or even no crop circles this year, has sent the close-knit croppie community into a geometric vortex.

It was prompted by probably the most famous circlemaker in Wiltshire, Matthew Williams, announcing he would be taking a year off because hay fever, probably sparked by the increase in oil seed rape fields, was getting the better of him.

Mr Williams, still the only person in the world to be found guilty of crop circle criminal damage, said: "I'll not be out this year, it really is getting too bad. After a night in the fields, it takes me at least a day to recover."

He, and other crop circlemakers were also stunned by the death of one of their number, Paul Obee, who was found dead in a car at Erlestoke, near Devizes, last month.

He was a popular member of the circlemaking community, which is based around the Barge Inn pub at Honeystreet, in the heart of Wiltshire's crop-circle country. That tragedy, coupled with another prominent but unnamed circlemaker emigrating to Portugal, raised doubts that there wouldn't be many formations this year.

And, until this weekend, that appeared to be the case. The crop-circle enthusiasts' Bible, the website [cropcircleconnector.com](http://cropcircleconnector.com), failed to report a single formation throughout May and early June, when normally there would be at least a dozen early happenings.

Enthusiasts of course, don't believe all, or even most, circles are made by a group of 'landscape artists' with planks of wood and a computer-aided graphic design sheet and they can spot a hoax a mile off.

They are still expected to come in their thousands to Wiltshire this summer, looking for more evidence and clues to the real perpetrators of the crop circle phenomenon. They will also be engaging scientists to show the intense heat and energy used to create a real crop circle, as well as trying to capture the balls of light many have seen around the time of the creation of crop circles.

This weekend, despite the fears of a barren year, a beautiful geometric circular formation appeared at West Overton, near Avebury. And now all appears to be right with the crop-circle world again.

Circlemaker John Lundberg, from London, said yesterday this year would be the best yet for crop circles. "To be fair to him, Matt Williams hasn't made a crop circle in years, probably not since he was arrested. Paul's death was tragic and did hit everyone hard, but there's more than three or four people making circles and it's business as usual.

"This year is an important year for us, as it is the 30th year since Doug and Dave (the first people to claim they hoaxed crop circles) first made a circle. We're going to have the biggest summer yet, and I'm looking forward to it."

Mr Lundberg and his colleagues Robert Irving and Mark Pilkington have a book published this month entitled A Field Guide: The Art, History And Philosophy of Crop Circle Making.

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Burns

From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:29:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:53:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Burns

>Source: The Mirror, London, UK

><http://tinyurl.co.uk/n4h3>

>15 June 2006

>Matt's Pollen Out  
>By Graham Brough

>Crop circle king Matt Williams has been forced to quit - because  
>he has hay fever.

<snip>

Dear all,

Matt Williams was at my house for a couple of days this week. A friend called round with the Daily Mirror in his hand and pointed it out to Matt.

His comment, "I have not spoken to anyone from the Daily Mirror."

The circle-makers have decided they are not going to do any this summer. Hence only 3 crop circles have appeared. Of poor quality and obviously done by random people wanting to try for themselves - without the technical know-how.

The pundits are quickly formulating new theories as to why the circles are not appearing. Just happens to coincide with the circle-makers ceasing activity this year.

Matt has spoken of these comments but not to the Mirror.

T-shirt sales may be down this summer and we may be struggling for 12 pictures for the season.

I can see the crop circle-traders generating their own product by the time the leaves fall.

Personally I would rather spend the evening howling at the moon...

Max

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:53:07 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:52:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: Greg Sandow <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 12:26:36 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>3. The presence in any city of an active gay community means  
>that the city will have strong economic growth. (Richard  
>Florida's research, as set forth in his famous book "The Rise of  
>the Creative Class."

<snip>

>There's also a kind of applied social science where reliable  
>results are very important - marketing.

<snip>

>Finally, here's a detailed example of scientific thinking  
>applied to a sociological problem, from a New York Times article  
>in 2001.

<snip>

>Their theory was that  
>legalized abortion leads to lower crime rates.

A couple of other points about this type of research I didn't  
have time to get to yesterday:-

The first is pretty simple. Methodologies of this kind are  
limited to uncovering correlations, but finding a correlation  
between two variables does not in itself tell you which variable  
is causing which, or indeed whether neither variable is causing  
the other and instead both are correlated with some other,  
unseen variable. Hence the statistician's mantra, "Correlation  
does not imply causation".

The second is more subtle. In any given social sciences context,  
there are always more variables than you can control for. Some  
of these variables may confound or mask the correlation you are  
looking for. Accordingly, you may want to "weed out" these  
confounding or masking variables.

But this is obviously open to abuse, because if you don't like  
the result you get, you can always throw out variables (under the  
guise of "control") until you get the result you want. By this  
means, you can actually "sculpt" a correlation out of purely  
random data, simply by selecting variables on the grounds of ad  
hoc rationalization.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:16:55 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:00:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 08:51:11 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 09:36:53 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>Brief update: I have established that the Ed Riddle identified  
>>is indeed the same guy and I am in correspondence with him. He  
>>has already offered two quite interesting additions to his story  
>>which I will pass on to the list ASAP.

>List

>As advertised, h/w the info on Ed Riddle, who turns out to be  
>(IMO) neither a rabid debunker, nor a joker, nor a trouble-  
>maker, but a reasonable and courteous gent. He admits some  
>ambiguity in his story and in the end is trying to be honest  
>about the limitations of his testimony. The bottom line seems to  
>be that he was beyond reasonable doubt shown hoax photos, but  
>there is a reasonable doubt that the hoax photos he was shown  
>were taken by Heflin.

<snip>

Yes, Martin, this does help a lot by putting the matter into  
perspective. I was quick to assume that he must be a liar (for  
my own good reasons) and apologize for that.

His story now is entirely plausible, and it seems clear to me  
that someone else did make copycat fakes as a joke.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:47:11 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:02:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 04:45:50 +0000  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

><snip>

>>Still, my purely subjective impression is that  
>>objects in the FLIR images seem much too bright to be  
>>the distant oil wells no matter how many assumptions  
>>of super infrared seeing conditions one makes.

>>Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure  
>>technical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't  
>>know.

>Besides we have the radar readings detecting also the objects to  
>the right and in front of the airplane. An important element  
>that Mr. Amateur Debunker conveniently has never mentioned, why?

>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field flames would be  
>nonsense and destroy the oil field hoax scheme unless he has a  
>new Guinness record.

Santiago et al,

I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it is possible that radar could detect oil field flames. Speaking very generally a flame is a conductive plasma, which could be associated with a great deal of turbulence in the heat column, plus there may be clouds of smoke particulates. Any or all of these - flame, turbulence, smoke - could in principle cause a radar echo. But I know nothing of the radar type or other essential details of the case so won't comment further.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Anonymous

From: **Anonymous** <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:05:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Anonymous

John Scheldroup has helped solve the Heflin 'mystery' in his last post. His photo enhancement and diagram are correct:

"A 1/32 scale drive wheel of a model steam locomotive" is precisely what the 'craft' is. Particularly insightful is his observation "You can just make out the wheel hub protruding off the face of the wheel."

Find the earliest generation print and enhance further. Dig a little deeper into pre-1960 toy/model trains and you will find the exact part used.

Combine 1) John's findings with 2) Tim Shell's airshow donut hole formations with 3) brave Ed Riddle's interviews- and the 40 year old Heflin "mystery" is solved !

Incidentally, I am not a skeptic on ET phenomena - I am, in fact, an unabashed believer. But too much time has been spent on obvious hoaxes i.e. the autopsy, Ed Walters, etc. I simply want the UFO research community to concentrate on genuine ET phenomena and not on pranksters or on opportunists.

And yes, usually "anonymous" types should be taken with a grain of salt. But sometimes "anonymous" types do not want to get involved simply because they-

- 1) are ashamed they did not come forward earlier
- 2) their family may be in a business or other pursuit where it may be perceived unfavorably to be associated publicly with UFOs
- 3) they want to spur others on to finding 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:36:19 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:07:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:27:44 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 15:38:29 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>Could be! Could also be the result of virtual reality-type  
>>environments created without any vehicles present at all, as in  
>>Al Lawson's research results. Could be anything, as you say (and  
>>as I say). Any conclusions, at this stage, are premature!

>Sorry, Eugene, but I can't follow your logic nor accept your  
>conclusions.

>For those interested in Al Lawson's experiment and  
>the serious problems with his and Eugene's conclusions, I would  
>refer you to pages 756-759 of Volume 2 of Jerome Clark's UFO  
>Encyclopedia. The detailed excellent article is Psychosocial  
>Hypothesis.

I never said I accept all of Alvin Lawson's conclusions - just  
that it indicates a different process may be operating during  
UFO incidents and abduction events (a process different than  
flesh and blood ET aliens driving nuts and bolts high tech  
vehicles). I've not even said ET can't be involved.

You mentioned "Eugene's conclusions" - let's be clear that I've  
not made any conclusions at all (unlike you) regarding the  
origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon (I'm talking about the  
whole UFO phenomenon, not just a hand-picked and chosen,  
carefully roped-off to match certain descriptions, arbitrarily  
categorized, seperated from all the messy cases portion of the  
UFO phenomenon).

And don't try to make it look like I'm advocating a  
psychosocial explanation! I've said it many times in this  
discussion that I consider it very possible that an outside  
intelligence is using processes intrinsic to the human mind to  
manipulate our perceptions of itself and of our reality. This  
intelligence could be ET or could be something else (like  
representatives of an older Earth-based technological  
civilization).

I've just asked how you justify ignoring all other possible  
answers (in view of such things as ancient artifacts that  
suggest earlier Earth-based technological civilizations and  
cases like the Khoury case that imply humans behind the  
abduction events) and how you justify cutting away and ignoring  
the majority of UFO cases (the non-high tech vehicle cases),  
cutting away and ignoring the high tech vehicle cases that have  
characteristics that indicate they might not be high tech  
vehicles at all (blur zone cases) - so that you're left with a  
nice neat little pile of cases that have the qualities you want  
(qualities that suggest an ET high tech vehicle or spaceship) -  
while you cut away and ignore research such as Lawson's that

suggests a different process may be at work - especially when hints of the process seen in Lawson's work is also seen in the non high tech vehicle incidents, as well as in the high tech vehicle incidents that have characteristics suggesting they may not be high tech vehicles at all.

These are only fair questions! Not hard "logic" to follow! You're making a fantastic claim - that is, you've made the fantastic conclusion "some UFOs are ET spaceships" - so you should be able to back it up. All you've offered, in essence, is: the hugh number of high tech vehicle cases suggest they are not from here and therefore they must be ET spaceships, and, since it looks this way, it must be. Now that's "logic" \_I\_ can't follow!

>I have already spent far too much time on this discussion. Those  
>who don't have a copy can email me and I will send one or fax  
>one.

Okay, Stan! You don't have to get \_specific\_! You don't have to spend any more time on this discussion. I'll consider it closed if that's how you want it! Unless you want to keep discussing it!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:56:03 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:42:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:08:53 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>That said, I still acknowledge 'truth' based on preponderance of  
>evidence, meaning about 51%, with the scales of reason, my  
>scales of reason, just slightly tipping one way or the other. I  
>think most people do this, though they might admit it  
>grudgingly! I see the limits of logic, math, the scientific  
>method, objective reasoning, and the like. We humans are  
>incapable of a "pure science". We can't be counted on to be that  
>objective and scrupled, because we're hard-wired with feeling,  
>and we have to pay the bills. I actually thank God for that!  
>That subjectivity is one reason we use computers. But garbage  
>in, garbage out, because while figures don't lie, liars always  
>figure. So even accurate calculations have limits.

>My preponderance is different than "beyond a reasonable doubt."

<snip>

Well, if that's the way you do it ...

Your "preponderance," however, should include the cases and  
research that conflict with what you "subjectively" accept.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Anderson

From: Paul Anderson <[paulanderson.nul](mailto:paulanderson.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 08:17:32 -0700  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:48:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Anderson

>From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:29:38 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Matt's Pollen Out

>Matt Williams was at my house for a couple of days this week. A  
>friend called round with the Daily Mirror in his hand and  
>pointed it out to Matt.

>His comment, "I have not spoken to anyone from the Daily  
>Mirror."

>The circle-makers have decided they are not going to do any  
>this summer. Hence only 3 crop circles have appeared. Of poor  
>quality and obviously done by random people wanting to try for  
>themselves - without the technical know-how.

There are 5 formations now in the UK and 11 in other countries (primarily Italy) so far... a very slow start to the English season this year. But, if there are still fewer formations by the end of the season in England, maybe this will help people to see what is happening in other countries more, including here in Canada. Some of the most interesting formations over the years have been found here and elsewhere (including the scientific evidence), so if the UK circlemakers take a break this year, I for one will not be too disappointed. They have taken the focus off of the genuine formations, including in England of course, for far too long now.

--

Canadian Crop Circle Research Network  
<http://www.cccrn.ca>

The Prairie Circular  
the weblog of the canadian crop circle research network  
<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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:27:59 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:49:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On

>From: Brad Sparks <[RB47x.nul](mailto:RB47x.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:32:05 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>A few months ago Bruce already kindly sent me microdensitometer  
>>scans across both axes of the negative through the object and a  
>>scan of a print made by himself and Bob Schaeffer in 1975. I can  
>>testify that there is no indication on these materials of any  
>>halo.

>>The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact  
>>just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a  
>>B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around  
>>other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As  
>>Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by  
>>others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the  
>>Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

>I told Bruce in March 2006 that his own microdensitometer scans  
>seemed to show the brightened region around the object in Photo  
>1, which was not visible in Photo 2 and not on his scan for  
>Photo 2 either.

Hi Brad

I need help to see this on the density curves.

Bruce's horizontal curve of Photo 1 seems to show a fairly smooth average trend from the centre to the edge, both left and right of the UFO. A gentle decline in negative density away from the centre would be expected due to off-axis light fall-off in camera optics. Plus there is a small variation in sky brightness that biases this whole curve slightly towards the left of the frame. But I see no step change corresponding to the fairly well-defined elliptical halo that appears on the colour scan.

The vertical curve doesn't cover the whole width of the negative but is much better resolution. The curve below the object looks near monotonic to me, and the indication of a slight brightening above follows the general brightness trend of the sky background so doesn't seem anomalous. I think Bruce commented that averaged density resolution here is in the region of 2%, so a ~5% variation should show up.

On the other hand, playing with the Maccabee/Schaeffer blow up of the immediate object area I do see a curious texture of patchy density in the area around the UFO, with a suggestion of linear features almost like fingerprint friction ridges or magnetised iron filings. At very high contrast there's also some "hairiness" of the top and bottom edges. I wouldn't say any of this resembles the colour-scan "halo", but it is a coincidence. Am I seeing faces in the clouds here or does anyone else see it

Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On

too?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 10:32:04 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:50:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>I think one thing being lost in the translation is that the  
>>Compache oil wells are not showing up now, why would they back  
>>then. Now before the barbs come out, that's what I'm getting  
>>from the emails posted by Santiago.

>To speculate, infrared is heavily absorbed by moisture, which  
>was one reason I was puzzled that the FLIR sensors could pick up  
>the oil wells at a distance of ~100 miles. Therefore, if it was  
>an unusually dry day over the Gulf of Mexico (if such conditions  
>ever exist), perhaps enough infrared leaked through to be  
>detected by the sensors.

<>snip>

>Still, my purely subjective impression is that objects in the  
>FLIR images seem much too bright to be the distant oil wells no  
>matter how many assumptions of super infrared seeing conditions  
>one makes. Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure  
>technical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't know.  
>Perhaps Bruce Maccabee and James Smith would care to comment.

>(Not that it proves anything, but last January I flew between  
>Mexico City and Miami, the course of which would have been  
>within 100 miles of the oil wells. It was nighttime and the  
>weather was fairly clear, so I expected to have no problems  
>seeing the giant flames burning off the wells in the Gulf, but I  
>never saw I thing despite looking intently.)

I like your reasoning and you raise a good question which is  
where we need an expert. It is a logical point and well  
thought out unlike Mr. Garza's armwaving. Although the  
gas flares are seen easily by Landsat satellites, this does not  
address the slant distance you are referring to which  
means you have to pass through more water vapor.

I can say that they did definitely image with the FLIR one gas  
flare on land near the coast at less than 100 miles (I forget  
how far, but I think it was about half that). It was very  
bright, similar to the UFO fleet but I did not measure the  
actual video intensity values. I can dig up that data if you are  
interested and repost it if you think it would help matters.  
Because if we definitely know that point, then we can derive the  
farther distance infrared intensity, right?

Also the Landsat infrared intensity pixel values are "off the  
scale" (exceed the limit of the sensor elements for that  
wavelength band) for all the gas flares I geolocated in the  
Campeche region.

The main reason I conclude that the UFO fleet are gas flares is based on the unique/limited number of Landsat-derived gas flare coordinates and how they appear if

- 1) plotted in three dimensions
- 2) from the perspective of the aircraft and
- 3) using the FLIR narrow fields of view.

If the collective pattern of gas flare lights did not match the FLIR video I would drop the whole thing.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:06:11 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:52:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 05:53:00 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>We have a huge database on the SEDENA/MAF case and just a small  
>percentage is known outside Mexico therefore those outsiders  
>ignoring so much facts on this major case instead of requesting  
>updates with us prefer to disseminate disinformation on this  
>case to serve their own pro-cover up/anti-UFO Disclosure  
>interests and this is also a fact.

Well, it was so easy to distribute the UFO FLIR video to the world, what's the problem with sending out the video confirming that the Air Force FLIR cameras cannot see the gas flares?

What's the problem of posting the expert analysis that shows the "fleet UFOs" cannot possibly be gas flares?

We would all be interested in your expert analysis. But don't armwave that it can't possibly be gas flares!

Show us the analysis!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Paintsville UFO/Train Collision Case - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:15:52 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:53:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: Paintsville UFO/Train Collision Case - Smith

>From: Frank Warren <[frank-warren.nul](mailto:frank-warren.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 16:41:09 -0700  
>Subject: Paintsville UFO/Train Collision Case

>Since that time Robby has recently replied to the "engineer's"  
>missive. In any event, the original account is back in my "gray  
>basket" (thanks Stan) and methinks this story is certainly worth  
>further investigation. Peter, has invited Mark Rodeghier (CUFOS)  
>to get involved given his geographical location.

An interesting case.

I checked the Federal Railroad Administration records:

<http://safetydata.fra.dot.gov/OfficeofSafety/Downloads/Default.asp>

but couldn't find any case that matched the event.

Not that I expected any if it was being covered up of course,  
but I just wondered if it could have been some  
misunderstanding... rock slide... something!

Examining railroad photo databases showed that the train (CSXT  
#3) is still seen in 2003 and 2004.

A discussion group lists that someone had heard the trains to be  
specifically with the numbers: CSX 234 and CSX 287:

[http://www.trains.com/community/forum/topic.asp?page=2&TOPIC\\_ID=66150](http://www.trains.com/community/forum/topic.asp?page=2&TOPIC_ID=66150)

Anyone heard the source of those numbers for the event?

Anyway, the train photo database also shows these still shipping  
freight.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:50:48 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:56:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Brad Sparks <[RB47x.nul](mailto:RB47x.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:32:05 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:47:56 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 12:22:52 -0400  
>>>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>>Keep in mind that digitization does 'funny things' like  
>>>>sometimes surrounding an image with a faint halo such as you can  
>>>>see around the object in the first presentation of said photo at  
>>>>the web site. But then, you blow up the picture and the halo  
>>>>goes away.

>>>>Sure. But on your site, the enlargement of the full Trent #1  
>>>>print has the blocky JPG artifacts, while your isolated blow-up  
>>>>of the saucer itself is cropped inside the area of greater  
>>>>brightness evident on the 600 dpi Olmos scan. So the two can't  
>>>>be compared to determine if the area of greater brightness is a  
>>>>scanning artifact, or inherent in the original image.

>>>>Link:

>>>><http://img150.imageshack.us/img150/7075/compare23im.jpg>

>>>>Do you have a blow-up of the saucer that includes more of the  
>>>>background? Or a scan of the entire picture, but at a higher  
>>>>resolution?

>>>>A few months ago Bruce already kindly sent me microdensitometer  
>>>>scans across both axes of the negative through the object and a  
>>>>scan of a print made by himself and Bob Schaeffer in 1975. I can  
>>>>testify that there is no indication on these materials of any  
>>>>halo.

>>>>The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact  
>>>>just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a  
>>>>B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around  
>>>>other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As  
>>>>Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by  
>>>>others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the  
>>>>Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

>>>>I told Bruce in March 2006 that his own microdensitometer scans  
>>>>seemed to show the brightened region around the object in Photo  
>>>>>1, which was not visible in Photo 2 and not on his scan for  
>>>>>Photo 2 either.

Interesting. Well, being the hands-on kind of guy I am, here's what I was able to come up with to check out the glow:

<http://img388.imageshack.us/img388/2162/mcminglow5vm.jpg>

It's a weird artifact, all right. I wonder what causes it.

Anyway, that's why I come to this List with questions. There's always somebody who knows about it who can point me in a different direction.

Of course, it still makes using the photo problematic for me. And it still makes me wonder why the #1 photo is so different than the #2 photo, which shows no indication of this glow. But perhaps those are questions for another day.....

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:01:07 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:57:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 04:45:50 +0000  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>Still, my purely subjective impression is that  
>>objects in the FLIR images seem much too bright to be  
>>the distant oil wells no matter how many assumptions  
>>of super infrared seeing conditions one makes.

>>Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure  
>>technical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't  
>>know.

>Besides we have the radar readings detecting also the objects to  
>the right and in front of the airplane. An important element  
>that Mr. Amateur Debunker conveniently has never mentioned, why?

Uh, I suppose you are referring to me, Mr. Garza? I guess if I  
sold a book or video tape this would make me professional and  
thus more worthy of notice.

Anyway, as I have stated in several past postings on this topic,  
based on Dr. Maccabee's excellent collection of video  
transcription and video/aircraft events/times, it is correct  
that there is a radar detection in the minutes prior to the  
"fleet UFOs". However, the radar reading also disappears prior  
to the "fleet UFOs". Thus there is absolutely no radar reading  
from the "fleet UFOs" during their appearance on the FLIR video  
tape. If you have some secret groundbased radar tape that you  
wish to share with the world, we would be glad to see it. But  
really, you will never get a radar reflection off of the gas  
burnoff flares!

That one radar reflection and infrared image seem to be an  
unknown aircraft, but it is not known for sure so is a UFO  
although I doubt the Mexican Air Force would call all such  
single light/radar reflecting objects that. They would likely  
call it an unknown aircraft. Too bad they could not do their job  
and go after it or get better data from the ground radar.

>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field flames would be  
>nonsense and destroy the oil field hoax scheme unless he has a  
>new Guinness record.

>>>(Not that it proves anything, but last January I flew  
>>>between Mexico City and Miami, the course of which  
>>>would have been within 100 miles of the oil wells.  
>>>It was nighttime and the weather was fairly clear,

>>>so I expected to have no problems seeing the giant  
>>>flames burning off the wells in the Gulf, but I  
>>>never saw I thing despite looking intently.)

>Same as the Air Force to date using FLIR and Radar all the time  
>and nothing like the March 5, 2004 phenomena. The case has been  
>extensively researched and remains unexplained. The mexican  
>UFO Disclosure lives.

Again you have not proven anything. How do we know the Mexican Air Force is doing anything you say it is? How do you know it is? Did you fly in the aircraft? Did you review the FLIR video? Did you map the path and correlate the camera angles? I doubt it. You are simply taking their word for it. You are simply trusting them. You don't want to burn any bridges with them by questioning them or making them lose face.

We can trust that the FLIR video was not a hoax since it matches independently observed reality (Landsat photos). Your other statements about subsequent Air Force flights are not real until you provide the video footage that we can then substantiate.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:54:27 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:59:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 22:05:40 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>A few months ago Bruce already kindly sent me microdensitometer  
>>scans across both axes of the negative through the object and a  
>>scan of a print made by himself and Bob Schaeffer in 1975. I can  
>>testify that there is no indication on these materials of any  
>>halo.

>I understand.

>>The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact  
>>just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a  
>>B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around  
>>other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As  
>>Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by  
>>others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the  
>>Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

>Now I'm curious to see if the same photo I'm working with will  
>show those lighter areas around dark objects like the mid-  
>distance phone line pole, like you say. Just out of curiosity.

And here it is:

<http://img388.imageshack.us/img388/2162/mcminglow5vm.jpg>

As Artie Johnson used to say, "Very interesting!" See, that's  
why I come to this board. Always somebody here who can point me  
in a new direction.

Well, it still means I have to find a different photo for my  
evil experiments. And I still wonder why the #1 photo is so  
different from the #2 photo, which has not indication of these  
weird glow. Another question for another day.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:54:41 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:02:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Hall

>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
>Subject: Heflin Mystery Solved

>John Scheldroup has helped solve the Heflin 'mystery' in his  
>last post. His photo enhancement and diagram are correct:

>"A 1/32 scale drive wheel of a model steam locomotive" is  
>precisely what the 'craft' is. Particularly insightful is his  
>observation "You can just make out the wheel hub protruding off  
>the face of the wheel."

>Find the earliest generation print and enhance further. Dig a  
>little deeper into pre-1960 toy/model trains and you will find  
>the exact part used.

>Combine 1) John's findings with 2) Tim Shell's airshow donut  
>hole formations with 3) brave Ed Riddle's interviews- and the 40  
>year old Heflin "mystery" is solved !

>Incidentally, I am not a skeptic on ET phenomena - I am, in  
>fact, an unabashed believer. But too much time has been spent on  
>obvious hoaxes i.e. the autopsy, Ed Walters, etc. I simply want  
>the UFO research community to concentrate on genuine ET  
>phenomena and not on pranksters or on opportunists.

>And yes, usually "anonymous" types should be taken with a grain  
>of salt. But sometimes "anonymous" types do not want to get  
>involved simply because they-

>1) are ashamed they did not come forward earlier

>2) their family may be in a business or other pursuit where it  
>may be perceived unfavorably to be associated publicly with UFOs

>3) they want to spur others on to finding the truth.

Now I'm getting confused; do we have more than one Mr.  
Anonymous, or is this Ed Riddle again? Whoever it is should add  
point No. 4 about why anonymous people do not want to get  
involved: Because they like to foster their own ill-founded  
opinions as if they were established fact, without being  
personally responsible for their assertions.

In my previous post I pointed out that Dr. Robert Nathan, who is  
one of the very few people who did work with earliest generation  
prints, in 1977 did re-investigate using state-of-the-art  
equipment, and there was no string, no scratch, not a thing  
suggesting a model. There was, however, a lot of evidence  
suggesting an extraordinary object of unknown origin, and  
(something that doesn't seem to sink in with debunkers) that  
Heflin was an honest and honorable man.

Heflin received highly positive character ratings from NICAP  
investigators, co-workers, police, and even the Air Force  
Systems Command investigator -- who interrogated Heflin at  
length, checked on his character, and determined that Marine  
Corps officials had verified a significant feature of his

observation that was recorded on film. This, of course, unlike nameless people who throw out off-the-wall opinions based on no cited investigation.

So spare me your debunking personal opinions based on nothing but speculation, and if you are too cowardly to identify yourself, you deserve no credibility at all. - Richard Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:55:49 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:35:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:27:44 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 15:38:29 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>Could be! Could also be the result of virtual reality-type  
>>environments created without any vehicles present at all, as in  
>>Al Lawson's research results. Could be anything, as you say (and  
>>as I say). Any conclusions, at this stage, are premature!

>Sorry, Eugene, but I can't follow your logic nor accept your  
>conclusions.

Well, it's not that hard to follow!

You made a conclusion: "some UFOs are ET spaceships." I say this  
is a premature conclusion!

You base your conclusions (there are high tech vehicles and they  
are piloted by ET aliens) on: there a hugh number of cases -  
many with physical trace evidence - describing high tech  
vehicles that fly up, up and away and that perform beyond the  
levels of our technology - and that there are a hugh number of  
cases that describe the pilots of these vehicles and cases as  
well that demonstrate these pilots are performing abductions on  
human beings. I say, "Maybe so! You might be right!"

I then ask you to justify why you are sure there are indeed high  
tech vehicles and then how you know for sure they are piloted by  
ET aliens. All you offer is: a hugh number of cases exist that  
describe same, which is tantamount to saying: it looks like this  
is the case, so it is. (Witnesses are describing high tech  
vehicles and alien pilots/abductors, so there is indeed high  
tech vehicles and alien pilots/abductors - "if it looks like a  
duck, waddles like a duck, quacks like a duck then it is a  
duck.")

I point out that there is a hugh category of UFO cases that  
describe non-high tech vehicles. I point out that there are a  
hugh number of such cases that suggest intelligence is involved  
in even these non- high tech vehicle cases. I point out there is  
even a category of apparent high tech vehicle cases but these  
'vehicles' possess characteristics that suggest they may not be  
high tech vehicles at all (blur zone cases). I point out there  
are numerous anomalies in the abduction scenario (interiors of  
craft that are out of proportion to the size of the craft as  
seen from outside). There are many others, too, that I didn't  
mention such as 'abductees' taking on the identities of 'aliens'  
themselves under hypnosis (Abduction: Human Encounters With  
Aliens by John E. Mack). I point out that there is research  
(such as Lawson's) that suggests a different process is at work  
- and that hints of this process is seen in the (1) non-high  
tech vehicle cases, (2) blur zone cases, and (3) abduction scene  
cases, of the real UFO phenomenon.

I ask why you feel none of this is relevant (and you have even stated that it is irrelevant). I ask you to justify how you can cut away and ignore all of this and justify why you can just pick certain UFO event cases and certain abduction cases - the well-behaving high tech vehicle cases and the well-behaving abduction cases. You don't justify it.

I ask you to either (1) justify why none of the above is relevant, or (2) provide explanations for these anomalies. You do neither, except to state "I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems" but you offer nothing to prove this to be the case. Proclamations!

So, in acknowledging that the whole UFO phenomenon involves a huge number of cases that don't describe high tech vehicles and that a lot of these cases seem to involve intelligence, that there are many, many cases that do describe high tech vehicles but the vehicles have extra characteristics that suggest they aren't high tech vehicles at all, that there is a huge amount of abduction cases that contain anomalies not explainable as yet, that research results exist which contain elements common to all these categories and the research suggests another process is at work, I ask the fair question (of the man who says that no other explanation exists for some of the UFO/Abduction cases) "How do you explain these facts and how do you justify separating certain cases from all this - especially separating certain high tech vehicle cases from the 'apparent high tech vehicles that contain characteristics that suggest they may not really be vehicles' cases. Because these blur zone cases suggests there may not even be vehicles!

These questions are fair! They are not hard to follow. They logically come out of your conclusion if you are taking into consideration all of the data and research. It's logical to ask how you know you have a real duck if you have a lot of things in the pond that are duck-like but they also have unduck-like qualities! That's not hard logic to follow!

Then I ask you how you know it is ET, even if it turns out they are indeed vehicles. I point out there are artifacts that suggest a prior Earth-based technological civilization might have existed and cases like the Khoury case that suggest humans are at the heart of the mystery. I ask you to explain how you know the artifacts are not indicative of a prior Earth-based technological civilization and how ET ties into the Khoury case or why it's not good for consideration. Since you are ruling it out, you should be able to demonstrate why you have ruled it out. But you don't do so!

I make no claims, no conclusions regarding the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon - neither pro-ET or anti-ET! I only ask questions - fair questions - of you. I ask you to explain away the anomalies, since you have ruled them all out as part of any possible solution other than your ET spaceship one. You counter with only accusations of "not being specific" and of "charismatic handwaving" and of not being "logical" - of not having a huge "list of publication credits, professional status, or memberships in fancy scientific organizations." You counter only with silly analogies, as if I'm not smart enough to realize that anyone can come up with an analogy to illustrate any situation but that doesn't mean the situation is reflected in reality. Analogies are merely used to make a point clearer - you can illustrate any point with an analogy - but it doesn't mean the point is valid, or that the point reflects reality.

You've offered only your assumption (high tech vehicles with their alien pilots exist because there are a huge number of cases describing this) to prove your conclusion (some UFOs are ET spaceships) despite the huge amount of UFO cases - non high tech vehicle and apparent high tech vehicle (with extra messy characteristics) alike, messy abduction scene cases, and research such as Lawson's, that exists to contradict your conclusion - or, as I am saying, to make it a premature one at this point in time. You don't explain the contradictions nor do you explain why they don't count. You just ignore them completely and call them irrelevant, proclaiming "some UFOs are ET spaceships."

Then you say `_my_` logic is hard to follow?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:45:53 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 07:56:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:47:11 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 04:45:50 +0000  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>>Still, my purely subjective impression is that  
>>objects in the FLIR images seem much too bright to be  
>>the distant oil wells no matter how many assumptions  
>>of super infrared seeing conditions one makes.

>>Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure  
>>technical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't  
>>know.

>>Besides we have the radar readings detecting also  
>>the objects to the right and in front of the  
>>airplane. An important element that Mr. Amateur  
>>Debunker conveniently has never mentioned, why?

>>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field  
>>flames would be nonsense and destroy the oil field  
>>hoax scheme unless he has a new Guinness record.

>Santiago et al,

>I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it  
>is possible that radar could detect oil field flames.  
>Speaking very generally a flame is a conductive  
>plasma, which could be associated with a great deal  
>of turbulence in the heat column, plus there may be  
>clouds of smoke particulates. Any or all of  
>these - flame, turbulence, smoke - could in principle  
>cause a radar echo. But I know nothing of the radar  
>type or other essential details of the case so won't  
>comment further.

Really? You didn't read correctly the reports. The C26A radar  
also detected the objects to the right and in front of the  
airplane, that is over the mainland performing manoeuvres and  
changes of speed. This is documented. Once again: Over the  
mainland direction not the ocean.

This important element has been most of the times ignored or  
misunderstood with results disappointing. At certain time and  
according to the FLIR and radar the C26A crew realized the  
airplane was surrounded by these objects and this is also



documented on the audio portions included in the case files.

This was real not an illusion, mistake or invention and remains as an important element in this investigation. It has been proven that the hoaxer never answered to this issues simply because he has not answers and then his theatrical hoaxed show fell down along with him.

I repeat, it's useless that some amateur debunkers still try to revive the old fashioned oil flames hoax. It's dead and buried for good. Period.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 17:59:20 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:01:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough

>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
>Subject: Heflin Mystery Solved

>John Scheldroup has helped solve the Heflin 'mystery' in his  
>last post. His photo enhancement and diagram are correct:

Oh well let's all go back to sleep then. Anonymous once again claims to know it all, but all that he/she does, once again, is recycle what somebody else already said! The tone of condescension aims for that of a master nudging his idiot pupils towards self-discovery of the truth by dropping judicious clues, but what we actually hear is the skulking noise of someone following a step behind.

>"A 1/32 scale drive wheel of a model steam locomotive" is  
>precisely what the 'craft' is.

Ah, 1/32 drive wheel eh? Well, why didn't you say this the first time? But not even that comes out of your own mouth, it's just an echo.

As it happens the photogrammetry is IMO not inconsistent with a small object about 1" across about 36" from the lens (this is based first on the parallax, and second on simple trig using the approximate window width of a 1962 Econoline van from estimated a contemporary drawing and the known angular scale of the photo). But "the diagram is correct" and that settles things, does it?

Well no, because 1) the proportions of disc and dome are not actually as shown in the diagram (OK maybe the diagram is not exactly to scale, but . . .), 2) there is no sign of the hub shown in the diagram, 3) there is possible evidence of asymmetry (see David Rudiak's post and look also at the distorted elliptical underside of photo #2), and 4) photos #2 and #3 show "vapour"-like features that remain unexplained. For these reasons alone, your ex cathedra declaration is valueless.

>Particularly insightful is his  
>observation "You can just make out the wheel hub protruding off  
>the face of the wheel."

In fact you cannot. The image John posted has what appears to be a scanning artefact on the top edge, a combination of coarse pixel resolution and a gremlin (scratch, dust, whatever) on the image source used. This appears as a dark vertical mark and an adjacent bright notch which are not on the original. Adjacent to this is a bright area of specular reflection possibly aiding the illusion. There is no "hub" visible on the best scans we have, made directly from the original photos.

>Find the earliest generation print and enhance further. Dig a  
>little deeper into pre-1960 toy/model trains and you will find  
>the exact part used.

Better scans have already been studied for some time. As stated, the blowups from the original photos used in the 2000 JSE

paper do not reveal the train-wheel "hub" you predict they should. Your "hypothesis" is refuted.

>Combine 1) John's findings with 2) Tim Shell's airshow donut  
>hole formations with 3) brave Ed Riddle's interviews- and the 40  
>year old Heflin "mystery" is solved !

Brave Ed Riddle? Listen to yourself. And next time you regurgitate someone else's information in the guise of a cunning clue, do try to actually read and comprehend it first.

>Incidentally, I am not a skeptic on ET phenomena - I am, in  
>fact, an unabashed believer. But too much time has been spent on  
>obvious hoaxes i.e. the autopsy, Ed Walters, etc. I simply want  
>the UFO research community to concentrate on genuine ET  
>phenomena and not on pranksters or on opportunists.

I accept that you are an "unabashed believer". This is consistent with the complete absence of critical sense and propriety you've already demonstrated.

>And yes, usually "anonymous" types should be taken with a grain  
>of salt. But sometimes "anonymous" types do not want to get  
>involved simply because they-

>1) are ashamed they did not come forward earlier

>2) their family may be in a business or other pursuit where it  
>may be perceived unfavorably to be associated publicly with UFOs

>3) they want to spur others on to finding the truth.

Rubbish. Until you yourself offer a single concrete piece of checkable information or evaluable logic, instead of just parroting the efforts of others in laughably sententious tones, then nobody has any business listening to a further word you say.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Burns

From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 18:02:17 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:04:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Matt's Pollen Out - Burns

>From: Paul Anderson <[paulanderson.nul](mailto:paulanderson.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 08:17:32 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Matt's Pollen Out

>>From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:29:38 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Matt's Pollen Out

>>Matt Williams was at my house for a couple of days this week. A  
>>friend called round with the Daily Mirror in his hand and  
>>pointed it out to Matt.

>>His comment, "I have not spoken to anyone from the Daily  
>>Mirror."

>>The circle-makers have decided they are not going to do any  
>>this summer. Hence only 3 crop circles have appeared. Of poor  
>>quality and obviously done by random people wanting to try for  
>>themselves - without the technical know-how.

>There are 5 formations now in the UK and 11 in other countries  
>(primarily Italy) so far... a very slow start to the English  
>season this year. But, if there are still fewer formations by  
>the end of the season in England, maybe this will help people to  
>see what is happening in other countries more,

EBK, Listers,

Hello Paul, long time. It is true that the UK circle makers have  
got no say or control over whether the rest of the world's  
plankers go out with their boards.....

Max

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 18:11:44 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:05:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:50:48 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Brad Sparks <[RB47x.nul](mailto:RB47x.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:32:05 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact  
>>>just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a  
>>>B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around  
>>>other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As  
>>>Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by  
>>>others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the  
>>>Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

>>I told Bruce in March 2006 that his own microdensitometer scans  
>>seemed to show the brightened region around the object in Photo  
>>1, which was not visible in Photo 2 and not on his scan for  
>>Photo 2 either.

>Interesting. Well, being the hands-on kind of guy I am, here's  
>what I was able to come up with to check out the glow:

><http://img388.imageshack.us/img388/2162/mcminglow5vm.jpg>

>It's a weird artifact, all right. I wonder what causes it.

Hi Tim

It looks as if the source image here is probably the same or  
similar colour scan originally used by Brad (maybe from VJ?),  
not the high res scan from a first gen print that Bruce was  
talking about and which I have been using. The halo effect  
around the pole and wires is very evident as I said. So yes,  
it's an artefact.

>Anyway, that's why I come to this List with questions. There's  
>always somebody who knows about it who can point me in a  
>different direction.

>Of course, it still makes using the photo problematic for me.  
>And it still makes me wonder why the #1 photo is so different  
>than the #2 photo, which shows no indication of this glow. But  
>perhaps those are questions for another day.....

If the effect doesn't appear on the original #1, then does it  
matter what the answers are (save to satisfy curiosity). Do you  
have a copy of the scan and density curves from the original? I  
thought Bruce said he was sending these.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:21:19 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:09:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 09:36:53 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 12:49:24 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>Yes, but see my other reply to Bob Shell re "Ed Riddle", the  
>>electronics technical writer cited as the origin for the  
>>train- wheel story. I suggested someone might take the  
>>trouble to track down this person. I can now offer some  
>>help. Owners of Apple Mac computers will find the gent's  
>>very own signature embossed inside the back panel!

>Brief update: I have established that the Ed Riddle identified  
>is indeed the same guy and I am in correspondence with him.  
>He has already offered two quite interesting additions to his  
>story which I will pass on to the list ASAP.

Hi Martin, Dave,

I can't see the comparison matching the Heflin photos matching a  
model train wheel. The flange on the model is shorter than that  
in evidence in the photos.

Mark Cashman also did analysis of the Heflin photos. His site is  
still up and running.

See: <http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/report/650803.htm>

His site shows the three photos together in a panarama from  
scans.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:27:18 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:12:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 14:01:50 -0500  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:05:21 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>>The truth was posted on UFO UpDates a very long time ago - on  
>>September 5, 1997! In a post by Stig Agermose entitled "Heflin's  
>>Photos Draw Fresh Fire From Skeptics" he includes the text of a  
>>July 22, 1997 article in the Orange County Register by reporter  
>>Amy Wilson.

>>See:

>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

>>In this article, people who know it is a toy train part relate  
>>that they have known this for a very long time, and that it was a  
>>joke gone out of control. Unlike Anonymous me, one of these  
>>people, a retiree in Menlo Park, is named and interviewed.

>>It amazes me that no one else on the List picked up on this at  
>>the time and responded to Stig's post and that no one mentioned  
>>the article in this latest discussion on Heflin.

>>Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole  
>>formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

>>There have to be model train hobbyists on this List who can now  
>>find the exact part that Rex used to create the 'craft'.

>IMO, Probably 1/32 scale drive wheel of a model steam  
>locomotive. Notice in the enhanced image, you can just make out  
>the wheel hub protruding off the face of wheel.

>This is shown on the diagram as feature P to face A.  
><http://tinyurl.com/r6174>

>Manufacturers and Suppliers  
><http://www.nmia.com/~vr bass/steam/steammfr.htm>

>Making Model Locomotive Wheels  
><http://www.nmia.com/~vr bass/steam/castwheel.htm>

><http://tinyurl.com/qf8a6>

>John

Photo Analysis:

I'm not getting into this Only True or Only False argument. I  
merely looking at the analytical perspectives required: trying  
to establish whether they've already been done effectively in



the past and making a point that replication isn't a bad thing anyway.

Heflin was an investigator and I'm hoping through detailed work we can gain some useful insights into the authenticity of these images without prejudice. You have to play both sides of the argument to gain useful insights.

The ratios look correct. If the wheel thickness is ~6.5 mm total, then the diameter of the wheel is around ~1 inch. If we can establish this with a certain amount of precision, we can determine and confirm from another source just how far the camera is from the subject (Horizontal width-of-field is approximately ~30 degrees). Since I don't have an uncropped original (not sure if these are), I can't comparison scale exactly for calculation purposes but believe 1 inch seems to be an appropriate scale given the window dimensions. This will either confirm the 3D stereo determined distance or not.

This would also allow us to determine, despite the fact the aperture is small and we have great depth of field, exactly where in proximity to the lens objects at close range begin to get blurred as they move in closer to the lens. If we can compare those images with the original for blurriness, we might establish yet another consistent perceptive comparison of distance to the model that may or may not confirm the distance to the model consistent with the 3D stereo. We might also take photos of metallic objects (water towers?) at approximately 1/8 (1/4) mile distance and determine the quality of the image with that of the original. In this way, we can obtain a better understanding for the camera's abilities at both close and far range as for blur factor comparison. This might give some badly needed experimental results and increase confidence levels. All in all, having several independent means for establishing distance to the target will gain either increased acceptance or rejection on various proposals.

Distance to the hypothetical model can also help establish detection limits of the film/lighting/camera settings on strings of various thickness/design/make conducted in experimental simulations. I'm currently trying to establish the exact camera settings before proceeding with calculations and mock setups.

Given that the camera film speed is 3000 (40 times faster than 80 ASA film), it is not likely clouds will show up in photographs: probably would appear very washed out. However, the use of filter may give better blue/white separation on B&W film. In any case, experimentation with the actual camera is in order.

How well would black smoke (similar density) appear against the sky? How high of a contrast as compared with the original, etc. In general, this film is recommended for low to moderate light conditions. The small aperture and high shutter speed was a good attempt to compensate for the bright outdoors by allowing much less light into the camera.

I think the orientation direction of the camera relative to the sun's orientation in photo #4 with the smoke is either already in the literature or needs to be determined as it relates to this camera's abilities to have even been able to capture such details. (my own feelings are that they would but, again, experiments are in order).

I'm also pursuing the likely chemical composition of atmospheric precipitates, their visible/scattering colors. Perhaps they would be white not black... who knows? let's find out. We can certainly discover what the chemical energy/pressure/density/temperature requirements are to induce likely chemical precipitation pathways and do some rough calculations. I'm trying to obtain atmospheric chemical readings on that day.

Another nuisance we must counter when lifting measurements from scans off the original is that, in some cases, they may not have the same height to width ratios that the original had depending upon the software of both the scanner and image viewer. Again, the uncropped originals are required for comparison and image adjustment before "on computer" image manipulation is confidently attempted.

The fact that Heflin took images through the front window may

have introduced additional distortions into #1 that can only be properly evaluated through experimentation. This is yet another factor that has yet to be established before undertaking measurements from the images. (This should have minimal impact, but, again, it has to be shown 'not to' and to what degree. The asymmetry at the very top of the Heflin #1 may simply be appropriate since off axis contact points and protrusions do occur on train wheels for mechanical advantage and torque requirements.

It is interesting that in Black's interview with Heflin, they did show model trains from, apparently, the home of Heflin. Perhaps these trains are still in existence and with family members. I only saw this briefly since that portion of the tape was damaged a little, but Richard Hall did tell me they were being shown. Therefore, Richard, with your help, we might be able to freeze-frame the original and have experts identify them. Was the train wheel model being proposed much earlier?

There really isn't enough image manipulation presented in the JSE paper. There is no systematic approach to the image analysis. There's no comparisons presented with actual experimental setups with models at close range nor with the camera in question. There's no confidence levels established on the effectiveness of certain enhancements or what would happen while attempting other enhancement routines. Therefore, there is much to overcome and reveal.

As just one example: If a certain image manipulation algorithm reveals strings with a model setup then that same routine has to be applied with the original, etc! Has this ever been done? This case is 40 years old and I keep hearing that all the analysis has been done already? Are we sure about that? Compare and contrast... weigh and measure... convince or not convince. If you can't demonstrate effectively there will be perpetual unresolved arguments. New tools are available so let's use them in the right way to increase confidence levels\_ that may very well have impact on both sides of the argumant stream.

Currently, I believe the apparent "smoke" trails visible in the photos is one of the best aspects in favor of Heflin other than his great character endorsements. Once I get the speed of the shutter, the pendulum comparison can further aid his side of events: in the event such rotational blur (#1) is not likely to have been possible from a still-action movement caught from a swinging close-up suspended model. Actual experiments with the camera will also aid distance calculations using other means.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:54:05 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:14:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:54:27 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 22:05:40 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:24:54 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: Clarifying 'Dodging' On Trent/McMinnville Photos

>>>A few months ago Bruce already kindly sent me microdensitometer  
>>>scans across both axes of the negative through the object and a  
>>>scan of a print made by himself and Bob Schaeffer in 1975. I can  
>>>testify that there is no indication on these materials of any  
>>>halo.

>>I understand.

>>>The reason this came up was that the an apparent "halo" artefact  
>>>just like this was noted by Brad Sparks on a colour scan of a  
>>>B&W print. It turns out that the same effect is visible around  
>>>other dark foreground features such as the utility pole. As  
>>>Bruce also pointed out, detailed densitometry had been done by  
>>>others before, including Nathan at JPL and Hartmann for the  
>>>Condon Report in 1967. No study has discovered such a halo.

>>Now I'm curious to see if the same photo I'm working with will  
>>show those lighter areas around dark objects like the mid-  
>>distance phone line pole, like you say. Just out of curiosity.

>And here it is:

><http://img388.imageshack.us/img388/2162/mcminglow5vm.jpg>

>As Artie Johnson used to say, "Very interestink!" See, that's  
>why I come to this board. Always somebody here who can point me  
>in a new direction.

>Well, it still means I have to find a different photo for my  
>evil experiments. And I still wonder why the #1 photo is so  
>different from the #2 photo, which has not indication of these  
>weird glow. Another question for another day.

Hi Tim,

If this is a genuine UFO with all of the baggage that comes with it, never mind the phobia most have against going through the doorway, then you are not going to have a clue what any haze would be, or what generates it. You cannot do a definitive photo analysis of this thing unless you know what's motivating it and the by-product of same. In one attitude it's not showing a haze or aura or whatever but in another it is. That could be the product of maneuvering affecting either the air enveloping it or

some effect which can be seen in the spectral range by a camera at a certain shutter speed using a certain speed of film at a certain time of the day, with certain moisture contents and particulate matter in suspension in the air yada, yada. That's a lot of parameters that have to be satisfied before one can even say with certainty that any aura seen around the thing is due to man made hoax or a by-product of some engine. And this can't be disregarded because there are thousands of UFO incidents where the witnesses report some type of effect around the object. Since we know little or nothing about UFO propulsion systems- other than "perhaps" they aren't prop driven-I don't see how it could ever be solved barring completely vetting any man made interference.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Visitors From Another World?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 10:06:47 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 10:06:47 -0400  
Subject: Visitors From Another World?

Source: The Tahoe Daily Tribune - Lake Tahoe, California, USA

<http://www.tahodailytribune.com/article/20060616/NEWS/106160056>

June 16, 2006

Visitors From Another World?

Jeff Munson  
[jmunson.nul](mailto:jmunson.nul)

The light in the sky that changed from red to orange to amber and popped side to side, up and down and disappeared and reappeared over Lake Tahoe early Wednesday morning wasn't a star, planet or airplane, swears Allan Brown.

It was an unidentified flying object that "was so real, it had me scared," the 44-year-old South Lake Tahoe resident insists.

"It was not a glitch of light or a flash in the sky. It moved and changed colors," he said.

Whatever it was - alien space craft from Planet XYZ on a doomsday colonization planning mission to Lake Tahoe or, perhaps, the waning light of a star protruding through a canopy of high clouds - something was clearly visible through the lens of Brown's video camera, with which he taped the object dancing in the sky between 3:30 a.m. and 5 a.m.

Standing outside his Tallac Avenue home smoking a cigarette on the porch, Brown spotted the object in the sky to the northwest. The light stood out like no others that night, he said. It was colder than most nights but virtually cloudless with no wind.

In quick-thinking mode, he grabbed his video camera, walked to the lake and began taping. The more he taped, the surer he became that the object in the sky was anomalous.

"It was bigger than any of the stars out that night. It hovered really close to the lake and above the mountains. It wasn't like it was a star in the sky. This was in our atmosphere," said Brown, who swears his only vice is cigarettes and that he doesn't drink alcohol or take drugs.

Allen Kenitzer with the public affairs office of the Federal Aviation Administration in Seattle said there were no reports of objects from air personnel in the Reno and Sacramento regions. A spokesperson for Edwards Air Force Base in the Mojave Desert also had no reports. A spokesman for the Reno-Tahoe International Airport said an experimental aircraft manned by the Sierra Nevada Corporation has flown in and out of the Stead Airport and may be mistaken as a UFO. A call to Sierra Nevada Corporation was not returned Thursday.

The Seattle-based UFO Reporting Center was also unavailable for comment.

Whatever it was, Brown is convinced that what he saw was out of this world.

"Seeing it has made question who we are and how we fit into the galactic picture," he said. "We on Earth may be one of many worlds with life on it."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:28:06 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 10:09:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

Hello Martin

>Excuse the intervention, but isn't it little strong to say that  
>theory construction is not part of the process? It surely is,  
>else there would be no process. Pure experimental induction is  
>(or would be if it existed) just the accumulation of lists of  
>data and science could be done by machines. Isn't the hard bit,  
>and the bit that transforms botanical lists into bodies of  
>knowledge, the theory construction? Testing is the historical  
>crux of a scientific process, yes, but a crux is a point of  
>intersection rather than a stand-alone thing. After all, if you  
>don't have a theory you can't test it.

It may be rather strong, but from my hardline empiricist  
viewpoint, the stronger the better. What I was objecting to was  
this (from Richard Hall's post of June 9):

"The people who are included as sociologists or political  
scientists or anthropologists include many who follow scientific  
methods, both in theory construction and compilation of  
empirical evidence"

In other words, the idea that a discipline can be regarded as  
scientific on the basis of the way its theories are constructed.  
A theory is either testable and scientific, or not testable, and  
not scientific. It makes no difference how it's constructed.

Of course I agree that constructing theories is often the most  
difficult and complex part of the process of doing science. But  
Nature doesn't really care how hard we work in concocting our  
precious ideas. One can spend twenty years on a beautiful and  
elegant theory that turns out to be scientifically useless (as  
Einstein did in the latter part of his life). Conversely, the  
horrendously ugly theory that someone just happened to scribble  
on the back of an envelope while waiting for a bus, might just  
turn out to be a work of scientific genius if only it makes the  
right predictions.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:40:17 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 10:11:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:35:21 +0000  
>Subject: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>Here is some background information on the Rex Heflin photo  
>case, which was investigated from August 1965 on by the Los  
>Angeles NICAP Subcommittee (LANS). NICAP was fortunate to have  
>many meticulous investigators (including Ray Fowler, Walt Webb,  
>and Fran Ridge) who intensively researched cases of this  
>potential importance.

>The leader of LANS was an unheralded woman, Idabel Epperson, who  
>was a superb and articulate leader, organizer, recruiter of  
>high-level scientific and analytical talent, and a shrewd judge  
>of character. She was thorough, discreet, diplomatic, and as  
>skilled an investigator as there was.

>Over the years she and I stayed in touch, and I have just gone  
>through a thick file of correspondence with her. What it shows  
>is that even 10-12 years after 1965, through the demise of NICAP  
>and the rise of the Mutual UFO Network (we both later became  
>active in MUFON), the LANS personnel remained in touch with Rex  
>Heflin and continued to gather pertinent information about the  
>case.

>The record also shows that the first hypothesis to be fully  
>investigated was the possibility of a suspended model. Further,  
>there have been previous "re-investigations" of the case  
>(notably in 1977) ordinarily consisting of someone deciding that  
>the photos were faked, but offering no real evidence of that and  
>betraying ignorance of the thorough NICAP investigation which,  
>to us, removed all doubt about the authenticity of the photos  
>and the integrity of Rex Heflin.

>For the benefit of those currently re-examining the case and  
>attempting new analysis of the photographs, here are some  
>excerpts from my Epperson file:

>August 1967; LANS report and taped interview transcript of  
>witnesses to a disc with dome seen in Santa Ana, California,  
>during the first week of August in 1965 (the exact date could  
>not be pinned down). While driving along the Santa Ana freeway a  
>family saw a disc with dome hovering just above electric power  
>lines. It was night and the object was glowing brightly. It  
>appeared to be about 40 feet in diameter. As they slowed to a  
>crawl to observe the object, it moved back and forth above the  
>power lines for a distance of about 60 feet in the vicinity of  
>the Broadway Street overpass. Other motorists also were stopped  
>and looking at the object.

Thank you Dick, invaluable background.

I just wanted to add that - if memory serves me right - the  
issue of unexplained under-reporting was also an explicit  
factor in this case.

Didn't the witnesses express surprise that there were  
no other reports despite the number of stopped cars on a busy

highway?

This is a relevant point in the Heflin case as well  
(notwithstanding the story of the surveyors, which I take it is  
still unconfirmed?)

Martin

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:46:11 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:16:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:56:03 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 22:08:53 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>>That said, I still acknowledge 'truth' based on preponderance of  
>>evidence, meaning about 51%, with the scales of reason, my  
>>scales of reason, just slightly tipping one way or the other. I  
>>think most people do this, though they might admit it  
>>grudgingly! I see the limits of logic, math, the scientific  
>>method, objective reasoning, and the like. We humans are  
>>incapable of a "pure science". We can't be counted on to be that  
>>objective and scrupled, because we're hard-wired with feeling,  
>>and we have to pay the bills. I actually thank God for that!  
>>That subjectivity is one reason we use computers. But garbage  
>>in, garbage out, because while figures don't lie, liars always  
>>figure. So even accurate calculations have limits.

>>My preponderance is different than "beyond a reasonable doubt."

<snip>

>Well, if that's the way you do it ...

>Your "preponderance," however, should include the cases and  
>research that conflict with what you "subjectively" accept.

The preponderance and beyond reasonable doubt standards are from  
the court settings, of which I am familiar in my work.

Preponderance tips the scales of justice, not reason, as the  
court ensures that rights are preserved, the rights of  
plaintiffs and defendants. Preserving rights after all is the  
only function of the courts, not the establishment of truth.

Beyond a reasonable doubt is also a legal standard to preserve  
rights, in this case the rights of the guilty/convicted  
regarding life in prison or the death penalty.

I admit that neither is best as a standard for "proving" ET  
flying saucers or abductions. But most folks can comprehend this  
kind of standard due to familiarity with it from the popular  
media. And since there appears to be no general standard for  
those UFO and ET proofs, at least from my review, I put those  
forth as standards to work from. I appreciate the scientific and  
statistical standards used by the professionals who contribute  
to discussions like UFO Updates.

I know I am repeating myself when I say that conclusions, like  
Friedman's and Jacobs', work for me now, but I'm willing to say  
it again. I hope this helps.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpDatesList.Com](http://UFOUpDatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:24:58 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:19:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Shell

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:55:49 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>I then ask you to justify why you are sure there are indeed  
>high tech vehicles and then how you know for sure they are  
>piloted by ET aliens. All you offer is: a hugh number of cases  
>exist that describe same, which is tantamount to saying: it  
>looks like this is the case, so it is.

You know what I think? I think Stan has inside information. I think that at some point in his long UFO career, he was taken aside by some military types and let in on the Big Secret, which is that we've recovered flying saucer wreckage (not at Roswell, though), along with creatures from another planet. Just like in the movies.

He was also told that he'd move into a position as a top spokesperson when the government finally does come clean about the whole thing, which will happen when and if a significant UFO event happens that is so public they can't cover it up. Not an official "MJ-12" position, but certainly within range.

All he would have to do in the meantime is keep quiet about it, and go on about his business as usual. He doesn't have to lie or make things up. He just needs to subtly steer his fellow investigators and the public away from the actual truth of the matter.

It's the only "logical" reason I can imagine that would explain Stan's absolute, unshakable certainty about the aliens. "Seeing is believing," in the UFO field, after all.

Oh, but I suppose I should put a big disclaimer here. Consider this post disclaimed.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** [tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:40:30 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:20:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 17:09:21 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole  
>>formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

>Well sure, three cheers for Tim Shell. But what a shame he has  
>attracted a dishonest advocate.

I hope I've been relatively clear in my posts that all I'm doing is trying different ways of looking at things, and that I try to be reasonable when presented with data that conflicts with any preconceptions I might have. Like with the "glow" on the McMinnville photos. Unless I'm being facetious to prove a point, I try not to present anything unverifiable as fact, because if it's unverifiable, I guess I can't really call it a fact, can I?

Model train wheel? Sure looks like one. Is that enough proof?

Nope.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Asteroid-Watchers Worry About Cosmic Katrina

From: Ray [Dickenson](#).nul <[ray.dickenson@virgin.net](mailto:ray.dickenson@virgin.net)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 22:47:25 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:24:55 -0400  
Subject: Asteroid-Watchers Worry About Cosmic Katrina

Source: MSNBC/Space.Com

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/12665493/>

May 6, 2006

Former Astronaut Presses Campaign For Global Preparedness  
By Leonard David  
Senior space writer

[Excerpt Begins]

In these NEO Deflection Policy workshops we will gather together a dozen or so international experts in diplomacy, international law, insurance and risk management, as well as space expertise to identify and wrestle with these difficult international issues," Schweickart noted. "Our goal is to return to the U.N. in 2009 with a draft NEO Deflection Decision Protocol and present it to them for their consideration and deliberation."

Facing the challenge

In wrapping up his ISDC talk, Schweickart said the NEO challenge, in a sense, "is an entry test for humankind to join the cosmic community." He reasons that, if there is intelligent life elsewhere in the universe "it is virtually certain that it has already faced this challenge to survival . and passed it."

Our choice is to face this infrequent but substantial cosmic test. or pass into history, not as an incapable species like the dinosaurs, but as a fractious and self-serving creature with inadequate vision and commitment to continue its evolutionary development," Schweickart concluded.

[Excerpt Ends]

-----

Cheers

Ray D

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [ray.dickenson](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:50:22 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:26:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 01:04:13 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sun, 11 Jun 2006 11:14:47 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>A few days ago I wrote a long reply to this email, kept it for a  
>few days, and decided the content didn't justify its length. So  
>this is an edited, amended version which I hope deals with most  
>of the points raised, although it's still rather longer than I'd  
>hoped. Never mind:-

>>In other words, a consensus is reached about the weight of  
>>evidence! You criticize my brother's use of that word below.  
>>Also, you failed to define what constitutes an issue.

>>Are you here implicitly defining an issue to be a controversy? I  
>>could accept that as a working definition.

>To the best of my knowledge, Dick, "controversy" was the word I  
>originally used, and you substituted the word "issue".

>I think there are real problems with this notion of consensus,  
>as you appear to use it. The most obvious is that it simply  
>fails to distinguish between science and other areas of academic  
>activity, and indeed many non-academic areas of activity. It  
>matters very much that the consensus, to the extent that it  
>exists, is wholly determined by evidence and is not something  
>that has to be "decided" upon.

>Secondly, I don't think it's necessarily true that an  
>overwhelming weight of evidence produces consensus. It's rather  
>more the case that dissenters either go silent or disappear into  
>the woodwork.

>Thirdly, I think this notion of consensus covers up a good deal  
>that is unsatisfactory in the way the social sciences operate.  
>For one thing, it's open to abuse, because the definition of who  
>counts as part of the consensus can be manipulated, and  
>frequently is. If consensus is genuinely the result of evidence,  
>then it shouldn't be necessary to manufacture artificial  
>consensus in this way.

<snip>

Cathy,

Thanks for your very full and candid response. I think we shall  
have to agree to disagree about what scientific method is and  
how it is or is not applied in the social/behavioral sciences. I  
personally find it mind-boggling that you reject theory  
construction as an integral part of scientific method, not to  
mention continued semantical confusion about words like  
'consensus.'

But I remain an admirer of your postings on this list which generally are cogent and well-argued, and look forward to future exchanges. Other than responding with my own parting shot to your parting shot, below, I see no point in continuing this discussion. Hopefully, it will have caused some people to think more carefully about science and scientific method.

>>I am not a scientist at all and have never claimed to be  
>>(however, in my experience many scientists operate by rote and  
>>have no special knowledge of scientific method either except for  
>>what they are told to do). I have formally studied logic and  
>>scientific method and think that I have a very good idea of what  
>>it is - or is supposed to be, though in real life in often  
>>departs from the ideal.

>You may be entirely right, but to me this sounds awfully like  
>someone saying: "I have no experience of combat, but I have  
>studied strategy and I believe I know how wars should be won".

I have a lot of experience of 'combat' (figuratively speaking), having spent close to 50 years applying (my concept of) scientific method to UFO cases, and dozens of years reading and digesting scientific literature in many fields. My abstracts have gone into several major national databases, entirely satisfying scientific standards. Also, it is not clear that you are a practicing scientist (which to me is not the know-all, end-all argument for having knowledge of scientific method anyway). Sauce for the goose?

Further, your combat experience argument is amusing to me in other ways. My brother, Bob, whose knowledge and experience of social/behavioral sciences surely is far more extensive than yours, flew (I believe) 40 combat missions against Japan and other Asian targets as top gunner on B-29s. Some of his early post-war research for the Air Force had to do with bonding and cohesiveness among bomber crew members. He has always been empirically and experimentally oriented.

He went on to have a distinguished career that included being department chairman and head of a statistical laboratory at the University of Illinois-Chicago, a program director at the National Science Foundation, etc. He and I have had many discussions about scientific method and UFOs over the years and, frankly, we are both puzzled by your comments in this area.

C'est la Vie!

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Gates

From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:31:04 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:32:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Gates

>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
>Subject: Heflin Mystery Solved

>John Scheldroup has helped solve the Heflin 'mystery' in his  
>last post. His photo enhancement and diagram are correct:

>"A 1/32 scale drive wheel of a model steam locomotive" is  
>precisely what the 'craft' is. Particularly insightful is his  
>observation "You can just make out the wheel hub protruding off  
>the face of the wheel."

>Find the earliest generation print and enhance further. Dig a  
>little deeper into pre-1960 toy/model trains and you will find  
>the exact part used.

>Combine 1) John's findings with 2) Tim Shell's airshow donut  
>hole formations with 3) brave Ed Riddle's interviews- and the 40  
>year old Heflin "mystery" is solved !

Listers,

Before everybody dances off into the sunset on this one, we need  
to keep in mind the issues raised by Ed Riddle's interviews.

The bottom line to Ed Riddle is that:

1) He recalls it was a co worker at the phone company that  
showed him the photographs. The person showing him the  
photographs showed him photographs of the "train wheel" hanging  
in the eves of the gerage and hanging off a car windows. Heflin  
didn't work at the phone company. So then we hear something  
about the possibility that it was the neighbor of Riddle's  
friend. We have no evidence that any of Heflins neighbors worked  
at the phone company, we have no evidence that whomever this  
friend is knew Heflin. Nor do we have any direct evidence as to  
when this conversation took place. What the more likely  
explanation is that after the Heflin photos hit the news,  
somebody might say, gee I can take (hoax) a photo like that  
using...pie pans...train wheels or whatever.

From a reliability stand point imagine people would say if  
somebody floated a story like this out 30 years after the event  
allegedly happened. Gee, my friend either knew somebody, or he  
himself saw dead alien bodies in a packing crete at Air Force  
Base X...blah blah blah. Or better yet something along the lines  
of "I knew a guy, who knew somebody else  
who said that he tested ET space ships at area 51.....

Now, not to dish Ed Riddle. He was simply "remembering" 30 years  
old memories back in 97, and again in 2006. Ed had no diary  
entries from the time and is basing it upon what he described as  
"dim" memory. We don't know who the friend was, other then he  
worked with Ed at the phone company, we don't know if the friend  
used the train wheel, or he got the photos from somebody else  
who hoaxed them using a train wheel.

2) The airshow donut formation didn't do much for me one way or

the other.

3) I looked at John Scheldroup so called findings and didn't see what he was attempting to show on the photo. Kind of reminded me of the photo interpretation being done on the Ramey telegram and 15 people arguing back and forth as to what letter was what on the telegram. Personally I saw something different on the Heflin blow up on Scheldroup's page, but there is enough distortion that you could probably show the same thing to 20 experts and see 20 different things.

4) You have the summary of Richard Hall's case files on Heflin, and how other people saw such a craft during that time frame, although unlike something being remembered 30 or 40 years after the fact, we have the documentation from not long after. The survey crew who saw it, and Heflin mentioning the crew but didn't understand why they didn't report it.

So, we have the model theory...which some touted and were allegedly confirmed by the BBC interview... which it wasn't.

We have the train wheel theory which is based upon dim memories and a blowup of a photograph that you could see many things in and theories about air show smoke ring.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:48:05 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:35:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 17:15:20 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>To speculate, infrared is heavily absorbed by moisture, which  
>was one reason I was puzzled that the FLIR sensors could pick up  
>the oil wells at a distance of ~100 miles. Therefore, if it was  
>an unusually dry day over the Gulf of Mexico (if such conditions  
>ever exist), perhaps enough infrared leaked through to be  
>detected by the sensors.

>On a very clear day, 90-95% of visible light is transmitted  
>through 1 atmosphere of air, i.e., from the zenith to ground,  
>but less than 50% of infrared (different bands of infrared  
>transmit different amounts). Looking sideways, every 4 miles  
>has as much air as looking straight up to infinity. Because the  
>plane was flying at several thousand feet and looking downwards  
>toward the horizon, maybe we should boost this to 5 miles of air  
>sideways (because of more rarefied air) to equal 1 atmosphere of  
>air straight up.

>Therefore, at 100 miles distance there is about an equivalent of  
>100/5 = 20 atmospheres of air to look through. Visible light in  
>the longer wavelengths transmits (under prime seeing conditions)  
>95% for each atmosphere, so in 20 atmospheres  $(.95)^{20} = .36$  or  
>36% of the light would be transmitted (ideally).

>But for infrared, the number is, at best,  $(.50)^{20} = .000001 =$   
>.0001% or 1 part in a million. The moisture in the air is going  
>to filter out the infrared to a very high degree.  
>But suppose it was a superdry day and the transmission got  
>boosted to 60%/atmosphere, which doesn't sound like a lot more  
>but has a big effect over long distances. Then  $(.60)^{20} =$   
>.000036 = .0036% or 36 times more infrared. Similarly if the  
>transmission was 65%, then  $(.65)^{20} = .00018 = .018%$  or 180  
>times more.

>Another thing that might improve visibility would be if it was  
>unusually cool that day. That would lower infrared backscatter  
>off the intervening atmosphere and increase contrast between the  
>oil flames and the background.

>Normally, the absorption might work to the systems advantage by  
>limiting the viewing range (it might get too confusing if you  
>see everything out there). E.g., at 50% transmission, you would  
>get similar transmission of infrared only up to about 60 miles  
>or 12 atmospheres:  $(.50)^{12} = .024%$ . Thus, if atmospheric  
>conditions were very unusual, this is the reason the crew had  
>never seen the oil wells before (and, as it seems, since).

>Still, my purely subjective impression is that objects in the

>FLIR images seem much too bright to be the distant oil wells no  
>matter how many assumptions of super infrared seeing conditions  
>one makes. Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure  
>technical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't know.  
>Perhaps Bruce Maccabee and James Smith would care to comment.

The "lights" are bright, especially the pair which I called "the Twins." I agree that they are surprisingly bright considering the distance if oil field fires. A calculation from "first principles" could be attempted if I knew the radiation intensity of an oil fire in the band range of the FLIR and if I knew the actual sensitivity of the FLIR.

The twins were also accompanied by lesser lights below which are marginally consistent with being reflections in the water from light/heat sources several hundred feet above water (burning gas).

All of the flares are at about the same distance so I don't know why the twins were so much brighter than the other lights.

Furthermore, as I pointed out in my paper at my web site, if you take the locations of the oil wells and use this to predict what the pattern or array would look like on the FLIR assuming they could all be seen, you get a pattern that does not exactly match what was recorded. This would be strong evidence that not all of the lights were oil fires if one could be certain of the reconstruction. However, it has to be proven that, in fact, the oil fires can (or can't) be seen under the conditions of the sighting.

If one decides that the 'lights' are unexplained, then one is left with a collection of heat sources that were above ground and farther than, say 10-15 miles because they always pass behind clouds that were triangulated at distances from 10-20 miles or so (at no time do they convincingly pass in front of a cloud... i.e., between a cloud and the airplane). If they were not as far as 100 miles then they were traveling at a speed and angle relative to the airplane that made them drop backwards slowly.

To paraphrase a quote from Major Hector Quintanilla in his article in Studies in Intelligence(?) about the Socorro case, at least they weren't traveling at an extraterrestrial speed. But if they were traveling at all.... they were True UFOs. And one wonders then, why they weren't picked up on the radar (were they farther than the 40 mile range limit?).

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

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

**UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:01:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:38:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:47:11 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 04:45:50 +0000  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field flames would be  
>>nonsense and destroy the oil field hoax scheme unless he has a  
>>new Guinness record.

>Santiago et al,

>I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it is  
>possible that radar could detect oil field flames. Speaking very  
>\_generally\_ a flame is a conductive plasma, which could be  
>associated with a great deal of turbulence in the heat column,  
>plus there may be clouds of smoke particulates. Any or all of  
>these - flame, turbulence, smoke - could in principle cause a  
>radar echo. But I know nothing of the radar type or other  
>essential details of the case so won't comment further.

You are correct, in principle, if the flares/fires were close  
enough. However, this radar could not detect them at 100 miles.

The range limit that the radar guy used was only 40 miles.

I doubt that the radar cross-section would have been large  
enough to detect even on the 100+ mile range - if there were  
one.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Belzil

From: Fern Belzil <[fbelzil.nul](mailto:fbelzil.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:13:37 -0600  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:42:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Belzil

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -" <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Sent: Friday, May 26, 2006 4:31 AM  
>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

I just have to make a comment on this ridiculous article of an  
'Alien Face' found in a duck.....

I am the only animal mutilation investigator in Canada, have  
lived and raised purebred Hereford cattle most of my life, I  
know how small a duck is - and to claim that an Alien had been  
found inside must mean that the Aliens must only be the size of  
a mouse?

When they decided to do an autopsy it was gone - how fortunate!

What people will say just to get publicity.

I hope that I am not the only one disturb about this.

Fern Belzil

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Karl Pflock's Official Obituary

From: Loren Coleman <[lcoleman.nul](mailto:lcoleman.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 07:18:48 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:51:52 -0400  
Subject: Karl Pflock's Official Obituary

The family passes along the final word.

When it was learned that Karl Pflock died recently, Cryptomundo noted his passing due to the fact he had, now and then, skeptically also tackled a few cryptozoological topics. I had corresponded with Karl during his life, and I wanted to note his departure from the scene. I have since, again, heard from his widow, who sends a formal obituary to be published here, so exacting details can be shared properly.

We express our sympathies to Karl's family, once again.

Mary Martinek emails along the following:

-----

Source: Loren Coleman's Crypto Mundo Site

<http://www.cryptomundo.com/cryptozoo-news/pflockfobit/>

June 17 2006

Karl Pflock=92s Official Obituary

Karl Tomlinson Pflock

06 January 1943 =97 05 June 2006

PFLOCK =97 Karl T. Pflock, died June 5, 2006 in Placitas, N.M. He was 63 years old and passed away after combating amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), commonly known as Lou Gerhig=92s Disease. He died at his home with his family.

Pflock was an author of fiction and non-fiction, best known for his non-fiction book Roswell: Inconvenient Facts and the Will to Believe (Prometheus, 2001), in which he concluded that the famous 'crashed flying saucer' in Roswell, N.M. in 1947 was actually a highly-classified program called Project Mogul, which was designed to determine if the Soviet Union was conducting atmospheric testing of an atomic bomb.

A former CIA intelligence officer (1966-72), Pflock returned to full-time writing and independent research in 1992 after devoting 11 years to public service and private consulting, during which he was a deputy assistant secretary of defense in the Reagan administration; a senior staff member in the U.S. House of Representatives; and a strategic planning consultant to the U.S. Department of Energy and other U.S. corporations and federal agencies.

Karl Pflock is survived by his wife, Mary Martinek, and his children Jennifer Martinek, Cynthia Newbury, Kurt Pflock, Anna Pflieger, Aaron Pflock, as well as 12 grandchildren and one great grandchild.

In lieu of flowers, the family suggests contributions to assist in researching cures and mitigations of ALS. Contributions may

be made to MDA/ALS, C/O Bank of America, 6201 San Mateo Blvd.,  
NE, Albuquerque, NM 87109; memo line should specify "Research".

French Mortuary  
9300 Golf Course Rd. NW  
(505) 897-0300

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 00:47:22 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:54:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:22:09 -0700  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:05:21 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>>The truth was posted on UFO UpDates a very long time ago - on  
>>September 5, 1997! In a post by Stig Agermose entitled "Heflin's  
>>Photos Draw Fresh Fire From Skeptics" he includes the text of a  
>>July 22, 1997 article in the Orange County Register by reporter  
>>Amy Wilson.

>>See:

>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

>>In this article, people who know it is a toy train part relate  
>>that they have known this for a very long time, and that it was a  
>>joke gone out of control. Unlike Anonymous me, one of these  
>>people, a retiree in Menlo Park, is named and interviewed.

>>It amazes me that no one else on the List picked up on this at  
>>the time and responded to Stig's post and that no one mentioned  
>>the article in this latest discussion on Heflin.

>>Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole  
>>formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

>>There have to be model train hobbyists on this List who can now  
>>find the exact part that Rex used to create the 'craft'.

>Dear "Anonymous",

<snip>

>As for the "model train wheel" part, perhaps our anonymous troll  
>hasn't read recent discussions between myself and Martin Shough.  
>The ratio of the top "dome" to the bottom disc rim varies  
>between photos 1 and 3. The likely explanation is that the  
>object isn't round but elliptical. Non-round "train wheels"?  
>That would make for a very bumpy ride.

>David Rudiak

Hi David,

I have been under the weather and working and haven't had time  
to go over every e-mail:

If you're referring in some way to the very top protrusion, it  
may very well vary in width given that train wheels have  
variously off-axis protrusions that serve as contact points for  
the driving arms that rotate the wheel and generate the needed

torque. To me it may appear that this upper dome favors the right side of the object and is off center as expected given the above disposition for driving arms in general (Heflin #1.#3). I'm not entirely sure though given that bright reflectance may be giving me false readings. It does seem that the upper dome area is off center somewhat? Is this your impression too? And, if the width ratios aren't proportional from image to image, this may also be a determining factor worth considering (see below).

In the event the object's isn't perfectly circular, this may also account for the apparent thickening of the object's right rim during some subset of the inferred rotation pattern or simple stationary orientation with respect to the plane of the photo: Geometric constraints may simply account for apparent thickening associated with what I may have previously assigned to movement related blurring on the right half of #1.

The reflectance off the right side of #1 may also lend some credence to your observations if more exact measurements could be conducted with the given sun angles as they interact with the skewed geometry. In this way, the thickening on the right side could be used as a tool to determine the orientation of the object's long and short diametric axis's in relation to their "out-of-page" projection. These may also be consistent with the expected (observed) angle of reflectance outside the plane of the photo... the angle may be shorter or longer than expected, etc.

Are the width ratios you and Martin observed directly proportional from one image to the next? Or, are the values skewed somewhat. An ellipse would imply that some exact proportions are in order (within the observational error of the photos)?

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:43:19 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:05:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:45:53 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:47:11 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>>>Besides we have the radar readings detecting also  
>>>the objects to the right and in front of the  
>>>airplane. An important element that Mr. Amateur  
>>>Debunker conveniently has never mentioned, why?

>>>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field  
>>>flames would be nonsense and destroy the oil field  
>>>hoax scheme unless he has a new Guinness record.

>>Santiago et al,

>>I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it  
>>is possible that radar could detect oil field flames.  
>>Speaking very generally a flame is a conductive  
>>plasma, which could be associated with a great deal  
>>of turbulence in the heat column, plus there may be  
>>clouds of smoke particulates. Any or all of  
>>these - flame, turbulence, smoke - could in principle  
>>cause a radar echo. But I know nothing of the radar  
>>type or other essential details of the case so won't  
>>comment further.

>Really? You didn't read correctly the reports. The C26A radar  
>also detected the objects to the right and in front of the  
>airplane, that is over the mainland performing manuevres and  
>changes of speed. This is documented. Once again: Over the  
>mainland direction not the ocean.

The fact that the radar detected targets on the land or over the  
land is has no bearing on the suggestion that the radar, in  
principle, could detect the ionization/plasma in a flame, if  
close enough.

However, as I pointed out in another message, the radar cross  
section (reflection strength) probably was not great for a fire  
and furthermore, so far as I know, the radar operator never  
switched to a range beyond 40 miles.

>This important element has been most of the times ignored or  
>misunderstood wich results dissapointing. At certain time and  
>according to the FLIR and radar the C26A crew realized the  
>airplane was surrounded by these objects and this is also  
>documented on the audio portions included in the case files.

The fact is that the radar did pick up other targets which were  
either moving very slowly - 60 mph - or not at all.

There were no FLIR lights in the directions of the radar targets at the right.

As for being "surrounded," the history of the sighting shows that the FLIR lights behind and to the left, which were the ones that most greatly perturbed the crew were not detected on radar and, conversely, the couple of radar targets at the the right and ahead were detected by the radar after the "family" of FLIR lights at the left had disappeared and they (radar targets at the right) were not detected by the FLIR.

>This was real not an ilussion, mistake or invention and remains  
>as an important element in this investigation. It has been  
>proven that the hoaxer never answered to this issues simply  
>because he has not answers and then his theatrical hoaxed show  
>fell down along with him.

IMHO the only radar target that was truly anomalous was the first one. It clearly had characteristics of speed (implying a heat source of some sort for propulsion) and size (to be detected by the radar out to 40 mi) to indicate that it should have been detectable visually and by the FLIR when only 2 miles ahead of the plane. So, why wasn't t detected? And why did it speed up as it continued to travel northwestward after the plane turned away from it?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 10:19:00 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:06:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

Is the whereabouts of the original Polaroid photographs known?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:11:42 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:19:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:28:06 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>Hello Martin

>>Excuse the intervention, but isn't it little strong to say that  
>>theory construction is not part of the process? It surely is,  
>>else there would be no process. Pure experimental induction is  
>>(or would be if it existed) just the accumulation of lists of  
>>data and science could be done by machines. Isn't the hard bit,  
>>and the bit that transforms botanical lists into bodies of  
>>knowledge, the theory construction? Testing is the historical  
>>crux of a scientific process, yes, but a crux is a point of  
>>intersection rather than a stand-alone thing. After all, if you  
>>don't have a theory you can't test it.

>It may be rather strong, but from my hardline empiricist  
>viewpoint, the stronger the better. What I was objecting to was  
>this (from Richard Hall's post of June 9):

>"The people who are included as sociologists or political  
>scientists or anthropologists include many who follow scientific  
>methods, both in theory construction and compilation of  
>empirical evidence"

>In other words, the idea that a discipline can be regarded as  
>scientific on the basis of the way its theories are constructed.

Of course, that is not what I said! I said nothing about `the  
way' theories are constructed. Cathy quotes me accurately, and  
then turns around and totally distorts what I said, which was  
that many of the social/behavioral scientists indeed do use  
scientific method. Cathy originally denied that theory  
construction was part of scientific method, and now pretends not  
to have said that or not to actually have meant that.

>A theory is either testable and scientific, or not testable, and  
>not scientific. It makes no difference how it's constructed.

Once again, I am totally puzzled by the semantics, meaning, and  
intent of this construction. By scientific method, theories are  
supposed to be constructed by means of inferences from data, and  
some imagination about how the data might be explainable.  
Although Cathy continually denies that any social/behavioral  
scientists are capable of doing this, I utterly disagree with  
her.

>Of course I agree that constructing theories is often the most  
>difficult and complex part of the process of doing science. But  
>Nature doesn't really care how hard we work in concocting our  
>precious ideas. One can spend twenty years on a beautiful and  
>elegant theory that turns out to be scientifically useless (as



>Einstein did in the latter part of his life).

Yes, of course. That's the purpose of theories.

>Conversely, the horrendously ugly theory that someone just  
>happened to scribble on the back of an envelope while waiting  
>for a bus, might just turn out to be a work of scientific  
>genius if only it makes the right predictions.

>Cathy

Yes, but what is the point of this observation? That sometimes people get lucky and guess the right answer while a lot of times elaborate theories are ultimately disproven? So what? All this proves is that scientists (like everyone else) sometimes let their imaginations get the better of them, and they are not sufficiently empirically grounded. I would agree with that.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:18:34 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:47:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Ledger

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:06:11 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 05:53:00 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

><snip>

>>We have a huge database on the SEDENA/MAF case and just a  
>>small percentage is known outside Mexico therefore those  
>>outsiders ignoring so much facts on this major case instead of  
>>requesting updates with us prefer to disseminate disinformation  
>>on this case to serve their own pro-cover up/anti-UFO Disclosure  
>>interests and this is also a \_fact\_.

>Well, it was so easy to distribute the UFO FLIR video to the  
>world, what's the problem with sending out the video confirming  
>that the Air Force FLIR cameras cannot see the gas flares?

If I may jump in here. Are you asking for all of the video  
taping of the equipment for every flight that the MAF took or  
takes in that area? That's a bit cumbersome and we both know  
that's not going to happen.

And can you tell me why you would expect the MAF to do all of  
this when you own air force would just laugh at such a  
suggestion. When have they ever given any help to private UFO  
investigators. The best you can hope for is a few whistle  
blowers.

At least the MAF released the video. When has the USAF ever done  
something like this? Don't throw the baby out with the bath  
water, James.

Incidentally in another email you mentioned that I wanted to  
stay on the good side of the MAF so as to get possible gun  
camera footage. I doubt if the MAF even knows I'm alive. But if  
I thought it would produce gun camera footage, your damn right I  
would shine up to them:)

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 12:30:55 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:49:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Golubik

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:35:21 +0000  
>Subject: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>Here is some background information on the Rex Heflin photo  
>case, which was investigated from August 1965 on by the Los  
>Angeles NICAP Subcommittee (LANS). NICAP was fortunate to have  
>many meticulous investigators (including Ray Fowler, Walt Webb,  
>and Fran Ridge) who intensively researched cases of this  
>potential importance.

<snip>

Thanks Richard! Historical perspective is one of the more  
elusive aspects of old cases to gain a handle on. With it, much  
more can be overcome and reconstructed with valued input such as  
this.

Do you still have the entire NICAP folders on this case? If not,  
who has them currently. I recall you mentioning that the files  
were dispersed at various times: different portions having  
separate locations. In any event, could there be potentially  
much more information available about this case from such  
locatable files. I would imagine the answer is a firm, "Yes."

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 19:09:40 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:51:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:27:18 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 14:01:50 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>Heflin was an investigator and I'm hoping through detailed work  
>we can gain some useful insights into the authenticity of these  
>images without prejudice. You have to play both sides of the  
>argument to gain useful insights.

Absolutely right.

>The ratios look correct.

The ratio of the "tyre" or rim diameter to flange diameter on  
the drawing shown differs from the ratio on the photos by around  
8%, but we'll let that go.

>If the wheel thickness is ~6.5 mm  
>total, then the diameter of the wheel is around ~1 inch. If we  
>can established this with a certain amount of precision, we can  
>determine and confirm from another source just how far the  
>camera is from the subject (Horizontal width-of-field is  
>approximately ~30 degrees). Since I don't have an uncropped  
>original (not sure if these are), I can't comparison scale  
>exactly for calculation purposes but believe 1 inch seems to be  
>an appropriate scale given the window dimensions. This will  
>either confirm the 3D stereo determined distance or not.

In another post I gave my estimate of 1" at 36" for the model  
hypothesis - based on parallax, on the UFO angular size  
calculated by Hartmann (and/or other early investigators) in  
photo #1 (2.4 degs), and a rough estimate of window size from an  
Econoline drawing converted to angular subtense. The result is  
pretty much identical to yours, but the construction is  
different.

I assume the JSE scans are essentially uncropped. The  
proportions are those of a 3.25" x 4.25" format to within about  
2%. Using the above angular scale I get ~41 deg for the lateral  
FOV. This gives ~ 28 degs for the roll-up window width, or about  
15" for a lens-window distance of 30" and a distance of ~ 36" to  
a model 1" across near the mirror. If ~15" is close to your  
measurement of the actual window of a 1962-65 Ford Econoline (as  
I say, my estimate was scaled from a perspective drawing) then  
~41 deg FOV it is.

Your 30 degs seems small. This would make Hartmann's angular  
value for the #1 object in error by nearly 40%, which bearing in  
mind that he made tests with the same camera and was referencing  
several other Air Force, Marine and NICAP photo analysis reports  
in his study, seems too much to me. Does this come from  
experiments with the camera? You mention that it's a guess. How  
educated a guess?

>This would also allow us to determine, despite the fact the  
>aperture is small and we have great depth of field, exactly  
>where in proximity to the lens objects at close range begin to  
>get blurred as they move in closer to the lens. If we can  
>compare those images with the original for blurriness, we might  
>establish yet another consistent perceptive comparison of  
>distance to the model that may or may not confirm the distance  
>to the model consistent with the 3D stereo.

Indeed. If your guess of 30-31 degs is correct then the object is only ~1.8 degs across, and a 1" train wheel with this subtense is at about 31" from the lens. If Hartmann's angular scale is correct, then our 1" train wheel would be only ~ 24" from the lens in photo #1, and since it must be hanging beyond the windscreen (it is directly sunlit) then the top of the windscreen must be somewhat closer, say about 20". Is this possible given the state of focus of the object and the windscreen frame?

The effective f.42 stop gives terrific depth of field as has been said. The JSE authors say:

"McDonald had been surprised when Hartmann demonstrated that Heflin's 101 Polaroid camera was capable of sharply focused photos at close range and had begun to think that Heflin could have photographed a small model. However, he learned from LANS that two and a half years before the very start of case investigation, LANS photo expert Zan Overall had discovered that Heflin's work camera sharply focused nearby objects; when set at infinity, the photos turned out sharp at 3 feet (McDonald, 1968)"

Ralph Rankow (FSR 14.1. p.21) quotes Polaroid figures stating that for a focus distance as small as 8.5 ft "the background would be sharp".

Pending Viktor's tests with the actual camera I wanted to check this. So using a DoF calculator for FL 114 mm, f.42 and CoC = 0.103 (nominal 10 x 8 CoC = 0.254 mm, enlargement factor for 3.25 x 4.25 Polaroid format = 2.46) I get the following values for 4 different focus distances:

1) focus dist.	9.0 ft,	near depth	4.7 ft,	far depth	103.6 ft
2) focus dist.	9.5 ft,	near depth	4.8 ft,	far depth	262.9 ft
3) focus dist.	9.8 ft,	near depth	4.9 ft,	far depth	1719.7 ft
4) focus dist.	10.0 ft,	near depth	5.1 ft,	far depth	INF

These results differ slightly from Rankow's Polaroid figures and from Overall's reported test result. According to this, if the cars and phone/power wires on the Santa Ana freeway about 1500 ft away are in sharp focus ("finely resolved", Ralph Rankow; "all parts in focus from the windows . . . on down the road to the cars", Santa Ana Register Chief Photographer) then the focus distance must have been greater than 9.5 ft and the near depth would be about 5 ft.

The calculator also disagrees with the Overall report that a focus distance of infinity would allow a near depth of 3 ft, indicating that if the camera is focused on the distance of the Santa Ana freeway traffic 1500 ft away the near depth distance would be twice the above figures at about 9.8 ft, around 5 times the windscreen distance (and further for longer focus distances.)

Based on this (again, pending actual tests), since the nearby windscreen frame in #1 is obviously not dramatically out of focus, we should conclude that the camera cannot have been set on infinity or focused on a distance comparable to the background landscape of 1500 ft, but must have been set on a relatively small focus distance in the order of 10 ft or so with a near depth of around 5 ft or 60". (Given the wide DoF it wouldn't much matter to Heflin for most ordinary purposes what the focus setting was.)

So, this suggests that if the freeway wires and traffic really are (as claimed) in sharp focus, then a 1" train wheel only ~ 24" from the lens in photo #1 should not also be in sharp focus. Both the model and the windscreen frame would be around three times closer than the near distance of the DoF with a difference of only about 7% between them, suggesting that both should be

very similarly resolved, or rather unresolved, within a few percent. But if you count the edge resolution on a greatly enlarged copy of JSE scan #1 you get about twice the pixel count for the edge of the windscreen as for the comparably oriented bottom edge of the UFO.

In short the roof edge looks much more out of focus than the UFO, and the significance of this is heightened because of evidence of motion blur on the UFO which (whether model or real) would tend to degrade the edge resolution.

In summary this does not look too good for a 1" train wheel just outside the window and favours a significantly larger object (model or real) at proportionately greater distance, which is a problem because a model significantly larger than 1" is not consistent with the photogrammetry of photos #2 and #3.

Of course, Heflin could have moved a large model between #2 and #3 and the apparent stereo parallax suggesting a 1" model could be happenstance, just as the same happenstance could occur with a real flying UFO; or he could have used two different train wheels of different sizes hung from the front of the van and the side of the van. But these are not the simplest hypotheses. The simplest hypothesis - one wheel on a thread, moved from one static position for #1 to a second static position for #2 and #3 - seems to me less likely on the basis of these figures.

But others on the List with better photographic expertise than me may disagree, and as always any theoretical arguments remain subject to Viktor's real-world experiments. I just offer this for discussion.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:43:30 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:52:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 10:19:00 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>Is the whereabouts of the original Polaroid photographs known?

Yes, Ann Druffel has them in California.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Scheldroup

From: **John Scheldroup** <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:45:02 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:53:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Scheldroup

>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
>Subject: Heflin Mystery Solved

><snip>

Upon examining Fig. 1. First photograph of Heflin sighting (Heflin Photo 1).

Source:  
<http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

Two visible transparent lines which come to an interest upon the image bottom found below. Can you see that swirling dust bowl in affect right below the object ?, strange isnt it,.. seems to fit neatly within the transparent region, better known as clear tape pasted on the window, but notice the finger mark where the two lines come to meet, looks like second smudge in the opposite corner too.

Sadly it seems, did our cat burglar forgot to wipe up afterwards ? <g>

<http://tinyurl.com/fwtrq>

John

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:46:31 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:56:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Friedman

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:24:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:55:49 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>I then ask you to justify why you are sure there are indeed  
>>high tech vehicles and then how you know for sure they are  
>>piloted by ET aliens. All you offer is: a hugh number of cases  
>>exist that describe same, which is tantamount to saying: it  
>>looks like this is the case, so it is.

>You know what I think? I think Stan has inside information. I  
>think that at some point in his long UFO career, he was taken  
>aside by some military types and let in on the Big Secret, which  
>is that we've recovered flying saucer wreckage (not at Roswell,  
>though), along with creatures from another planet. Just like in  
>the movies.

>He was also told that he'd move into a position as a top  
>spokesperson when the government finally does come clean about  
>the whole thing, which will happen when and if a significant UFO  
>event happens that is so public they can't cover it up. Not an  
>official "MJ-12" position, but certainly within range.

>All he would have to do in the meantime is keep quiet about it,  
>and go on about his business as usual. He doesn't have to lie or  
>make things up. He just needs to subtely steer his fellow  
>investigators and the public away from the actual truth of the  
>matter.

>It's the only "logical" reason I can imagine that would explain  
>Stan's absolute, unshakable certainty about the aliens. "Seeing  
>is believing," in the UFO field, after all.

>Oh, but I suppose I should put a big disclaimer here. Consider  
>this post disclaimed.

The post is total fiction having no basis in fact, no evidence,  
and suggesting some notions that are totally and completely  
false, and obviously contradicted by all kinds of things I have  
written over the past 38 years. For example, try my  
congressional testimony of July 29, 1968, p. 214..

Stan Friedman

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 19:57:10 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:57:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 10:19:00 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>Is the whereabouts of the original Polaroid photographs known?

Yes Bob

They are in the possession of Ann Druffel in California. I'm told there is zero chance of her letting them out of her sight.

At present although Bob Wood was amenable to allowing access to 500 dpi scans of these, the other JSE paper authors (Ann, and Ed Kelson) did not agree even to this.

Neither the high res scans nor the originals themselves will be available, I understand, until some time after the publication of a second JSE paper. I'm told the date has been brought forward to "this summer" in light of recent interest, but as Ann reminded us recently refereed papers can take a long time to get to print and we have no idea if Ed Kelson has even begun the work yet.

Don't hold your breath!

Martin

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Heflin UFO Photos - King

From: Kyle King <[kyleking.nul](mailto:kyleking.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:18:18 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 16:00:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin UFO Photos - King

The anonymous poster who has sent messages regarding the Heflin Photos has written to me to ask that I send you a link to my blog where I have posted some information regarding this case.

Herewith is his message to me:

-----

Hi Kyle-

I am "Anonymous" on UFO Updates.

Your recent "UFO Reflections" blog entry on Heflin is incredibly accurate. Your research on this was obviously thorough.

May I please ask you to submit the comparison photos of the train wheels you found, and of the airshow donut formation you located (with corresponding Heflin photos) to UFO Updates? If you are not a member, Errol Bruce-Knapp (whose email is on the site) will post them for you.

I ask this of you because the wheels may in fact be the exact ones that Rex used. If not, they are very, very similar.

I have taken somewhat of a "beating" on UFO Updates and I am not quite sure why. However, read past posts and you will see that Tim Shell's train wheel diagram and John Scheldroup's photo of a airshow donut hole (as well as Ed Riddle's interview on the Heflin photos) helps substantiate what I have been saying and what you have discovered.

Your contribution in exposing the hoax is significant. Again, I believe you have found two precise matches to the "craft" and I would very much appreciate your sharing it with researchers on the List...

Thanks

-----

The posts in question are located at my blog...

[uforeflections.blogspot.com](http://uforeflections.blogspot.com)

I do not know who this person is, but I have followed up his posts by checking the sources he mentioned, and the results of these searches is posted in my blog entries.

While I remain neutral as to the validity of the Heflin story, I think the information I've found might help in the discussion.

At any rate, Mr. Anonymous seems to think so.

Best,

Kyle

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 20:23:33 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 16:38:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Hall

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:40:17 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:35:21 +0000  
>>Subject: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>>Here is some background information on the Rex Heflin photo  
>>case, which was investigated from August 1965 on by the Los  
>>Angeles NICAP Subcommittee (LANS). NICAP was fortunate to have  
>>many meticulous investigators (including Ray Fowler, Walt Webb,  
>>and Fran Ridge) who intensively researched cases of this  
>>potential importance.

<snip>

>>For the benefit of those currently re-examining the case and  
>>attempting new analysis of the photographs, here are some  
>>excerpts from my Epperson file:

<snip>

>Thank you Dick, invaluable background.

>I just wanted to add that - if memory serves me right - the  
>issue of unexplained under-reporting was also an explicit  
>factor in this case.

Not particularly more so in this case, it was a general issue at  
the time and later. Lots of evidence indicates that very few  
witnesses report their UFO sightings. The other example I  
reported of the disc seen by dozens of motorists in the same  
general location during the first week of August is a case in  
point.

>Didn't the witnesses express surprise that there were  
>\_no\_other\_reports\_ despite the number of stopped cars on a busy  
>highway?

That was the other case I mentioned.

>This is a relevant point in the Heflin case as well  
>(notwithstanding the story of the surveyors, which I take it is  
>still unconfirmed?)

Well, I don't consider it especially relevant. To the best of my  
knowledge the surveyors were never tracked down. - Dick

>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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 20:32:12 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 16:41:21 -0400  
Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Hall

>From: Fern Belzil <[fbelzil.nul](mailto:fbelzil.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:13:37 -0600  
>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers -" <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Sent: Friday, May 26, 2006 4:31 AM  
>>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

>I just have to make a comment on this ridiculous article of an  
>'Alien Face' found in a duck.....

>I am the only animal mutilation investigator in Canada, have  
>lived and raised purebred Hereford cattle most of my life, I  
>know how small a duck is - and to claim that an Alien had been  
>found inside must mean that the Aliens must only be the size of  
>a mouse?

>When they decided to do an autopsy it was gone - how fortunate!

>What people will say just to get publicity.

>I hope that I am not the only one disturb about this.

Thanks, Fern. I am disturbed that newspapers, and TV (including  
major networks) are so willing to report junk stories like this,  
tongue-in-cheek stories, while totally ignoring serious UFO  
reports and related evidence.

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:51:38 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 07:43:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Lehmborg

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 20:32:12 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

>>>From: Fern Belzil <[fbelzil.nul](mailto:fbelzil.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:13:37 -0600  
>>>Subject: Re: 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

>>>>I just have to make a comment on this ridiculous article of an  
>>>>'Alien Face' found in a duck.....

>>>>I am the only animal mutilation investigator in Canada, have  
>>>>lived and raised purebred Hereford cattle most of my life, I  
>>>>know how small a duck is - and to claim that an Alien had been  
>>>>found inside must mean that the Aliens must only be the size of  
>>>>a mouse?

>>>>When they decided to do an autopsy it was gone - how fortunate!

>>>>What people will say just to get publicity.

>>>>I hope that I am not the only one disturb about this.

>>>>Thanks, Fern. I am disturbed that newspapers, and TV (including  
>>>>major networks) are so willing to report junk stories like this,  
>>>>tongue-in-cheek stories, while totally ignoring serious UFO  
>>>>reports and related evidence.

The preceding is fact. I cannot see but that this could not be  
the design of a \_jealous\_, non-elected, and remotely  
intelligent... scientific, institutional, governmental, and  
spiritual leadership.

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 20:53:26 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 07:45:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Hall

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 12:30:55 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:35:21 +0000  
>>Subject: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>>Here is some background information on the Rex Heflin photo  
>>case, which was investigated from August 1965 on by the Los  
>>Angeles NICAP Subcommittee (LANS). NICAP was fortunate to have  
>>many meticulous investigators (including Ray Fowler, Walt Webb,  
>>and Fran Ridge) who intensively researched cases of this  
>>potential importance.

><snip>

>Thanks Richard! Historical perspective is one of the more  
>elusive aspects of old cases to gain a handle on. With it, much  
>more can be overcome and reconstructed with valued input such as  
>this.

>Do you still have the entire NICAP folders on this case? If not,  
>who has them currently. I recall you mentioning that the files  
>were dispersed at various times: different portions having  
>separate locations. In any event, could there be potentially  
>much more information available about this case from such  
>locatable files. I would imagine the answer is a firm, "Yes."

Viktor,

You seem to have forgotten that I told you privately the NICAP case file on Heflin should be in the CUFOS collection. In fact, you told me you were going to try to obtain copies. Note the dates of my background information items; virtually all post-NICAP or well after I left NICAP about 1970.

I do not have the NICAP files, only some small percentage of copies from them. Absolutely, the original NICAP case file on Heflin would include invaluable information, far better and more significant than the wild guesswork currently passing for 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 17:34:07 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 07:50:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 19:09:40 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:27:18 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>>From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 14:01:50 -0500  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>Heflin was an investigator and I'm hoping through detailed work  
>>we can gain some useful insights into the authenticity of these  
>>images without prejudice. You have to play both sides of the  
>>argument to gain useful insights.

>Absolutely right.

>>The ratios look correct.

>The ratio of the "tyre" or rim diameter to flange diameter on  
>the drawing shown differs from the ratio on the photos by around  
>8%, but we'll let that go.

>>If the wheel thickness is ~6.5 mm  
>>total, then the diameter of the wheel is around ~1 inch. If we  
>>can established this with a certain amount of pecision, we can  
>>determine and confirm from another source just how far the  
>>camera is from the subject (Horizontal width-of-field is  
>>approximately ~30 degrees). Since I don't have an uncropped  
>>original (not sure if these are), I can't comparison scale  
>>exactly for calculation purposes but believe 1 inch seems to be  
>>an appropriate scale given the window dimensions. This will  
>>either confirm the 3D stereo determined distance or not.

>In another post I gave my estimate of 1" at 36" for the model  
>hypothesis - based on parallax, on the UFO angular size  
>calculated by Hartmann (and/or other early investigators) in  
>photo #1 (2.4 degs), and a rough estimate of window size from an  
>Econoline drawing converted to angular subtense. The result is  
>pretty much identical to yours, but the construction is  
>different.

>I assume the JSE scans are essentially uncropped. The  
>proportions are those of a 3.25" x 4.25" format to within about  
>2%. Using the above angular scale I get ~41 deg for the lateral  
>FOV. This gives ~ 28 degs for the roll-up window width, or about  
>15" for a lens-window distance of 30" and a distance of ~ 36" to  
>a model 1" across near the mirror. If ~15" is close to your  
>measurement of the actual window of a 1962-65 Ford Econoline (as  
>I say, my estimate was scaled from a perspective drawing) then  
>~41 deg FOV it is.

Thanks for the input Martin... Since we don't know the  
distance/angle the camera was from the window, (Yes, we can

guess), the percent to which the photos have been cropped, and the percent of the FOV actually falling upon the photo, it is difficult to apply precision. The actual width of field has to be determined from actual test which should settle all debate. This is the whole reason I pursued experiment over all else. The purpose was to end debate over hypothetical imprecision and let others see the same results rather than just, let's say, taking someone's else's word for it.

Once we have the actual width-of-field falling upon the photo, the full uncropped original, fishbowl distortion removed, we can get the camera positions down really well. Maybe we'll find out how he was holding the camera too? This interaction should be insightful and again give Heflin's case more credence.

>Your 30 degs seems small. This would make Hartmann's angular >value for the #1 object in error by nearly 40%, which bearing in >mind that he made tests with the same camera and was referencing >several other Air Force, Marine and NICAP photo analysis reports >in his study, seems too much to me. Does this come from >experiments with the camera? You mention that it's a guess. How >educated a guess?

Yes, 40 degrees is correct... but consider this with the above too:

Two FOV values are typically reported: both diagonal and horizontal. The diagonal value will be greater... 30 degrees may in fact be closer to reality, etc. I just shrank it for cautionary purposes. Knowing I'll be getting actual values with real tests is more to my point. The focus adjustment on the camera also moves the lens position quite a bit toward and away from the film plane. Despite the fact that this focus adjustment should have little impact on the actual B&W focus (we'll see), it may, however, impact the apparent FOV as it may limit the amount of the calculated FOV falling upon the actual film square as you move the focus in and out. I'll be testing this out as well.

>>This would also allow us to determine, despite the fact the >>aperture is small and we have great depth of field, exactly >>where in proximity to the lens objects at close range begin to >>get blurred as they move in closer to the lens. If we can >>compare those images with the original for blurriness, we might >>establish yet another consistent perceptive comparison of >>distance to the model that may or may not confirm the distance >>to the model consistent with the 3D stereo.

>Indeed. If your guess of 30-31 degs is correct then the object >is only ~1.8 degs across, and a 1" train wheel with this >subtense is at about 31" from the lens. If Hartmann's angular >scale is correct, then our 1" train wheel would be only ~ 24" >from the lens in photo #1, and since it must be hanging beyond >the windscreen (it is directly sunlit) then the top of the >windscreen must be somewhat closer, say about 20". Is this >possible given the state of focus of the object and the >windscreen frame?

>The effective f.42 stop gives terrific depth of field as has >been said. The JSE authors say:

>"McDonald had been surprised when Hartmann demonstrated that >Heflin's 101 Polaroid camera was capable of sharply focused >photos at close range and had begun to think that Heflin could >have photographed a small model. However, he learned from LANS >that two and a half years before the very start of case >investigation, LANS photo expert Zan Overall had discovered that >Heflin's work camera sharply focused nearby objects; when set at >infinity, the photos turned out sharp at 3 feet (McDonald, >1968)"

>Ralph Rankow (FSR 14.1. p.21) quotes Polaroid figures stating >that for a focus distance as small as 8.5 ft "the background >would be sharp".

>Pending Viktor's tests with the actual camera I wanted to check >this. So using a DoF calculator for FL 114 mm, f.42 and CoC = >0.103 (nominal 10 x 8 CoC = 0.254 mm, enlargement factor for >3.25 x 4.25 Polaroid format = 2.46) I get the following values >for 4 different focus distances:

>1) focus dist. 9.0 ft, near depth 4.7 ft, far depth 103.6 ft



>2) focus dist 9.5 ft, near depth 4.8 ft, far depth 262.9 ft  
>3) focus dist 9.8 ft, near depth 4.9 ft, far depth 1719.7 ft  
>4) focus dist 10.0 ft, near depth 5.1 ft, far depth INF

>These results differ slightly from Rankow's Polaroid figures and  
>from Overall's reported test result. According to this, if the  
>cars and phone/power wires on the Santa Ana freeway about 1500  
>ft away are in sharp focus ("finely resolved", Ralph Rankow;  
>"all parts in focus from the windows... on down the road to  
>the cars", Santa Ana Register Chief Photographer) then the focus  
>distance must have been greater than 9.5 ft and the near depth  
>would be about 5 ft.

<snip>

>But others on the List with better photographic expertise than  
>me may disagree, and as always any theoretical arguments remain  
>subject to Viktor's real-world experiments. I just offer this  
>for discussion.

The whole reason for my emphasis on focus and depth of field is  
two fold: first to get a handle on how well the camera can  
capture, on "Film", variously constructed strings hanging  
"nearby" in oversaturated conditions: both the focus and the  
saturation can affect the detection limits. Second, to  
determine what impact blur has on the perception of distance.  
The amount of blurring may also vary as a function of distance  
from the central field. With actual tests we can qualitatively  
evaluate this parameter as well and hopefully improve Heflin's  
case more stringently and without repeated controversy.

With actual tests we will also be able to remove any fishbowl  
distortions from the images and for the first time get Though  
this should have much less impact on central field area.

Yes Martin, the whole point of experimentation is to be working  
with actual performance characteristics. We can expend energy  
on two fronts if we want.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 17:56:59 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 07:52:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 19:57:10 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>They are in the possession of Ann Druffel in California. I'm  
>told there is zero chance of her letting them out of her sight.

>At present although Bob Wood was amenable to allowing access to  
>500 dpi scans of these, the other JSE paper authors (Ann, and Ed  
>Kelson) did not agree even to this.

OK. I could arrange for some extremely high quality scans if they were amenable. A friend of mine actually designs the imaging systems for scanners and can work wonders pulling information out of images. His lab is in Boston. The problem with saying that there are 500dpi scans is that there are scans and then there are scans. Scanner driver software that is generally available isn't designed for critical scientific research. To evaluate scans, we need to know scanner manufacturer and model, software driver used, and driver settings. Just such a simple thing as having dust and scratch filtering turned on can ruin a scan for any really critical evaluation of fine detail.

I'm always skeptical of researchers who resist allowing others to examine things like scans. What possible harm could it do to let others examine them? Basically they are saying "our interpretation is the only one we want out there. Take it or leave it." Having worked in real science (a status which UFOlogy is far from attaining as yet), this sort of stuff just frustrates and infuriates me.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 23:04:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 07:55:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough

>From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:45:02 -0500  
>Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved

>>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
>>Subject: Heflin Mystery Solved

>><snip>

>Upon examining Fig. 1. First photograph of Heflin sighting (Heflin Photo 1).

>Source:  
><http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

This is just a link to the JSE paper.

>Two visible transparent lines which come to an interest upon  
>the image bottom found below.

This is incomprehensible.

>Can you see that swirling dust  
>bowl in affect right below the object ?, strange isnt it,...

This "dust bowl" is a patch of dead grass, as Dick Hall wearily had to remind everyone the last time Nick Balaskas resurrected this old mistake on-List a week or two back! If you use your eyes you'll see the same patch next to the other post further down the road.

>seems to fit neatly within the transparent region, better known  
>as clear tape pasted on the window, but notice the finger mark  
>where the two lines come to meet, looks like second smudge in  
>the opposite corner too.

Perhaps it's just me but I can't understand this either.

>Sadly it seems, did our cat burglar forgot to wipe up  
>afterwards? <g>

Anyone?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 23:18:32 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 07:56:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 20:23:33 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:40:17 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>  
>>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 19:35:21 +0000  
>>>Subject: Richard Hall's Heflin Case Background

>>>For the benefit of those currently re-examining the case and  
>>>attempting new analysis of the photographs, here are some  
>>>excerpts from my Epperson file:

><snip>

>>Thank you Dick, invaluable background.

>>I just wanted to add that - if memory serves me right - the  
>>issue of unexplained under-reporting was also an explicit  
>>factor in this case.

>Not particularly more so in this case, it was a general issue at  
>the time and later. Lots of evidence indicates that very few  
>witnesses report their UFO sightings. The other example I  
>reported of the disc seen by dozens of motorists in the same  
>general location during the first week of August is a case in  
>point.

That's exactly what I meant.

>>Didn't the witnesses express surprise that there were  
>>\_no\_other\_reports\_ despite the number of stopped cars on a busy  
>>highway?

>That was the other case I mentioned.

Yes indeed. That's my point. There was another case in the same  
area at around the same time where a number of people ought to  
have been in a position to report but didn't. This has also been  
held against the Heflin case: Broad daylight, nearby roads, lots  
of traffic, big object, why not many other reports? The other  
case in comparable circumstances, where witnesses specifically  
\_drew\_attention\_ to many other witnesses who didn't come forward  
(possible "evidence against interest" as Brad might say - but  
not necessarily in this case) possibly establishes the Heflin  
"under-reporting" as part of a pattern. Such a \_pattern\_ is not  
necessarily negative evidence, whereas seen in isolation  
Heflin's "single witness" status could be interpreted that way

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 21:02:06 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 08:03:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - Ledger

>From: Fern Belzil <[fbelzil.nul](mailto:fbelzil.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:13:37 -0600  
>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

>I just have to make a comment on this ridiculous article of an  
>'Alien Face' found in a duck.....

>I am the only animal mutilation investigator in Canada, have  
>lived and raised purebred Hereford cattle most of my life, I  
>know how small a duck is - and to claim that an Alien had been  
>found inside must mean that the Aliens must only be the size of  
>a mouse?

>When they decided to do an autopsy it was gone - how fortunate!

>What people will say just to get publicity.

>I hope that I am not the only one disturb about this.

Hi Fern,

I think most thought it was so silly as to not be taken  
seriously or even to be commented on.

I'm with you.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 18:14:34 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 08:15:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Rudiak

>From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:45:02 -0500  
>Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved

>>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
>>Subject: Heflin Mystery Solved

>><snip>

>Upon examining Fig. 1. First photograph of Heflin sighting  
>(Heflin Photo 1).

>Source:  
><http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

>Two visible transparent lines which come to an interest upon  
>the image bottom found below. Can you see that swirling dust  
>bowl in affect right below the object ?

Actually just a patch of dead grass or weeds ~200 feet down the road.

>strange isnt it...  
>seems to fit neatly within the transparent region, better known  
>as clear tape pasted on the window,

What I find strange is that you would think "clear tape pasted on the window" has some hoaxing connection to something several hundred feet away. I also find it strange that you immediately "know" that the "clear transparent lines" are caused by tape pasted to the windshields. That's called jumping to conclusions.

E.g., they could easily be a photo developing artifact common in old Polaroid cameras, caused by not pulling the picture out of the camera in a perfectly even fashion, i.e. roller streaks. That can cause uneven development. I see at least two more possible streaks further to the right. Did Heflin cover his windshield with transparent tape?

I also notice that the two vertical streaks I think you are referring to do NOT line up with the object, but are offset to the left of it. So if Heflin taped a model to his windshield, oddly he left the right edge of it sticking out to the side of the "tape."

Adding to the strangeness, a model taped to the windshield would have been 2 feet or less from the camera. However, it is clearly in focus as are objects hundreds of yards away. How did Heflin manage that?

To pile more weirdness onto strangeness, a model taped to the windshield would have been in the shadow of Heflin's van (the sun was off to his right and behind him at the time). How did he get all that wonderful sunlit illumination on the top and right side of the object? A model would have had to be at least



an inch or two in front of the windshield to get out of the shadow and pick up such illumination. Perhaps he took the tape and made a big loop around the model? Yeah, that must be it!

Also would you guys settle on a consistent hoax scenario? Was the model taped to the window or was it suspended from a nylon fishing line? Please make up your minds.

>but notice the finger mark  
>where the two lines come to meet, looks like second smudge in  
>the opposite corner too.

>Sadly it seems, did our cat burglar forgot to wipe up  
>afterwards? <g>

Are you saying Heflin left his fingerprints on that "tape" of yours? If that's the case, then Heflin would have had fingers about 6 inches wide.

Obviously these are just fingerprints from somebody handling the Polaroid print afterwards. Sheesh! Talk about trying to make a Federal case out of nothing.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 18:22:57 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 08:27:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Rudiak

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 00:47:22 EDT  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:22:09 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 08:05:21 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>>[Non-Subscriber Post]

>>>The truth was posted on UFO UpDates a very long time ago - on  
>>>September 5, 1997! In a post by Stig Agermose entitled "Heflin's  
>>>Photos Draw Fresh Fire From Skeptics" he includes the text of a  
>>>July 22, 1997 article in the Orange County Register by reporter  
>>>Amy Wilson.

>>><http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/1997/sep/m05-001.shtml>

>>>In this article, people who know it is a toy train part relate  
>>>that they have known this for a very long time, and that it was a  
>>>joke gone out of control. Unlike Anonymous me, one of these  
>>>people, a retiree in Menlo Park, is named and interviewed.

<snip>

>>As for the "model train wheel" part, perhaps our anonymous troll  
>>hasn't read recent discussions between myself and Martin Shough.  
>>The ratio of the top "dome" to the bottom disc rim varies  
>>between photos 1 and 3. The likely explanation is that the  
>>object isn't round but elliptical. Non-round "train wheels"?  
>>That would make for a very bumpy ride.

>I have been under the weather and working and haven't had time  
>to go over every e-mail:

>If you're referring in some way to the very top protrusion, it  
>may very well vary in width given that train wheels have  
>variously off-axis protrusions that serve as contact points for  
>the driving arms that rotate the wheel and generate the needed  
>torque.

Victor, no this has nothing to do with the alleged top  
protrusion. It has to do with the ratio of the width of the  
top, very distinct "dome", to the width of the bottom "flange."

This came out because Martin Shough and I were comparing sizes  
of the object in photo 2 (showing the object bottom) to photo 3.  
Martin computed the ratio of dome to flange in #1, then  
extrapolated the width of the flange in #3 by measuring the  
distinct dome width, assuming the same ratio as in #1. He used  
this method because he felt the flange in #3 wasn't distinct  
enough. Using this indirect method, he found the flange in #3

to be 3% to 9% (as I remember) larger than in #2 and argued this indicated that the object in #3 was closer to the camera than in #2.

In contrast, I felt that the bottom flange in #3 had distinct enough edges and measured it directly. It came out about 3-4% smaller than in #2, and I argued this indicated the object in #3 was further away than in #2.

To resolve this discrepancy, I suggested that maybe the object top, bottom, or both, were elliptical and the different ratios of top to bottom were the result of different perspectives on a noncircular object.

However, I have just gone back and done a lot of ratio calculations using the enlargements in the Druffel et. al. JSE paper I get that the ratio of bottom "flange" to top "dome" for photo #1 is 1.38 +/- .05; for photo #3 1.36 +/- .04, and for photo #2 1.50 +/- .05. However, the ratio for #2 is dubious because the lower part of the slightly flared "dome" is probably partly obscured by the tilted bottom, artificially narrowing it and resulting in an inflated ratio.

The ratios of #1 and #3 are essentially the same within measurement error, suggesting that the object could very well be circular (both dome and flange) instead of elliptical. So now I would say you couldn't rule out a train wheel \_on this basis alone\_, because the object might very well be circular.

\_However\_, this brings me back to my original position that if the object is indeed circular, then object #3's bottom flange is slightly smaller (by at least 3%) than object #2, suggesting that it is indeed further from the camera. In addition, since the camera is about 5% closer to the van window in #3, this means that if it were a nearby model it would actually have to be at least 8% further away than the model in #2 (5% + 3%) to account for both the difference in camera distance and observed object size different.

Thus, \_if\_ a circular model, you can rule out a static position, such as the model being attached to the window or suspended by a nylon thread from the window. You would either need Heflin to move the position of the model between shots #2 and #3, or have a common suspension point (simpler hoax) and the size and distance difference be the result of a swinging object.

However, this raised another conundrum, namely that the elevation angle of the object in #2 and #3 is exactly the same (to within about 1%), which is a remarkable coincidence for either a static or swinging model, because if the camera and model were at the same height in both shots, the elevation angles would be markedly different for a nearby hoax model. This means for Heflin to get them to coincide, he would have had to be extremely lucky, with either the camera and/or model heights varying just the right amounts to get the elevation angles to coincide.

On the other hand, if the object was truly distant, this would not be such a remarkable coincidence and would match Heflin's story. Heflin said the object was starting to move away in photo #3 and seemed to be gaining in altitude as it left the vicinity. This would account naturally for the difference in size and coincidence of elevation angles. E.g., I measure the elevation angle at 7.9 deg. If the object were 500 feet away in photo #2, it would be at an absolute altitude of 69 feet above the ground in #2. To appear 3% smaller in #3, it would be only 15 feet further away (but on a different course) and would need to gain only 2 feet in elevation to have the same elevation angle.

>To me it may appear that this upper dome favors the  
>right side of the object and is off center as expected given the  
>above disposition for driving arms in general (Heflin #1.#3).

The argument about the object being possibly elliptical had \_nothing\_ to do with the probably imaginary "drive arms" on the tippy top. It had to do with the ratio of the prominent top dome to prominent bottom flange.

>I'm not entirely sure though given that bright reflectance may  
>be giving me false readings. It does seem that the upper dome

>area is off center somewhat? Is this your impression too? And,  
>if the width ratios aren't proportional from image to image,  
>this may also be a determining factor worth considering (see  
>below).

Again, I think you are talking about something else entirely.

>In the event the object's isn't perfectly circular, this may  
>also account for the apparent thickening of the object's right  
>rim during some subset of the inferred rotation pattern or  
>simple stationary orientation with respect to the plane of the  
>photo: Geometric constraints may simply account for apparent  
>thickening associated with what I may have previously assigned  
>to movement related blurring on the right half of #1.

>The reflectance off the right side of #1 may also lend some  
>credence to your observations if more exact measurements could  
>be conducted with the given sun angles as they interact with the  
>skewed geometry. In this way, the thickening on the right side  
>could be used as a tool to determine the orientation of the  
>object's long and short diametric axis's in relation to their  
>"out-of-page" projection. These may also be consistent with the  
>expected (observed) angle of reflectance outside the plane of  
>the photo... the angle may be shorter or longer than expected,  
>etc.

>Are the width ratios you and Martin observed directly  
>proportional from one image to the next? Or, are the values  
>skewed somewhat. An ellipse would imply that some exact  
>proportions are in order (within the  
>observational error of the photos)?

If the object parts were elliptical, the ratios could be all over the map depending on perspective. However, I am now measuring essentially the same ratio in photos #1 and #3 (see above), to within measurement error, which would certainly allow for the object to be circular. #1 and #3 show essentially the same almost edge-on view, and are therefore directly comparable, whereas #2 has the object tilted, showing the oval bottom and hiding part of the upper dome. Therefore, I don't consider my substantially different ratio for #2 to be reliable. That's about all I can say about it.

David Rudiak

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:04:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 08:29:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved - Shough

>From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:31:04 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Heflin Mystery Solved

>>From: Anonymous <[modernherbal.nul](mailto:modernherbal.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 -0400  
>>Subject: Heflin Mystery Solved

>>John Scheldroup has helped solve the Heflin 'mystery' in his  
>>last post. His photo enhancement and diagram are correct:

>>"A 1/32 scale drive wheel of a model steam locomotive" is  
>>precisely what the 'craft' is. Particularly insightful is his  
>>observation "You can just make out the wheel hub protruding off  
>>the face of the wheel."

>>Find the earliest generation print and enhance further. Dig a  
>>little deeper into pre-1960 toy/model trains and you will find  
>>the exact part used.

>>Combine 1) John's findings with 2) Tim Shell's airshow donut  
>>hole formations with 3) brave Ed Riddle's interviews- and the 40  
>>year old Heflin "mystery" is solved !

>Listers,

>Before everybody dances off into the sunset on this one, we need  
>to keep in mind the issues raised by Ed Riddle's interviews.

>The bottom line to Ed Riddle is that:

>1) He recalls it was a co worker at the phone company that  
>showed him the photographs. The person showing him the  
>photographs showed him photographs of the "train wheel" hanging  
>in the eves of the garage and hanging off a car windows. Heflin  
>didn't work at the phone company. So then we hear something  
>about the possibility that it was the neighbor of Riddle's  
>friend. We have no evidence that any of Heflins neighbors worked  
>at the phone company, we have no evidence that whomever this  
>friend is knew Heflin.

Robert

Broadly correct, but you have one part inverted. Just to get it completely straight, Riddle's testimony (on recent reflection) seems to be that his earliest memory is of thinking his colleague was himself the hoaxer. He does not deny that this may be what he told the Register in 1965. Since this man clearly was not Heflin, this may be one reason they didn't take his story seriously. It was in 1997 that Riddle apparently told the Register that the actual hoaxer might have been a friend or neighbour of his colleague instead, thus by implication possibly Heflin after all. But it is to Riddle's credit that he concedes this 1997 was a late amendment to his original memory and may not be reliable.

>Nor do we have any direct evidence as to

>when this conversation took place. What the more likely  
>explanation is that after the Heflin photos hit the news,  
>somebody might say, gee I can take (hoax) a photo like that  
>using...pie pans...train wheels or whatever.

No this is not so likely. Riddle's testimony is that he was shown the fakes in late Aug or early Sept, a few weeks before Heflin's photos appeared in the Santa Ana Register. He was only on a temporary assignment to that office and left at about that time - possibly "before the story broke". As I pointed out there were apparently many copies in circulation around Santa Ana amid a lot of private rumour and speculation weeks before the Register made the case "public". Riddle may have seen either such copies passed around, or (more likely IMO) he saw someone else's copy-cat attempt to reproduce them, either for a joke or just to see if it was possible. The model hanging from the garage is the clincher, since there is zero likelihood that Heflin himself ever circulated copies of such damning evidence against his own photos. Of course Riddle may have been shown Heflin's photos and someone else's copycat fakes hung from their garage.

>>From a reliability stand point imagine people would say if  
>somebody floated a story like this out 30 years after the event  
>allegedly happened. Gee, my friend either knew somebody, or he  
>himself saw dead alien bodies in a packing crete at Air Force  
>Base X...blah blah blah. Or better yet something along the lines  
>of "I knew a guy, who knew somebody else  
>who said that he tested ET space ships at area 51.....

Since the facts of Riddle's story are fully consistent with seeing a copy-cat hoax there is really no "need" for Heflinites to question his reliability.

>Now, not to dish Ed Riddle. He was simply "remembering" 30 years  
>old memories back in 97, and again in 2006. Ed had no diary  
>entries from the time and is basing it upon what he described as  
>"dim" memory. We don't know who the friend was, other then he  
>worked with Ed at the phone company, we don't know if the friend  
>used the train wheel, or he got the photos from somebody else  
>who hoaxed them using a train wheel.

His memory of having seen fakes of a train wheel hung from some guy's garage seems to be perfectly clear and non-negotiable. Since this supports rather than undermines the theory of a copycat hoaxer and is in Heflin's favour you ought to be quite happy with Riddle's memory.

>2) The airshow donut formation didn't do much for me one way or  
>the other.

<snip>

>4) You have the summary of Richard Hall's case files on Heflin,  
>and how other people saw such a craft during that time frame,  
>although unlike something being remembered 30 or 40 years after  
>the fact, we have the documentation from not long after. The  
>survey crew who saw it, and Heflin mentioning the crew but  
>didn't understand why they didn't report it.

To be balanced about this we do not know that a survey crew saw it. What we know is that someone told Isabel Epperson that his sister told him that a surveyor told her that his crew had seen a UFO in the same area on some unknown date presumably around the same time but that said surveyor then died uninterwiewed and none of his crew were traced either. This is hearsay, however tantalising.

>So, we have the model theory...which some touted and were  
>allegedly confirmed by the BBC interview... which it wasn't.

Well maybe it was, maybe it wasn't. Vik Golubik tells us that Heflin's model trains were shown in that interview. That has to be classed as "interesting". I haven't seen it (or at least not for many years and don't recall it). Dave Clark has seen it and for what it may be worth he volunteered to me his own impression that Heflin seemed to be referring to his model-making in a knowing or slightly arch manner, suggesting a scam. This is directly opposite to Richard Hall's impression of open frankness.

>We have the train wheel theory which is based upon dim memories  
>and a blowup of a photograph that you could see many things in  
>and theories about air show smoke ring.

Hmm. Well the memories in this case turn out, unexpectedly, to  
be latent evidence in support of Heflin. Does this mean they  
don't have to be so "dim" now?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [ufoupdateslist.com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Researcher Has Photo Of 1976 UFO Over Clovis

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:36:18 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:36:18 -0400  
Subject: Researcher Has Photo Of 1976 UFO Over Clovis

Source: The Portales News-Tribune, New Mexico, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/myaq6>

June 17, 2006

Researcher Claims He Has Photo Of 1976 UFO Over Clovis  
By Marlina Hartz  
Freedom Newspapers  
[marlena\\_hartz.nul](mailto:marlena_hartz.nul)

Thirty years after UFOs were reportedly sighted hovering over Clovis skies, another photograph of the event has surfaced.

A UFO researcher said this week he has a photo =97 albeit fuzzy =97 of a tubular-shaped craft that danced above Clovis on Jan. 21, 1976.

Canadian resident Brian Vike said he obtained the photo about a week ago from a former Eastern New Mexico University journalism student. Vike would not reveal the identity of that photographer, but said his source was threatened in 2004 after discussing the events on a radio talk-show.

"His attitude now is, =91people need to know.=92 And =91if anything happens to my family, people definitely need to know,=92" Vike said.

Another photo of a UFO sighted in Clovis that same week appeared in the Jan. 23 edition of the Clovis News Journal. That photo, which shows a lightning-like streak in the sky in the shape of a telephone receiver, was taken by amateur astronomer Steve Muscato.

Vike plans to post the photograph on his Web site, [www.hbccufo.org](http://www.hbccufo.org). He is also searching for more eyewitness accounts of the events.

"I want to try to figure out what these people are seeing," said Vike, who said he has investigated scores of reports of UFO sightings from around the world.

"We don't have the answer: Is there life out there?" Muscato, who now lives in Las Vegas, Nev., remembers the reported sightings caused quite a stir.

"I received dozen of calls from all over the country," said Muscato, who took the photograph through a window from the top floor of the Clovis Hotel.

"I honestly thought it was Saturn," recalled Muscato, who was a high school senior at the time. Muscato said he checked with a noted astronomer, who told him Saturn would not have been visible at that time.



To this day Muscato=92s not sure what he saw that night.

"I remember him coming home all excited," said Frank Muscato, Steve=92s father, who then owned a doughnut store at 14th and Mitchell streets. "The only thing I was concerned about was whether (the UFOs) wanted carry-out doughnuts."

The elder Muscato said the buzz in town lasted awhile.

"Everybody was excited about it," Muscato said. "All the major networks were in town and they were all on the top of Hotel Clovis."

A document from the National Military Command Center confirms UFO sightings on Jan. 21, 1976, but does not offer an explanation as to the origin of the crafts.

"Two UFOs are reported near the flight line at Cannon AFB, New Mexico," the document reads. "Security Police observing them reported the UFOs to be 25 yards in diameter, gold or silver in color with a blue light on top, a hole in the middle, and red light on bottom."

The Military Command document on Cannon is lumped in with 11 other declassified military reports of UFO sightings that occurred across the nation near military installations, and in Iran, from 1975 and 1976.

Following the Jan. 21 UFO sightings in Clovis, other strange events were reported in the area, according to Clovis News Journal archives.

UFO sightings continued in Clovis for the next two days, according to CNJ archives. On Jan. 22, 1976, the strange objects zipped around Cannon F-111s that were sent into the air to investigate them, according to testimony that appears on Vike=92s Web site. The objects darted out of the reach of the jets, cutting through the air at 90-degree angles, and racing at phenomenal speeds, the Web site reads.

A CNJ staff writer reported seeing 23 UFOs, sliding in and out of complex formations, the next night.

Also, an unexplained circle was burned into the ground of a New Mexico ranch and a cylindrical object of unknown origin was discovered in the grass in the days following the initial UFO sightings, according to CNJ archives.

Several UFO investigative teams, including Project Starlight International, swarmed into Clovis after the sightings, according to CNJ archives. But most concluded that the sightings were likely a result of a weather inversion or some other weather phenomenon. One suggested they could have been glimpses of a planet.

Clovis resident John Fondrick was a high school senior when the UFOs were sighted and a series of articles on the events appeared in the Clovis News Journal. He said he doesn=92t recall seeing the mysterious crafts. He and his friends attempted numerous sky vigils atop Hotel Clovis, but were always intercepted by police, he said.

At the time of the alleged sightings, Clovis resident Bill Gaedke was an advisor to the commander of the 27th Fighter Wing. He spent six years stationed at the base and retired in 1979 as a chief master sergeant, he said. "I didn=92t hear anything about (the UFOs). I vaguely recall something about the crop circles, but I couldn=92t relate the details," he said.

The deputy chief of Cannon Public Affairs, 1st Lt. James Nichols, said the base could provide "no information" on the UFO sightings of 1976, or on whether or not there have been subsequent UFO sightings around Cannon since.

Several other longtime area residents contacted for the story said they were either unaware of the reports or had no firsthand knowledge.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:02:51 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:38:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:46:11 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>The preponderance and beyond reasonable doubt standards are from  
>the court settings, of which I am familiar in my work.

I'm quite familiar with them too! I have training in criminalistics and police science. Doesn't count though when trying to figure out what in the world it was a witness saw (when they truly witnessed an anomaly) - although it helps when interviewing the witness, checking into possible mundanes, evidence gathering in the field, and things of this nature!

>Preponderance tips the scales of justice, not reason, as the  
>court ensures that rights are preserved, the rights of  
>plaintiffs and defendants. Preserving rights after all is the  
>only function of the courts, not the establishment of truth.

>Beyond a reasonable doubt is also a legal standard to preserve  
>rights, in this case the rights of the guilty/convicted  
>regarding life in prison or the death penalty.

What the heck does "Preserving rights after all is the only function of the courts, not the establishment of truth" got to do with determining the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon? This statement by itself beautifully shows how inapplicable what you are saying is to studying UFOs.

I'm not concerned with "preserving rights" or whether or not this "is the only function of the courts" but I am concerned with "the establishment of truth" - the truth about the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon. This is what this discussion has been about from its inception, at least, as how Stan's conclusion that "some UFOs are ET spaceships" applies to it.

Contrary to what you think (or have come to accept based on your own subjective "personal scales of balance"), the "preponderance" does not show that UFOs are ET spaceships - you have to cut out a lot to shape the "preponderance" this way.

I prefer not to cut away and ignore - merely call "irrelevant" - a huge category of UFO cases (the non-high tech vehicle ones) and to not cut away and ignore - merely call "irrelevant" - another big important category of UFO cases (the blur zone ones where apparent high tech vehicles display characteristics that strongly hint they are not high tech vehicles at all) and to not cut away and ignore - merely call "irrelevant" - the very large category of abduction scene cases that have anomalies which don't fit the pretty little 'ET aliens abducting humans' picture, and I also prefer to not cut away and ignore - merely call "irrelevant" - research that has an obvious relationship to all these categories and cases just because it bears results that call into question certain conclusions.

I prefer to be "illogical" if that's what not doing the above is called!

So don't talk to me about "preponderance" unless you really want to talk about the preponderance (not just what's left after you trim the big picture away - not just the hand-picked cases that match perfectly your chosen scenario).

>I know I am repeating myself when I say that conclusions, like >Friedman's and Jacobs', work for me now, but I'm willing to say >it again. I hope this helps.

Helps who? I knew exactly what you were trying to say when you first started saying it. I didn't agree with it then and I still don't now. Are you trying to help yourself become convinced of its applicability?

I'm not arguing about your "preponderance" \_method\_ (although I don't think it's a good way to study UFOs) - I'm talking about the "preponderance" itself, how you \_shape\_ that preponderance.

Like it or not, this is a phenomenon that has to be studied more! That's what some of us have decided to keep doing. (It's called being objective.) Your "beyond a reasonable doubt" has ensured there are a number of people who have been falsely convicted of crimes, even incarcerated. But there would be a hell of a lot more - and I do mean a \_lot\_ more - if the jury cut away and ignored - merely called "irrelavent" - most of the evidence available for consideration and just hand-picked and grabbed information that matched their accepted scenario, as is being done most of the time in Ufology.

Hope this helps!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Houston Bat Man Flashback

From: Loren Coleman <[lcoleman.nul](mailto:lcoleman.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 10:51:00 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:39:30 -0400  
Subject: Houston Bat Man Flashback

Flashback: Houston Bat Man

Fifty-three years ago in 1953, at 2:30 am, on Third Street,  
today: What was that thing in a pecan tree?

Read Full Post...

<http://www.cryptomundo.com/cryptozoo-news/pecanbatman/>

Posted by Loren Coleman on June 18, 2006

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:59:29 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:41:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 13:18:34 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:06:11 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 05:53:00 +0000  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>We have a huge database on the SEDENA/MAF case and just a  
>>>small percentage is known outside Mexico therefore those  
>>>outsiders ignoring so much facts on this major case instead of  
>>>requesting updates with us prefer to disseminate disinformation  
>>>on this case to serve their own pro-cover up/anti-UFO Disclosure  
>>>interests and this is also a fact.

>>Well, it was so easy to distribute the UFO FLIR video to the  
>>world, what's the problem with sending out the video confirming  
>>that the Air Force FLIR cameras cannot see the gas flares?

>If I may jump in here. Are you asking for all of the video  
>taping of the equipment for every flight that the MAF took or  
>takes in that area? That's a bit cumbersome and we both know  
>that's not going to happen.

We do not need every flight. However, if they are claiming the  
MAF has tried to look for these "fleet UFOs" and were following  
a similar flight path and looked in a similar direction, then  
the least they could do is provide the one tape showing that  
they did this. It would then be incumbent upon ourselves to  
examine this tape to see if what they say is really confirmation  
that they cannot view the gas flares.

>And can you tell me why you would expect the MAF to  
>do all of this when you own air force would just laugh  
>at such a suggestion. When have they ever given any  
>help to private UFO  
>investigators. The best you can hope for is a few whistle  
>blowers.

You are right that the USAF would probably not release such  
footage. But the rationale is different, I suspect. The US  
military/intelligence offices would likely have buckets of money  
and researchers and scientists to throw at the footage before  
considering releasing it. They would likely then only release it  
if it is definitely prosaic. Even then they would likely not do  
so for security reasons. For this reason I consider such sources  
tainted and I don't trust them.

>At least the MAF released the video. When has the >USAF ever  
done something like this? Don't throw the baby >out with the  
bath water, James.

I know, they did release the video. But although they don't have the exact agenda as the USAF, they have their own set of cultural/institutional characteristics. Believe me, I thought it was exciting when I saw it. From a pure UFO researcher viewpoint it was a terrific film! But my problem all along with the thing was that, if the MAF truly did not know what it was, if proven to be ET spaceships, this could only create a sense of despair in the public that they have a military that is confronted with something they cannot combat. This seems irresponsible.

On the other hand, if they knew it was gas flares and are playing dumb to make the UFO community look stupid or examine their behavior, then this is not desirable.

It is saddening that the possibility exists that the Mexican military is so cash strapped that it has to go to UFO researchers/promoters rather than academicians/scientists.

>Incidentally in another email you mentioned that I wanted  
>to stay on the good side of the MAF so as to get possible  
>gun camera footage. I doubt if the MAF even knows I'm  
>alive. But if I thought it would produce gun camera footage,  
>your damn right I would shine up to them:)

Yes, I remembered a while ago you mentioning a real desire to get such gun footage. I had felt in this particular case that your conciliatory attitude toward the Mexican AF was somewhat related to that desire. I did not mean to imply the MAF knew about 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 18:59:58 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:45:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Shough

>From: Kyle King <[kyleking.nul](mailto:kyleking.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:18:18 -0500  
>Subject: Heflin UFO Photos

>The anonymous poster who has sent messages regarding the Heflin  
>Photos has written to me to ask that I send you a link to my  
>blog where I have posted some information regarding this case.

<snip>

>While I remain neutral as to the validity of the Heflin story, I  
>think the information I've found might help in the discussion.

>At any rate, Mr. Anonymous seems to think so.

Kyle

I would never have tried the List's patience with this long dissection of your "blog" in the normal course of events, but since you have chosen to bring it to the List's attention I have no choice.

Your misrepresentation of me as a "convinced" and "undeterred" believer in Heflin is so completely unsupportable and ludicrous (as anyone here knows) that you take my breath away. What outrageous nonsense!

In order to believe that you have actually read my posts on this case as you claim, I'm forced to assume you are guilty either of deliberate misrepresentation or blinkered stupidity. If this offends you by seeming "rude" then reflect that you have no one to blame but yourself.

The following (for the benefit of Listers who may have declined to swell your blog traffic) are passages from your blog, marked K, followed by my comment, marked M.

---

K: This image is from the infamous "Condon Report" on UFOs. It is a photo taken at the same location as the Heflin photos, but is of a lens cap suspended by a fine thread just outside the vehicle. Apparently the Condon investigators actually attempted to re-create the photos. I think they did a pretty good job considering that they didn't have a "model train wheel". Still, it's a fairly accurate reproduction, and I don't see a suspension thread evident, although admittedly this is a web graphic of a copy of a Polaroid photo... just like the images the current researchers are using.

M: This is completely incorrect. The JPEG of Hartmann's photo in the online Condon Report, like all images therein including the Heflin photos, is not scan of a Polaroid photo; it is a scan of screened half-tone litho reproduction of a Polaroid photo, i.e. a scan of what you see if you open the Condon Report (Viking hardback) to p.472. The screen clash (moire pattern) is plainly visible - check the skies in any of the thumbnails at <http://ncas.sawco.com/condon/text/pl-41-57.htm> . In any case it



would be obvious to anyone who has spent any time at all looking at them that these are badly degraded reproductions. Not only is the Hartmann JPEG a copy of a half-tone out of a book, the pixel resolution of the scan is several times coarser than the best resolution close up scans shown in JSE, which are furthermore scans direct from the original Polaroids. In short your Hartmann image is not "just like the images the current researchers are using". There is no comparison.

M again: But that doesn't mean I haven't looked closely at this Hartmann image myself. Have you Kyle? In fact if you play with the density curve in a tone mapper you can bring out a linear feature above the lens cap that may be the faint digital shadow of a string. It isn't very clear. I'd be interested to see the original Polaroid. In fact whilst waiting for Vik Golubik's promised test results on a Polaroid 101 and the appropriate film (which you know about as you're abreast of everything) I suggested that the original may still be in the APS Condon archive in Philadelphia and might be worth getting hold of for digital comparison. I'm a hell of a way from Philadelphia however. Have you done this?

K: Oddly, the person who currently holds the actual Heflin photos... former NICAP investigator Ann Druffel (an author of the re-investigation of the case in the '90s)... will apparently not release the photographs for re-analysis. Supposedly she and others plan to re-re-reanalyze the photos. Hmmm... I certainly wish Ms. Druffel were willing to allow these photos to be "independently" analyzed using CURRENT "state of the art" analysis. Might save everyone a lot of time and trouble.

M: I agree that it's regrettable and I've said as much, not only long before you but also directly to those in a position to have done something about it, rather than just whining in my private blog. Their refusal to budge is unhelpful, but it's not "odd" and your supercilious "hmmm" misses the mark. It is a fact that a second JSE paper was advertised as pending in 2000, promising the results of different investigations from those described in the first paper. It is not fair to characterise this as another re-re-analysis of the work already published. At least, it will be disappointing if that's the case because it's not what was promised. Apparently this work by Ed Kelson (the photoanalyst of the team) got delayed and is currently unfinished. Yes this is very unfortunate and frustrating and we haven't a hundredth of the information we would like to get from the original Polaroids. But it's understandable that materials which are the property of an individual, recovered and cared for by them at personal cost as in this case, will be kept confidential whilst their own analysis is ongoing. If you want to get ahead of the game, then get on your bike to Pasadena CA and plead with Ann Druffel. At least some of have tried, Kyle. Have you?

K: At any rate, in the re-analysis available here... mention is made of the photo you see above [Hartmann]. But while the analysis correctly states that the Heflin photos would likely be highly over-exposed [quote paragraph 1]... the report claims there IS no suspension thread, stating [quote paragraph 2] ... However, these two paragraphs are contradictory. If the over-exposure is capable of "washing out" contrast and sky detail, it is certainly capable of washing out a suspension line. Such a line would be far enough away from the camera to be at the scale of the film grain (this is ASA 3000+ film!!) And it could easily be of LOWER contrast than clouds to the background sky, so these two statements clearly contradict one another. The report later bypasses this paradox to dismiss the Condon recreation seen above... [much compressed from original]

M: This is perfectly true. It remains possible that a support line could go undetected. It also remains possible that it ought to be detectable. Nobody knows for sure yet. Vik Golubik has the camera and has tests in progress, we are told. If he's not fast enough for you, why haven't you just done the necessary tests yourself on a Polaroid 101 with the right film in the appropriate setting instead of wasting our time with all this theoretical argument?

K: The title of this post [Heflin UFO available for sale???] links to a site which sells model locomotive wheels in the 1/32 scale. Note any similarities to the Heflin photos?

M: We've already seen this material thanks to John Scheldroup.

K: Another "Anonymous" posting has been submitted to UFO Updates regarding the Heflin photos. While the post is getting run through the ringer by Martin Shough, Don Ledger and others, the protestations seem rather flat compared to the relative ease of testing the points brought forth by "Anonymous".

M: Anonymous brought forth no damn points Kyle, merely parroted what others had already said, accusing me implicitly of ignoring Ed Riddle's train wheel. Now you do the same. You parrot Anonymous, and take offence on his behalf (how interesting!). You take a crack at others' inconsistency a few paragraphs up. Well catch yourself on! Do I have to remind you that it was me who posted the link to the forgotten claim of Ed Riddle in the first place? That it was me who tracked down and corresponded with Ed Riddle to get his story? That it is me who has actually defended Ed Riddle on-List against accusations of being an unreliable debunker or a liar? That if I (I the "convinced", I of the "flailing numbers", "antipathy", "dismissal") had not done this there would be no talk of train wheels at all, and nothing for some bloggers to fill the tedium of their empty evenings with? That it is me who has argued in quantitative detail the consistency of Heflin #2 and #3 with a small ~ 1" model about 36" from the lens? Well of course I do have to remind you, because if any of these facts ever penetrated your skull in the first place you have so tied yourself in logical knots attempting to pigeon-hole me as a believer that you have pressed "delete".

K: Why waste a bunch of time claiming "trigonometric" inconsistencies and just test the claims?

M: I could say again, why waste time whingeing on your blog when you could be on Ebay buying train-wheels and an old Polaroid? But the wider point is that you don't understand the issue here. Simulating the photos to show that they could be fakes of a little model is useful, which is why I await Vik Golubik's and/or Bob Shell's results with interest. But we already know they could be fakes. We knew it before Hartmann's 1967 effort. We already know that there is some combination of models and distances and fishing lines and angles etc etc that will produce exactly what we see on the Heflin photos. This would be true whatever they showed. We already know from 60 years collective experience that no photograph or set of photographs is a stand-alone proof against the evaluation "of no probative value in establishing the existence etc etc.". Simulating the photos does not disprove them; failing to simulate them does not prove them. It will always be a question of judgement, as with any case of second-hand evidence, and the subtlety of judgment rests on balancing the interdependent probabilities of a large number of different factors. Some of these factors are to do with the likelihoods of certain trigonometrical relationships arising in different scenarios. I could list a dozen issues, but hey, if you just want a snappy "could be a train wheel, so a train wheel's good enough for me" then fine. What ever simple-mindedness consenting adults choose to practice in the privacy of their own blogs is up to them. Go to it.

K. To the left you can see an example of a model locomotive drive wheel (the larger wheel). Note that the wheel is not symmetrical, but has an "eccentric" hub and a counterweight built into the rim. (Shough claims the object in the Heflin photos is not symmetrical). Hmmm. Shough inadvertently SUPPORTS the train wheel explanation, perhaps? LOL This is standard design for steam locomotive drive wheels.

M: Have you totally taken leave of your senses? First I did not claim that the Heflin object is asymmetrical. Right? This was David Rudiak's suggestion to account for my report that measurements of the relative diameters of #2 and #3 images seemed to be consistent with a small model near the truck mirror, whereas his measurements did not! LOL yourself. Got that? OK. Now read these posts again, properly this time. You might notice that David's suggested explanation for the inconsistency involves the fact that I was measuring relative diameters of the "dome" and the "disc" - in railway terms, the tyre and the flange of the wheel. Thus the suggested asymmetry has nothing whatever to do with "eccentric hubs" or counterweights but is to do with - in railway terms - the relative diameters of the traction surface (the steel tyre or rim) and the concentric flange of the wheel. Perhaps you would

care to explain to the List how a variable-radius rim and/or a variable-radius flange is a "standard design" for any kind of wheel? And if you think you understand this differently, or if you are tempted to cry "believer!" once more in expectation of camouflaging a retreat, then I recommend you to think again.

K: Note also the smaller wheel, which seems more in line with the appearance of the Heflin UFO. While it does not have the asymmetrical hub or counterweight, it does have a hub which protrudes very slightly above the plane of the wheel face. Shough claims that the "flange" of the wheel is "narrower" than that of the object in the Heflin photos.

M: Saints preserve us! I claim no such thing.

K: Well, since the photos are overexposed, determining the actual dimensions of the object is rather difficult, but Shough forges ahead and makes rather precise measurement calculations based on his PERCEPTION of the object as if it is represented accurately. This is simply not meritorious based on the camera used and the photos themselves... no matter how much you enlarge or "enhance" the photos. The object is very brightly lit and overexposed (just as the sky and background are overexposed), therefore the edges and true dimensions are distorted beyond any certainty. Yet this does not deter the "convinced", apparently.

M: You're aiming for some prize for obtuseness here Kyle. Do you have any idea yet why this issue of possible eccentricity arose? No? It's because I explicitly recognised the difficulty of determining bright edges against overexposed bright sky and used an indirect method based on the proportionality of the #1 object to estimate the proper ratio of diameters in photos #2 and #3. This gives a different result from the result I previously got (and which David still gets) for the true diameter of #3 and suggests that the angular size increases consistently with what would be expected for a small model. Perhaps you can explain to the List what it is you accuse me of being convinced of? Oh yes, and please explain again why your hilarious "eccentric trainwheel" theory should "deter" me from my accustomed scepticism. LOL Obviously there are ambiguities with any method where neither optical, nor chemical nor digital resolution is infinitely fine. Well now we have two methods and two measures with which to metaphorically triangulate the problem, leading to one possible solution suggested by David. That's all.

K: In the Heflin photos, the object... like the sky... is highly overexposed due to the camera being in a dark truck cab. Thus the "gleam" evident on the object is "brighter" than it would actually have looked to the unaided eye. This alone could account for the perceived asymmetry. Keep in mind the film used in these photos was ASA 3200!!! Admittedly the aperture was very small, but this would still result in a VERY overexposed photo if taken from the interior of a dark truck cab, as the camera attempted to record a "good exposure" of the entire scene.

M: Yes, there is some truth to these points. I'm not unaware of them. But are you aware of the irony of chipping away at the case I was making for consistency with a small trainwheel-sized model? (BTW, do you happen to recall where the overexposure theory you quote so succinctly was first suggested in the present discussion Kyle? It was in my first List post on the topic. I subsequently discovered others had long ago come to exactly the same conclusion.)

K: This camera was an amateur "point and shoot" type designed to produce a pleasing exposure in a wide range of conditions. It was built to take a "good" photo in almost any conditions. This is elementary photography, not sophisticated in the least. And overexposure is exactly what you would want if you were attempting to hide a suspension thread. Hmmm.

M: What's with the "hmmm"? Are you trying to imply that Heflin chose the Polaroid 101 because its characteristics were uniquely adapted for hoaxing? If he could have chosen any one of a number of cameras whilst at work in his van you might have a point. But he didn't have a choice. The highway authority issued their inspectors with Polaroid 101's and that's it. On the contrary, if he'd used any other camera it would be suspicious.

K: If one were to take one of these wheels and a Polaroid 101

camera and attempt to reproduce the photos... accounting for general weather conditions, time of day, and approximate scenery and perspective... I'm fairly confident that the results would be pretty consistent with the Heflin photos.

M: You're fairly confident are you? So confident you don't feel the need to actually do this thing you keep berating everybody else to do?

K: But it could also rule out the wheel explanation altogether... or at least with high confidence. But no one seems to be interested in doing that. Instead we get trig calcs based on inaccurate photographic evidence and blustery accusations based solely on the anonymity of the witness. This is UFOlogy today? How impressive.

M: Wrong on all counts Kyle. People are interested in "doing that", and unlike you they are actually doing it. Yes! And unlike you I prefer to weight for their results rather than blithely predict them with "confidence". And I have made no accusations "based solely on" the anonymity of anybody, still less the anonymity of a "witness"! Witness to what? All your anonymous friend did - proveably - was to regurgitate material that was already there for discussion on the List, claiming it to be new information, apparently having such an insulting contempt for the intelligence of Listers that he thought nobody would notice! He was asked for actual information; any smallest act of "witness" - even to his own damn name! - would have been a start. But no. He is witness to nothing but the deflation of his own mysterious purpose, and runs away to tell tales to Uncle Kyle.

K: Why not just test the claim? I can only think of one reason... It appears that these investigators are starting to get far too defensive of their hard work, rather than keeping an open mind and testing what appears to be a quite simple explanation. Several of them claim to have the SAME camera model in their possession and the film is in fact still available, or a reasonable facsimile. Note this link... ASA 3000 is pretty darned close. High speed black & white for the 101 camera. T'would seem a simple thing to try, eh? But nope... we get flailing numbers, anger, antipathy, dismissal, and just plain rudeness.

M: What am I dismissive of, Kyle? The Polaroid experiments promised by Golubik and Shell? Ed Riddle? The train wheel story? Any checkable fact or piece of evaluable logic at all? Any sceptical 'small model' hypothesis? No none of these. And you know you could not begin to justify any such accusation. What I am dismissive of is the "rudeness" and cowardliness of fact-less insinuation hiding behind anonymity, and of anyone who would think they could get away with misrepresenting and distorting publicly-archived evidence in order to ally themselves with it.

K: Again, why?

M: A question I'm asking myself with much puzzlement, since I used to regard you as an influence for reason and balance on the List. What happened?

---

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:22:01 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:46:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

>From: Tim Shell [tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:40:30 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 17:09:21 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>>Tim Shell is brilliant and resourceful. The black donut hole  
>>>formation speaks volumes that I speak the truth.

>>Well sure, three cheers for Tim Shell. But what a shame he has  
>>attracted a dishonest advocate.

>I hope I've been relatively clear in my posts that all I'm  
>doing is trying different ways of looking at things, and that I  
>try to be reasonable when presented with data that conflicts  
>with any preconceptions I might have. Like with the "glow" on  
>the McMinnville photos. Unless I'm being facetious to prove a  
>point, I try not to present anything unverifiable as fact,  
>because if it's unverifiable, I guess I can't really call it a  
>fact, can I?

>Model train wheel? Sure looks like one. Is that enough proof?

>Nope.

Couldn't have put it better or fairer Tim

Martin

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:48:28 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:48:40 -0400  
Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

For those interested in A.I. and Robotics,

Tonight, on The Discovery Science Channel, the program "Robo-Sapiens: The New (R)Evolution" will air twice.

The show is dedicated to informing the public of the advancements in the field and where we as a society are heading.

Topics such as Implants, Artificial Telepathy, "The Matrix", and Neural Interfaces will be addressed.

An actual quote from the program: "I may have been born a human, but I will die a Cyborg."

The same program will air on The Discovery Channel on June 20th.

I highly recommend the program, especially for those in the field who believe that the UFO Phenomena may involve a form of A.I.

- Jason Gammon

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 21:11:14 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:51:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:50:22 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>I have a lot of experience of 'combat' (figuratively speaking),  
>having spent close to 50 years applying (my concept of)  
>scientific method to UFO cases, and dozens of years reading and  
>digesting scientific literature in many fields. My abstracts  
>have gone into several major national databases, entirely  
>satisfying scientific standards. Also, it is not clear that you  
>are a practicing scientist (which to me is not the know-all,  
>end-all argument for having knowledge of scientific method  
>anyway). Sauce for the goose?

As a matter of fact I was a pure theoretician, Dick. I'll leave it up to you whether that counts as a scientist ;-)

For me, this is a question of practicalities, not just a filing exercise to do with which things belong in which labeled boxes. The question is, how does one constrain oneself to do, as far as possible, only good science in a field that is right at the boundaries of knowledge and which is populated by charlatans, poseurs and cranks beyond numbering? In fact, one way or another, it all comes down to a question of boundaries - boundaries between science and philosophy, between science and pseudoscience, between science and the Humanities, and underlying all of these is the vast chasm which separates empiricism from rationalism.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney

From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 21:57:13 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 20:54:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Harney

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 18:41:01 -0400  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2006 18:47:40 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006 22:17:47 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>There doesn't seem to be any evidence of anything about the  
>>damage to the police car, apart from the fact that it appeared  
>>to have been done deliberately. At least, no one has given a  
>>convincing account of how it could have been produced  
>>accidentally, or by natural forces. Of course, there does not  
>>appear to be any way of testing this or any hypothesis, prosaic  
>>or otherwise, so the case remains unexplained.

>Smashed glass is not hard to "explain": something hit it  
>(what?). However the antennas are difficult to explain, assuming  
>the report is correct, that the "bug tar" coating the front  
>(leading edge) side of each antenna was unbroken... only  
>stretched... at the bend. Have you ever tried to permanently bend  
>a steel whip antenna? it takes some strength and you have to  
>exert considerable grasping force on the antenna. This force  
>would smear or remove the insect matter coated on the antenna.

No, I don't bend antennas, as I'm a dodderly old man; I was  
assuming that they would have been bent by a strong man. Also,  
in order to bend them, he would grasp them above and below the  
place where the bend would appear, not on it. Most of the insect  
matter might remain in place.

>Each of two antennas, both of which were mounted on spring  
>support, as bent by 30-40 degrees, if I recall correctly... not  
>a small bend. Hard to imagine how a person could have bent  
>either antenna without disturbing the coating of insect matter.

>You say there is no way of testing "this or any hypothesis,  
>prosaic or otherwise..."

>I say, let a person try to bend a similar antenna wire with his  
>bare hands or any other way compatible with the hypothesis that  
>Johnson or a proposed unknown "passenger" did it, without  
>disturbing the coating of insect residue.

I'm surprised this hasn't already been done. Or did the  
investigators simply assume it must have been done by some  
mysterious force?

>>>Maccabee's Rule #1 for Debunkers:

>>>Any explanation is better than none.

>>You cannot debunk anything unless it is bunk,

>Skeptics and debunkers often act as if they thought sightings  
>were "bunk". They propose explanations and let it go at that  
>even if the explanations make no sense.

Some of them do this; these are the ones who prefer blanket  
explanations, a procedure which often leads to absurdity, i.e.  
all mirages, all ball lightning, all meteors, etc.

<snip>

>>as been pointed  
>>out before on this List. It is unlikely that anyone will ever be  
>>able to provide a definitive explanation for this case, but that  
>>is no reason why possibilities should not be considered. Also, in  
>>view of the fact that it is a single-witness report, its  
>>importance has been somewhat exaggerated

>Somewhat exaggerated? Just how important should it be? A  
>policeman on duty is not just any witness.

You can't special status to police officers; you have to consider  
the evidence in each case.

>Plus, there was damage to the witness and "hard evidence" damage  
>to the police car, including damage to the antennas that is  
>"difficult," if not impossible to explain in a conventional  
>matter. (Not bent by human hands, so far as we know.) This goes  
>beyond the typical "single witness report."

Not bent by human hands? What sort of hands, then?

>What is there about the implications of "no explanation" that  
>you don't understand?

>This is the doorway to new phenomena. If all sightings were  
>convincingly explainable in conventional (if unusual) terms,  
>then there would be no need to contemplate the possibility of  
>new phenomena (such as ET).

There is no need to bring in exotic explanations. All those UFO  
cases which have been solved have been solved using conventional  
treatments of the facts of each case. Where has speculation  
about ET got us in making progress in the study of UFO reports  
during the last 60 years? Absolutely nowhere, just lots of  
speculation which is not even good science fiction.

>Any time a sighting cannot be  
>convincingly explained in terms of conventional phenomena it  
>should be studied even more intensely to find out if anything  
>new can be learned (such as how to bend steel antenna wires  
>without rubbing off insect matter)

This could be done by some strong men in a scrapyard full of old  
cars.

>NOTE: it is not always possible to determine whether or not a  
>proposed conventional explanation is the actual explanation.  
>However, it is possible to determine whether or not, in the  
>context of a sighting (history, witnesses, physical effects,  
>etc) a particular explanation is convincing.

Convincing to whom?

>>>To borrow your phrase, "anyone with a grain of common sense"  
>>>would know that hiding a coffee cup is not in the same league  
>>>with damaging a police car.

>>Not necessarily. We would need to know a great deal more about  
>>Johnson in order to consider whether or not such an  
>>explanation  
>>was plausible.

>What more would need to know? Perhaps you think that the police  
>department knew next to nothing about Johnson? we know that the  
>police department trusted him. How much more do we need to know?

The police department would not tell the world everything they  
knew about Johnson. Personal details would be kept confidential,  
as is the normal procedure in most organisations.

>>My classification of this case: Unexplained - insufficient  
>>information.

>But, of course!

>The American Air Force would be proud of you.

Yes the US Air Force got it right where UFOs were concerned.  
It's no use trying to wriggle out of it; in this case the  
evidence points to the damage to the car being done either by  
Johnson or by someone else (with or without his knowledge).  
However, it is unlikely that all the relevant facts will ever  
become available.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 00:23:46 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 08:58:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 11:01:07 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update>

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 04:45:50 +0000  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

<snip>

>>Besides we have the radar readings detecting also the objects to  
>>the right and in front of the airplane. An important element  
>>that Mr. Amateur Debunker conveniently has never mentioned, why?

>Uh, I suppose you are referring to me, Mr. Garza? I guess if I  
>sold a book or video tape this would make me professional and  
>thus more worthy of notice.

>Anyway, as I have stated in several past postings on this topic,  
>based on Dr. Maccabee's excellent collection of video  
>transcription and video/aircraft events/times, it is correct  
>that there is a radar detection in the minutes prior to the  
>"fleet UFOs". However, the radar reading also disappears prior  
>to the "fleet UFOs". Thus there is absolutely no radar reading  
>from the "fleet UFOs" during their appearance on the FLIR video  
>tape. If you have some secret groundbased radar tape that you  
>wish to share with the world, we would be glad to see it. But  
>really, you will never get a radar reflection off of the gas  
>burnoff flares!

At the very least the fires were beyond the search range of the  
radar (used with the 40 nmi range)

>>That one radar reflection and infrared image seem to be an  
>>unknown aircraft,  
>>but it is not known for sure so is a UFO

I presume you mean the initial radar detection that lasted about  
10 minutes and perhaps coinciding with one "FLIR light" that  
appeared just as the plane entered the right turn.

If so, the only resemblance to an "unknown aircraft" (airplane  
or helicopter is that are the facts that it did reflect radar  
radiation and it traveled at aircraft-type speeds (up to maybe  
400-500 mph). The other two primary characteristics reject the  
aircraft hypothesis: invisible to the eye at only 2 nmi distance  
and invisible to the FLIR at only 2 nmi distance. Any aircraft  
capable of reflecting radar and also traveling at speeds up to  
several hundred mph would be (a) sizeable (meters in size) and  
(b) a source of heat, especially when viewed from the rear.

>>although I doubt the Mexican Air Force would call all such  
>>single light/radar reflecting objects that. They would likely  
>>call it an unknown aircraft. Too bad they could not do their job  
>>and go after it or get better data from the ground radar.

If I recall correctly, the AF said they had no ground radar

operating but at the same time they said there were no other known A/C in the area during the sighting.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters?

From: **Greg Taylor** <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:46:06 +1000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:01:32 -0400  
Subject: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters?

Hi all,

Can List members recommend any sources of information on auditory effects heard during UFO sightings or other 'high strangeness' (abduction, entity/fairy/mothman sighting)?

I have found various references to 'buzzing' sounds heard, but no analysis of whether this is an actual sound, an induced sound, or simply an artefact of the brain (eg. temporal lobe stimulation). Of course, it could be all of the above - but has anyone looked further into the 'sound' aspect of the experience?

Kind regards,

Greg Taylor

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:23:40 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:23:40 -0400  
Subject: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

Source: Barb Campbell's SPPRC Site - Saskatchewan, Canada

<http://www.ufo-connection.com/reports/database/2006/24.html>

June 19 2006

Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

Date: 2nd or 3rd week of June, 2006

Discovered: morning of June 16, 2006

Time: unknown

Location: near Hillmond (exact location withheld)

-----

Full report & many images at site

-----

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:39:07 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:39:07 -0400  
Subject: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

Source: Rocky Mountain News - Denver, Colorado, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/odu5p>

June 17, 2006

It's Often Too Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe  
Linda Seebach  
Rocky Mountain News - Opinion

Michael Shermer, skeptic-in-chief, has a new book titled Science Friction: Where the Known Meets the Unknown, about all the ways in which people deceive themselves or allow themselves to be deceived by irrational beliefs.

"As pattern-seeking primates," he says in the introduction, "we scan the random points of light in the night sky of our lives and connect the dots to form constellations of meaning. Sometimes the patterns are real, sometimes not."

That about sums it up, but here I'm going to focus on Shermer's career as a psychic. Note Shermer is not a psychic, and does not claim to be - in fact, he believes as I do that no one is.

Nonetheless, he had the opportunity to play one on TV when Bill Nye invited him to be a guest on the show Eyes of Nye and spend a day as an astrologer, tarot card reader, palm reader and psychic medium talking to the dead.

"With almost no experience in any of these psychic modalities, I prepared myself the night before and on the plane flying to the studio, then improvised live-to-tape in studio, managing to completely convince my sitters that I had genuine psychic powers, reducing several subjects to tears when we 'connected' to lost loved ones. It was at this point that I realized the emotional impact that psychics can have on believers, and the immorality of the entire process and industry that has built up around these claims."

My son Peter years ago worked up a tarot-card-reading display for something to amuse people at parties, but he hastily quit when he found out that people were asking him for readings in all seriousness. He worried that some of them might actually take his ad-libbed advice.

But people are eager to believe, and easy to fool. I asked Shermer, by e-mail, about what happens when people find out they've been taken in. "My experience with disclosing to subjects that I've been pretending to be psychic is not at all positive. No one has ever said 'Oh, wow, I never realized how easy it is to fake being a psychic, I guess this means I should rethink my beliefs about ESP.'" Instead what I always get is anger and resentment that I've tried to take something away, that I'm evil for being a spoiler of a cherished belief, and that it is none of my business," he answered.



"For a television show I did for Unsolved Mysteries, in which I received a psychic reading from James Van Praagh, along with a dozen other people in an all-day shoot at a home in Pasadena, at the end of the day we disclosed to everyone that I was a plant in the group and that Van Praagh's reading was completely wrong, and then I explained to the group how he got all the information he did on them. Instead of thanking me for disclosing a fraud, instead of being furious at Van Praagh for deceiving them during their time of loss and grief, they were mad at me!

For Nye's show, Shermer did "cold readings" on five women - that is, he had no prior information about them, except their birth dates, as used to prepare an astrological chart. His how-to book was The Full Facts Book of Cold Reading, by Ian Rowland. He was introduced to the subjects in the studio as "Michael from Hollywood" and he told them that he was a "psychic intuitor," adding that everyone has the gift but he had improved his gift with practice.

The subjects were told, after their sessions, that Shermer was a psychologist trying to demonstrate how those claiming to be psychic accomplish what they do, so they knew then it wasn't "real."

Shermer reprints the opening statement he used with all of them - all of them, please note - that ended with the sentence, "You are wise in the ways of the world, a wisdom gained through hard experience rather than book learning." Every one of the subjects "nodded furiously in agreement, emphasizing that this statement summed them up to a T."

One of his subjects was a woman of 50 whose father had died suddenly when she was in her 20s, and it was clear to Shermer that she had unresolved issues about his death. He told her - as he thought he ethically could - that her father would want her to remember him, but it was time to move on. And then he added, for a somewhat lighter touch, "And it's OK to throw away all those boxes of his stuff that you have been keeping but want to get rid of."

Bingo! She had a garage full.

In the post-reading interview she said she had been going to psychics for 10 years, trying to resolve her issues, "and that mine was the single best reading she had ever had."

If you believe in any of these things - especially if you spend money on them - you're being gulled.

Linda Seebach is an editorial writer for the News. She can be reached by telephone at (303) 892-2519 or by e-mail at:

[seebach.nul](mailto:seebach.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Aliens In California

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:47:29 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:47:29 -0400  
Subject: Aliens In California

Source: BBC World Service - London, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/ozqtw>

Aliens In California

Hat Creek Radio Observatory

Irini Rouboglou was brought up on the Greek myths of her homeland, and science fiction television programmes like Star Trek.

This combination has resulted in a fascination for our endless quest to discover life beyond our world and our innate need not to feel alone.

She meets the people who spend their lives analysing and listening to the noise that emanates from space in their search for extraterrestrial intelligence.

As she discovers, there has been a fundamental shift in the way the skies are being scanned for signals and so the possibility of contact from other life forms seems closer than it has ever been before.

Will these optimistic scientists really find voices from other worlds, or will they simply discover that Earth is unique and alone?

Listen to the program:

<http://tinyurl.com/ozqtw>

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:31:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:50:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:45:53 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:47:11 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field  
>>>flames would be nonsense and destroy the oil field  
>>>hoax scheme unless he has a new Guinness record.

>>Santiago et al,

>>I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it  
>>is possible that radar could detect oil field flames.  
>>Speaking very generally a flame is a conductive  
>>plasma, which could be associated with a great deal  
>>of turbulence in the heat column, plus there may be  
>>clouds of smoke particulates. Any or all of  
>>these - flame, turbulence, smoke - could in principle  
>>cause a radar echo. But I know nothing of the radar  
>>type or other essential details of the case so won't  
>>comment further.

>Really? You didn't read correctly the reports. The C26A radar  
>also detected the objects to the right and in front of the  
>airplane, that is over the mainland performing manoeuvres and  
>changes of speed. This is documented. Once again: Over the  
>mainland direction not the ocean.

Oh dear, Santiago. Is it a language thing? Maybe if spoke  
Spanish I would be better understood. But you blatantly  
misrepresent my post, which, as I was very careful to point out,  
was limited only to commenting in general terms on your  
assertion that "to argue that radar can detect oil field flames  
would be nonsense", not on particular details of echo azimuths  
etc etc in this case, which as I said I haven't studied.

Without prejudice to the question of what may or may not have  
been detected in this particular case, I'm pointing out that you  
need better arguments than that radars are generically incapable  
of getting echoes from huge turbulent columns of flame and  
smoke, which is inaccurate. You could, if you wished, regard  
this reminder as helpful. You now mention that you do have such  
specific arguments. Well fine. Use 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:52:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:21:19 -0300  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 09:36:53 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>Brief update: I have established that the Ed Riddle identified  
>>is indeed the same guy and I am in correspondence with him.  
>>He has already offered two quite interesting additions to his  
>>story which I will pass on to the list ASAP.

>Hi Martin, Dave,

>I can't see the comparison matching the Heflin photos matching a  
>model train wheel. The flange on the model is shorter than that  
>in evidence in the photos.

>Mark Cashman also did analysis of the Heflin photos. His site is  
>still up and running.

>See: <http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/report/650803.htm>

>His site shows the three photos together in a panarama from  
>scans.

Hi Don

The train wheel photos posted by John Scheldroup and Kyle King do not resemble the Heflin object, just as you say. The cross section drawing found by John is closer, though proportions still appear to be different by a few percent. More importantly there is no apparent evidence on the Heflin photos of the "hub" claimed by Scheldroup (on the basis of a digital artefact).

But I suppose there are many different types of model train wheels in different scales and styles from different manufacturers, not to mention that some enthusiasts turn their own wheels etc on lathes and maybe engineering tolerances vary for different track gauges and patterns - some hobbyists probably even make their own track as well. The chances seem to me to be remote of proving that there are no toy train wheels out there identical in proportion to the Heflin object.

But the point is that Kyle and his anonymous sponsor have been urging us to forego futile analysis of the images and just hunt down the exact same train wheel, so this can be photographed to test their case that the Heflin photos are identical. And why is this method to be preferred? Because measurements of the Heflin images have unreliably large error bars due to problems of digital resolution, motion/focus blur, exposure saturation etc. There is some truth in this, but it begs the question: How will we know it's the exact same train wheel? By comparing physical measurements of the train wheel with the Heflin images? Well no, because these images are said to be too poor to measure reliably. So the method would be to collect a whole bunch of

train wheels and photograph them all in different conditions until we get a result from one of them that looks like the Heflin images.

Unfortunately this is not a scientific test of the hypothesis that Heflin photographed a train wheel. It would be (if it were to succeed) a demonstration that it is possible to simulate the Heflin object by controlling the appropriate co-variables of object shape, object size, object composition, object texture, lens distance, focus distance, sky brightness etc. This would tell us no more than we already know right now: - Based solely on optical evidence, they could be fakes.

Now if further digital analysis finds evidence of support strings then maybe the train wheel is in business and we could start to assemble a case. (I think there are a couple of unconvincing hints of possible linear features on the JSE images as I pointed out long ago, but these wait to be confirmed or eliminated on the originals or very high-res full-image scans) Or if Viktor's tests with a 101 and fine support lines show that they ought to show up where they don't, then we'd maybe have a different kind of case. But in either case the hunt to produce identical images of train wheels would have a very secondary role, and even if successful could not be probative on its own.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:46:27 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:56:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 08:43:19 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:45:53 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:47:11 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

><snip>

>>>>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field  
>>>>flames would be nonsense and destroy the oil field  
>>>>hoax scheme unless he has a new Guinness record.

>>>Santiago et al,

>>>>I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it  
>>>>is possible that radar could detect oil field flames.  
>>>>Speaking very \_generally\_ a flame is a conductive  
>>>>plasma, which could be associated with a great deal  
>>>>of turbulence in the heat column, plus there may be  
>>>>clouds of smoke particulates. Any or all of  
>>>>these - flame, turbulence, smoke - could in principle  
>>>>cause a radar echo. But I know nothing of the radar  
>>>>type or other essential details of the case so won't  
>>>>comment further.

>>Really? You didn't read correctly the reports. The C26A radar  
>>also detected the objects to the right and in front of the  
>>airplane, that is over the mainland performing manuevres and  
>>changes of speed. This is documented. Once again: Over the  
>>mainland direction not the ocean.

>The fact that the radar detected targets on the land or over the  
>land is has no bearing on the suggestion that the radar, in  
>principle, could detect the ionization/plasma in a flame, if  
>close enough.

>However, as I pointed out in another message, the radar cross  
>section (reflection strength) probably was not great for a fire  
>and furthermore, so far as I know, the radar operator never  
>switched to a range beyond 40 miles.

Okay. There's always the remote possibility of third-trip  
returns from way beyond the display range. But I agree that's  
very unlikely here.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Roswell UFO Festival

From: Nigel Watson <[nigelwatson1.nul](mailto:nigelwatson1.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 12:51:55 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:58:43 -0400  
Subject: Roswell UFO Festival

Hi,

Please could anyone going to the Roswell UFO Festival at the end of the month, who can take digital pics and email of the event contact me.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 14:48:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:31:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 17:34:07 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 19:09:40 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>  
>>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 13:27:18 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>>If the wheel thickness is ~6.5 mm  
>>>total, then the diameter of the wheel is around ~1 inch. If we  
>>>can established this with a certain amount of precision, we can  
>>>determine and confirm from another source just how far the  
>>>camera is from the subject (Horizontal width-of-field is  
>>>approximately ~30 degrees). Since I don't have an uncropped  
>>>original (not sure if these are), I can't comparison scale  
>>>exactly for calculation purposes but believe 1 inch seems to be  
>>>an appropriate scale given the window dimensions. This will  
>>>either confirm the 3D stereo determined distance or not.

>>In another post I gave my estimate of 1" at 36" for the model  
>>hypothesis - based on parallax, on the UFO angular size  
>>calculated by Hartmann (and/or other early investigators) in  
>>photo #1 (2.4 degs), and a rough estimate of window size from an  
>>Econoline drawing converted to angular subtense. The result is  
>>pretty much identical to yours, but the construction is  
>>different.

>>I assume the JSE scans are essentially uncropped. The  
>>proportions are those of a 3.25" x 4.25" format to within about  
>>2%. Using the above angular scale I get ~41 deg for the lateral  
>>FOV. This gives ~ 28 degs for the roll-up window width, or about  
>>15" for a lens-window distance of 30" and a distance of ~ 36" to  
>>a model 1" across near the mirror. If ~15" is close to your  
>>measurement of the actual window of a 1962-65 Ford Econoline (as  
>>I say, my estimate was scaled from a perspective drawing) then  
>>~41 deg FOV it is.

>Thanks for the input Martin... Since we don't know the  
>distance/angle the camera was from the window, (Yes, we can  
>guess), the percent to which the photos have been cropped, and  
>the percent of the FOV actually falling upon the photo, it is  
>difficult to apply precision. The actual width of field has to  
>be determined from actual test which should settle all debate.  
>This is the whole reason I pursued experiment over all else. The  
>purpose was to end debate over hypothetical imprecision and let  
>others see the same results rather than just, let's say, taking  
>someone's else's word for it.

I applaud your experiments Viktor and await results with  
interest. Of course the exact FOV and flatness of field etc etc  
remains to be established. But meanwhile we can think about  
where certain results are likely to lead, and please note that

it was you who introduced a "guess" of a 30 deg FOV, not me, a guess which I gave reason to think unrealistic.

>>Your 30 degs seems small. This would make Hartmann's angular  
>>value for the #1 object in error by nearly 40%, which bearing in  
>>mind that he made tests with the same camera and was referencing  
>>several other Air Force, Marine and NICAP photo analysis reports  
>>in his study, seems too much to me. Does this come from  
>>experiments with the camera? You mention that it's a guess. How  
>>educated a guess?

Evidently you now agree.

>Yes, 40 degrees is correct... but consider this with the above  
>too:

>Two FOV values are typically reported: both diagonal and  
>horizontal. The diagonal value will be greater...

Obviously, but equally obviously we were not talking about any  
"reported" nominal values,. We were talking about what the  
actual angular scale may be in this case. Lateral or diagonal  
measure is irrelevant. There's no confusion there.

>30 degrees  
>may in fact be closer to reality, etc. I just shrank it for  
>cautionary purposes. Knowing I'll be getting actual values with  
>real tests is more to my point.

"May be"? And what on earth is cautionary about introducing a  
33% error? If the best guess at present is ~ 40 degs then that's  
what we have to work with, pending those real tests. How can  
this be criticised?

>The focus adjustment on the  
>camera also moves the lens position quite a bit toward and away  
>from the film plane. Despite the fact that this focus adjustment  
>should have little impact on the actual B&W focus (we'll see),  
>it may, however, impact the apparent FOV as it may limit the  
>amount of the calculated FOV falling upon the actual film square  
>as you move the focus in and out. I'll be testing this out as  
>well.

<snip>

>>. . . If your guess of 30-31 degs is correct then the object  
>>is only ~1.8 degs across, and a 1" train wheel with this  
>>subtense is at about 31" from the lens. If Hartmann's angular  
>>scale is correct, then our 1" train wheel would be only ~ 24"  
>>from the lens in photo #1, and since it must be hanging beyond  
>>the windscreen (it is directly sunlit) then the top of the  
>>windscreen must be somewhat closer, say about 20". Is this  
>>possible given the state of focus of the object and the  
>>windscreen frame?

<snip>

>>Pending Viktor's tests with the actual camera I wanted to check  
>>this. So using a DoF calculator for FL 114 mm, f.42 and CoC =  
>>0.103 (nominal 10 x 8 CoC = 0.254 mm, enlargement factor for  
>>3.25 x 4.25 Polaroid format = 2.46) I get the following values  
>>for 4 different focus distances:

>>1) focus dist. 9.0 ft, near depth 4.7 ft, far depth 103.6 ft  
>>2) focus dist 9.5 ft, near depth 4.8 ft, far depth 262.9 ft  
>>3) focus dist 9.8 ft, near depth 4.9 ft, far depth 1719.7 ft  
>>4) focus dist 10.0 ft, near depth 5.1 ft, far depth INF

>>These results differ slightly from Rankow's Polaroid figures and  
>>from Overall's reported test result. According to this, if the  
>>cars and phone/power wires on the Santa Ana freeway about 1500  
>>ft away are in sharp focus ("finely resolved", Ralph Rankow;  
>>"all parts in focus from the windows... on down the road to  
>>the cars", Santa Ana Register Chief Photographer) then the focus  
>>distance must have been greater than 9.5 ft and the near depth  
>>would be about 5 ft.

<snip>

>>But others on the List with better photographic expertise than  
>>me may disagree, and as always any theoretical arguments remain

>>subject to Viktor's real-world experiments. I just offer this  
>>for discussion.

>The whole reason for my emphasis on focus and depth of field is  
>two fold: first to get a handle on how well the camera can  
>capture, on "Film", variously constructed strings hanging  
>"nearby" in oversaturated conditions: both the focus and the  
>saturation can affect the detection limits. Second, to  
>determine what impact blur has on the perception of distance.  
>The amount of blurring may also vary as a function of distance  
>from the central field. With actual tests we can qualitatively  
>evaluate this parameter as well and hopefully improve Heflin's  
>case more stringently and without repeated controversy.

>With actual tests we will also be able to remove any fishbowl  
>distortions from the images and for the first time get Though  
>this should have much less impact on central field area.  
>Yes Martin, the whole point of experimentation is to be working  
>with actual performance characteristics.

And we're all eagerly waiting for you to do so. Meanwhile please  
feel free to ignore the above theoretical DoF figures. They may  
be revised, but as far as I can see they are at present all  
we've got, and a value of ~ 40 degs, not 30 degs, is the best  
FOV figure we've got. At least perpetuating poor guesses is not  
going to help anyone.

>We can expend energy on two fronts if we want.

Seems like it's just as well to do so.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 07:01:31 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:34:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:02:51 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 12:46:11 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>Contrary to what you think (or have come to accept based on your  
>own subjective "personal scales of balance"), the  
>"preponderance" does not show that UFOs are ET spaceships - you  
>have to cut out a lot to shape the "preponderance" this way.

<snip>

>I'm not arguing about your "preponderance" method (although I  
>don't think it's a good way to study UFOs) - I'm talking about  
>the "preponderance" itself, how you shape that preponderance.

>Like it or not, this is a phenomenon that has to be studied  
>more! That's what some of us have decided to keep doing. (It's  
>called being objective.) Your "beyond a reasonable doubt" has  
>ensured there are a number of people who have been falsely  
>convicted of crimes, even incarcerated. But there would be a  
>hell of a lot more - and I do mean a lot more - if the jury  
>cut away and ignored - merely called "irrelavent" - most of the  
>evidence available for consideration and just hand-picked and  
>grabbed information that matched their accepted  
>scenario, as is being done most of the time in Ufology.

>Hope this helps!

Thanks Eugene! Very good! It does help!

So the next step is to determine What standard or standards you  
would recommend in determining that flying saucers are ET in  
origin? Considering that even so-called scientific "laws" may,  
in the end, turn out to be fallible and yet high-level theories  
only, which standard would you accept?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe -

From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron.510.nul](mailto:corycameron.510.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:20:34 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:39:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe -

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:39:07 -0400  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

>Source: Rocky Mountain News - Denver, Colorado, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/odu5p>

>June 17, 2006

>It's Often Too Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe  
>Linda Seebach  
>Rocky Mountain News - Opinion

>Michael Shermer, skeptic-in-chief, has a new book titled  
>Science Friction: Where the Known Meets the Unknown, about all  
>the ways in which people deceive themselves or allow themselves  
>to be deceived by irrational beliefs.

>"As pattern-seeking primates," he says in the introduction, "we  
>scan the random points of light in the night sky of our lives  
>and connect the dots to form constellations of meaning.  
>Sometimes the patterns are real, sometimes not."

<snip>

At least on the topics of UFOs and Cryptozoology I feel I don't have a willingness to believe in these things. As a matter-of-fact, I would be happy to find out these things didn't exist.

Human sightings and testimonials are one thing because they may be prone to falsehood but what happens when these cases are combined with photographs and film that are not touch ups and support the testimony of the eye-witnesses?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

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



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond -

From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron.510.nul](mailto:corycameron.510.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:25:38 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:42:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond -

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:23:40 -0400  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>Source: Barb Campbell's SPPRC Site - Saskatchewan, Canada  
><http://www.ufo-connection.com/reports/database/2006/24.html>

>June 19 2006

>Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>Date: 2nd or 3rd week of June, 2006

>Discovered: morning of June 16, 2006

>Time: unknown

>Location: near Hillmond (exact location withheld)

>-----

>Full report & many images at site

>-----

Seeing these pics this morning brought back to me some chilling memories from a few years ago,

Cory

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

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

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:30:17 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:45:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 17:56:59 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 19:57:10 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>They are in the possession of Ann Druffel in California. I'm  
>>told there is zero chance of her letting them out of her sight.

>>At present although Bob Wood was amenable to allowing access to  
>>500 dpi scans of these, the other JSE paper authors (Ann, and Ed  
>>Kelson) did not agree even to this.

>OK. I could arrange for some extremely high quality scans if  
>they were amenable. A friend of mine actually designs the  
>imaging systems for scanners and can work wonders pulling  
>information out of images. His lab is in Boston. The problem  
>with saying that there are 500dpi scans is that there are scans  
>and then there are scans. Scanner driver software that is  
>generally available isn't designed for critical scientific  
>research. To evaluate scans, we need to know scanner  
>manufacturer and model, software driver used, and driver  
>settings. Just such a simple thing as having dust and scratch  
>filtering turned on can ruin a scan for any really critical  
>evaluation of fine detail.

Bob

Just to clarify: They do already have much higher res scans than  
500 dpi, presumably complete print scans at the same res as the  
close-ups in the JSE paper. The 500 dpi scans that Bob Wood  
wanted to release to me would have been (I believe) domestic  
Dell scans of 10x8 prints made from high quality negatives of  
the original Polaroids. Unfortunately.

>I'm always skeptical of researchers who resist allowing others  
>to examine things like scans. What possible harm could it do to  
>let others examine them? Basically they are saying "our  
>interpretation is the only one we want out there. Take it or  
>leave it." Having worked in real science (a status which UFOlogy  
>is far from attaining as yet), this sort of stuff just  
>frustrates and infuriates me.

I agree it's very frustrating. It's also complicated, because  
whereas the original Polaroids are in the control of Ann Druffel  
the high-res scans of them are in the control of Ed Kelson for  
continued use in his forthcoming second JSE paper. Kelson  
declined to share the scans; however Bob Wood did tell me that  
the original Polaroids are "in principle available for research  
under controlled conditions". That means checking that Bob Wood  
is speaking for Ann Druffel here and then going to California to  
study them under supervision. That might be possible for you,  
not for me.

I can understand why Ann wouldn't want to risk the originals

(having spent a lot of time, effort and money in acquiring and maintaining them). As for the high-res scans, if Kelson is in the middle of preparing a paper I can understand him being proprietorial about them pending publication - especially if he got them made himself, maybe at his own expense - because everyone wants their own work appreciated for itself and as a whole, uncompromised by partial 'leaks' and without its force dissipated in prior controversy, and most importantly, everyone badly wants \_academic\_priority\_! That's real science alright :-)

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:35:09 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:48:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:28:06 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 09:58:54 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>Hello Martin

>>Excuse the intervention, but isn't it little strong to say that  
>>theory construction is not part of the process? It surely is,  
>>else there would be no process. Pure experimental induction is  
>>(or would be if it existed) just the accumulation of lists of  
>>data and science could be done by machines. Isn't the hard bit,  
>>and the bit that transforms botanical lists into bodies of  
>>knowledge, the theory construction? Testing is the historical  
>>crux of a scientific process, yes, but a crux is a point of  
>>intersection rather than a stand-alone thing. After all, if you  
>>don't have a theory you can't test it.

>It may be rather strong, but from my hardline empiricist  
>viewpoint, the stronger the better. What I was objecting to was  
>this (from Richard Hall's post of June 9):

>"The people who are included as sociologists or political  
>scientists or anthropologists include many who follow scientific  
>methods, both in theory construction and compilation of  
>empirical evidence"

>In other words, the idea that a discipline can be regarded as  
>scientific on the basis of the way its theories are constructed.  
>A theory is either testable and scientific, or not testable, and  
>not scientific. It makes no difference how it's constructed.

As I read that paragraph he is saying that it can be regarded as  
scientific on the basis of two things, the way its theories are  
constructed and the way it deals with "empirical evidence".  
You may disagree about the practice, but I can't find fault with  
the statement of principle.

You say it makes no difference how theories are constructed. I  
think it does. If it really didn't matter how they were  
constructed they would not exist.

Why go to the bother, if all that is necessary is the testing of  
individual questions? Well the answer is in the question isn't  
it. If you quantise the process into individual questions you  
find you have to assume an infinite number of them, but you have  
no idea what most of them are and no idea how one answer relates  
to another. Worse than that, you have a presumption that none of  
them do relate to one another. Ah, but that's a theory isn't  
it? So we should test it, right?

How do we do that? By proposing that A never varies as a  
function of B etc., but what do you know, turns out it does, and  
bingo, pretty soon we have a different class of theory - all

these information bits are related after all, and we find this is actually a very useful kind of theory because it is productive of new questions that weren't in existence even among the infinite set of quantised questions we started out with (a bit of a paradox there!).

>Of course I agree that constructing theories is often the most >difficult and complex part of the process of doing science. But >Nature doesn't really care how hard we work in concocting our >precious ideas. One can spend twenty years on a beautiful and >elegant theory that turns out to be scientifically useless (as >Einstein did in the latter part of his life). Conversely, the >horrendously ugly theory that someone just happened to scribble >on the back of an envelope while waiting for a bus, might just >turn out to be a work of scientific genius if only it makes the >right predictions.

I don't think beauty is relevant to the issue in question here: "Does it matter how science gets the theories that it tests?" At the moment of testing there is a sort of academic sense in which the entire history of the theory becomes irrelevant: It then either stands or falls, yes. But this is true of my leaping across the raging Falls of Rogie in spate (or would be if I dared): In the relief of being alive afterwards, there is a sort of academic sense in which it doesn't matter how well I timed my jump. I did it; the rest is just history as we say. But in the real world where the difference between success and failure is measured, my run-up mattered rather a lot.

You can't deconstruct science down from a connected social-historical process into a list of independent experimental inductions. Could we have good science with irrelevant theories, arbitrary theories, consistently failing theories that fail to apply or misapply the the lessons learned from tests of previous theories - i.e. theories that fail to build on the "body of knowledge" or try to modify it arbitrarily and unreasonably? No. We can have bad and arbitrary science with bad and arbitrary theories. Surely good science evolves by spawning good and useful and testable new theories which respect the results of testing past theories, so theory construction has an empirical component built deep into it. To deny that the construction of the theory to be tested plays any part in the scientific process seems to me to be negative, abstract, a rather scholastic and anti-historical point of view.

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](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:06:35 +0000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:59:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 21:11:14 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 21:50:22 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>I have a lot of experience of 'combat' (figuratively speaking),  
>>having spent close to 50 years applying (my concept of)  
>>scientific method to UFO cases, and dozens of years reading and  
>>digesting scientific literature in many fields. My abstracts  
>>have gone into several major national databases, entirely  
>>satisfying scientific standards. Also, it is not clear that you  
>>are a practicing scientist (which to me is not the know-all,  
>>end-all argument for having knowledge of scientific method  
>>anyway). Sauce for the goose?

>As a matter of fact I was a pure theoretician, Dick. I'll leave  
>it up to you whether that counts as a scientist ;-)

>For me, this is a question of practicalities, not just a filing  
>exercise to do with which things belong in which labeled boxes.  
>The question is, how does one constrain oneself to do, as far as  
>possible, only good science in a field that is right at the  
>boundaries of knowledge and which is populated by charlatans,  
>poseurs and cranks beyond numbering? In fact, one way or  
>another, it all comes down to a question of boundaries -  
>boundaries between science and philosophy, between science and  
>pseudoscience, between science and the Humanities, and  
>underlying all of these is the vast chasm which separates  
>empiricism from rationalism.

>Cathy

Cathy,

I agree with this about 99.5%. If you were employed in some  
field of science as a theoretician, then I would call you a  
scientist. In other words, a scientist is a person who actually  
practices science as a profession...even theory construction! I  
have a degree in philosophy, but I don't call myself a  
philosopher because I am not practicing in that field.

If you were more familiar with my work related to UFOs you would  
know that I, yoo, am strongly empirically oriented. A constant  
theme of mine over the years has been to strongly criticize the  
excessive speculation and guesswork and pseudo-science  
'theorizing' (on this list and everywhere else). I abhor it and  
have said so emphatically over and over again to the point where  
some of its practitioners consider me dumb and backwards, a real  
party pooper.

There are some classic rationalists on this list. They are not  
necessarily uneducated or dumb, but in my estimation they are  
way off the mark with their wild, ungrounded meanderings and  
promotion of pet theories. I find it difficult to believe at

times, but apparently they really think they are being reasonable and scientific as they float airily far above the ground.

Say, let's start a Journal of Empirical Ufology! That might attract, oh, 10 or 12 subscribers.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Pope

From: Nick Pope <[nick.nul](mailto:nick.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 19:09:37 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:21:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Pope

>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:46:06 +1000  
>Subject: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters?

>Can List members recommend any sources of information on  
>auditory effects heard during UFO sightings or other 'high  
>strangeness' (abduction, entity/fairy/mothman sighting)?

>I have found various references to 'buzzing' sounds heard, but  
>no analysis of whether this is an actual sound, an induced  
>sound, or simply an artefact of the brain (eg. temporal lobe  
>stimulation). Of course, it could be all of the above - but has  
>anyone looked further into the 'sound' aspect of the experience?

The MOD's 'Condign Report' covers this in Volume 2, in Annex A  
of Working Paper 1, and in Working Paper 8:

<http://tinyurl.com/kqgu5>

From investigations I undertook during my tour of duty, the  
most commonly reported noise was a low frequency humming sound.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:15:17 -0300  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:05:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Ledger

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 18:59:58 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Heflin UFO Photos

>>From: Kyle King <[kyleking.nul](mailto:kyleking.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:18:18 -0500  
>>Subject: Heflin UFO Photos

>>The anonymous poster who has sent messages regarding the  
>>Heflin Photos has written to me to ask that I send you a  
>>link to my blog where I have posted some information  
>>regarding this case.

><snip>

>>While I remain neutral as to the validity of the Heflin  
>>story, I think the information I've found might help in the  
>>discussion.

>>At any rate, Mr. Anonymous seems to think so.

>K: Another "Anonymous" posting has been submitted to UFO  
>Updates regarding the Heflin photos. While the post is getting  
>run through the ringer by Martin Shough, Don Ledger and  
>others, the protestations seem rather flat compared to the  
>relative ease of testing the points brought forth by  
>"Anonymous".

What are you dragging me into this for Kyle? I don't recall  
running anonymous through the ringer. My contribution has been  
minimal-power pole heights, haze notes and the difference in  
the train wheel flange size and the Heflin photo object's  
"flange" if you will.

Do you know this "anonymous"?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Frison

From: **Eugene Frison** <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:16:26 -0300  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:11:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Frison

>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:46:06 +1000  
>Subject: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters?

>Can List members recommend any sources of information on  
>auditory effects heard during UFO sightings or other 'high  
>strangeness' (abduction, entity/fairy/mothman sighting)?

>I have found various references to 'buzzing' sounds heard, but  
>no analysis of whether this is an actual sound, an induced  
>sound, or simply an artefact of the brain (eg. temporal lobe  
>stimulation). Of course, it could be all of the above - but has  
>anyone looked further into the 'sound' aspect of the experience?

This is one of the things that the Canadian Aerial Anomalies  
Research Society (C.A.A.R.S.) is trying to focus on as part of  
its investigation into the 'Reality Transformation' component of  
the UFO phenomenon, although our research in this area is still  
in its infancy.

You'll probably find though that most people in this field  
(Ufology) will consider such ventures to be "illogical" as they  
are more concerned with chasing aliens and spaceships, rather  
than trying to figure out such "irrelavent" and unimportant  
"truth(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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

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

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Gammon

From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 14:01:01 EDT  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:01:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Gammon

>From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:48:28 EDT  
>Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>For those interested in A.I. and Robotics,

>Tonight, on The Discovery Science Channel, the program "Robo-  
>Sapiens: The New (R)Evolution" will air twice.

>The show is dedicated to informing the public of the  
>advancements in the field and where we as a society are heading.

>Topics such as Implants, Artificial Telepathy, "The Matrix", and  
>Neural Interfaces will be addressed.

>An actual quote from the program; "I may have been born a human,  
>but I will die a Cyborg."

>The same program will air on The Discovery Channel on June 20th.

>I highly recommend the program, especially for those in the  
>field who believe that the UFO Phenomena may involve a form of  
>A.I.

FYI: The post above was sent on 6/18/06.

I watched the program and it seems it wasn't what the previews  
made it seem to be. In fact all the good stuff, the content  
shown in the previews, was only addressed in the last 10 minutes  
of the program.

This said the material presented was somewhat interesting.

I also need to make a correction. "RoboSapiens" will air on the  
Discovery Channel on July 20th and not June 20th as I originally  
indicated above.

I should indicate that the July 20th broadcast may be a  
completely different program. The information I have come across  
concerning it's content did not appear on the program airing on  
The Discovery Science Channel last night..

-Jason Gammon

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:56:25 +0000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 17:57:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Yturria

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:31:38 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 16:45:53 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:47:11 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>Because to argue that radar can detect oil field  
>>>flames would be nonsense and destroy the oil field  
>>>hoax scheme unless he has a new Guinness record.

>>Santiago et al,

>>I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it  
>>is possible that radar could detect oil field flames.

>You could, if you wished, regard this reminder as helpful. You  
>now mention that you do have such specific arguments. Well  
>fine. Use them.

As I understood you mentioned the following: Radar and oil field  
flames. What does this tell me? A connection, a link.

So here we go again but just to this specific issue that you  
seem to be trying to link. When I said the radar was detecting  
objects to the front and the right of the airplane it means  
precisely in direction to the mainland. The Cantarel oil wells  
zone is on the ocean, different direction.

Can you tell me what could have been the objects the radar was  
detecting? Very simple. Besides we have the radar operator  
statements during the interviews same that were published  
extensively in May 2004 during our investigation. Have you read  
them?

I will just mention a short segment that I consider most  
relevant but remember, he is a military trained radar operator  
officer.

Lieutenant German Ramirez Marin:

Initially, only one target was detected by the RADAR. Then  
another target appeared at one 'o clock, that's how we describe  
the position that is in the front but slightly to our right. And  
then a third one in back of the plane.

Our data information - most of all, the icons (blips), the  
clusters - were always there on the screen, but the information  
on their movements was heavily changing. Their speed changes  
were sudden, 60 -120- 300 knots, according to the RADAR  
information.

The same happened with their flight paths. The flying paths showed first 90 degrees and suddenly 130 degrees in the RADAR screen.

This means that the target changed direction constantly at great speed. There is no aircraft that can perform such direction changes so quickly. (End)

As you can see these objects performed unusual movements and changes not conventional and this element was one of the most relevant in this investigation. And the objects were over the mainland not the ocean. Do I need to be more specific?

This sterile discussion is going nowhere and still remains the ignorance of the escence: The oil wells story was a hoax !! It was revealed, proved and exposed long time ago with evidences and the self-exposure of the hoaxer himself. It's a dead topic and forgotten here in Mexico.

The mystery of the C26A flight remains just like many other unsolved mysteries in Ufology.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/19/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 14:00:26 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:09:35 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/19/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 71  
June 19, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* GAO SAYS IT WILL FOREGO OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE  
\*\* GEN. HAYDEN ON INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT (2005)  
\*\* AGENCY FOIA IMPROVEMENT PLANS PRESENTED  
\*\* DOJ INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT ON MOUSSAOUI  
\*\* THE MUBTAKKAR OF DEATH  
\*\* SELECTED DOCS ON MILITARY POLICY  
\*\* TIME OUT

GAO SAYS IT WILL FOREGO OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE

One way to supplement and improve intelligence oversight would be to employ the Government Accountability Office (GAO), an investigative arm of Congress, to perform routine audits of key intelligence functions.

Yet this potentially valuable oversight tool lies dormant due to opposition from the CIA and other intelligence agencies.

The GAO will not even attempt to conduct oversight of intelligence unless it is specifically tasked to do so by the Congressional intelligence committees, a GAO official said last week.

"For us to undertake such work would require the sponsorship of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence or the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence."

"While we have the authority to do such work, we lack the cooperation we need to get our job done in that area. As a result, unless and until we receive such cooperation, and given GAO's limited recourse, we will continue our long-standing policy of not doing work that relates directly to intelligence matters unless requested to do so by one of the select intelligence committees."

The statement appeared in a June 14 letter report to Congress on security clearance policy (footnote 1). See:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/gao/gao-06-693r.pdf>

This places responsibility on the intelligence committees to fully utilize the tools at their disposal, including the GAO.

"Every committee member up for re-election in 2006 and 2008 ... should be required to commit publicly to applying the full weight of the GAO, with added resources, to intelligence matters," urged Robert Steele of Open Source Solutions



([www.oss.net](http://www.oss.net)).

In 2001 testimony, a GAO official outlined his agency's authority to conduct intelligence oversight and described the history of GAO access to intelligence information.

"We have not actively audited the CIA since the early 1960s, when we discontinued such work because the CIA was not providing us with sufficient access to information to perform our mission," said Harry L. Hinton, Jr.

See "Observations on GAO Access to Information on CIA Programs and Activities," July 18, 2001:

[http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2001\\_hr/071801\\_hinton.html](http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2001_hr/071801_hinton.html)

#### GEN. HAYDEN ON INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT (2005)

Gen. Michael Hayden, who is now the new CIA director, presented himself as a committed proponent of intelligence oversight in an April 2005 hearing on his nomination to become Deputy Director of National Intelligence.

But the record of that hearing, which has just been published, takes on a different aspect in light of the NSA warrantless surveillance program which was disclosed by the New York Times in December 2005 and kept secret from most members of the congressional intelligence committees.

"In a variety of sessions I have tried to be completely open and have treated the Committee as a stakeholder in our operational successes," Gen. Hayden told the Senate Intelligence Committee in spring 2005.

He explained his understanding of the indispensable role of oversight.

"To be successful, the American intelligence community has to be very powerful and largely secret. And yet we live in a political culture that distrusts two things most of all: power and secrecy."

"The path through what would otherwise be an unsolvable dilemma is the Congressional oversight structure where the people's elected representatives have full access to our activities -- thus ensuring necessary secrecy while creating the public confidence that ultimately allows us to create and exercise the powers that we need," Gen. Hayden said then.

It follows logically that a failure to provide elected representatives with "full access to our activities" would engender a loss of public confidence.

See "Nomination of Lt. Gen. Michael V. Hayden to be Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence," hearing before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, April 14, 2005:

[http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005\\_hr/shrg109-270.html](http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2005_hr/shrg109-270.html)

#### AGENCY FOIA IMPROVEMENT PLANS PRESENTED

In a December 14, 2005 Executive Order, President Bush directed government agencies to review their Freedom of Information Act programs, evaluate their performance, and develop plans to reduce backlogs and improve efficiency.

<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/eo/eo-13392.htm>

Those plans were due on June 14 and some of them, not all, have now been published by the Department of Justice Office of Information and Privacy here:

[http://www.usdoj.gov/04foia/agency\\_performance.html](http://www.usdoj.gov/04foia/agency_performance.html)

#### DOJ INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT ON MOUSSAOUI

The Department of Justice Inspector General released a newly declassified version of its 2004 audit of the FBI's handling of

intelligence information related to the September 11 attacks, including a newly disclosed chapter on the case of Zacarias Moussaoui.

In a previously released version of the report, the entire chapter 4 on Moussaoui had been withheld by court order because of Moussaoui's ongoing trial. With the conclusion of that trial last month, the suppressed chapter was approved for release.

See "A Review of the FBI's Handling of Intelligence Information Related to the September 11 Attacks," as released June 16, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/doj/oig/fbi-911/index.html>

#### THE MUBTAKKAR OF DEATH

Al Qaeda terrorists contemplated an attack on New York subways in 2003 using an "easily constructed" device called a "mubtakkar" to release cyanide gas, according to a story in Time Magazine this week:

<http://www.time.com/time/nation/printout/0,8816,1205309,00.html>

But there are reasons to question the reliability and significance of the story, suggested chemist George Smith of GlobalSecurity.org.

For one thing, "why, if the mubtakkar of death is so easy to make has it not been seen since, or employed in Iraq, or used anywhere there have been other terror attacks?"

See Smith's skeptical account on his new blog Dick Destiny:

<http://tinyurl.com/qvpye>

An overview of chemical warfare agents and analytical methods for their identification was prepared this year by Defence Research and Development Canada.

See "Analysis of Chemical Warfare Agents: General Overview, LC-MS Review, In-House LC-ESI-MS Methods and Open Literature Bibliography," Defence Research and Development Canada, March 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/cbw/drdc2006.pdf>

#### SELECTED DOCS ON MILITARY POLICY

"The alteration of official DoD imagery by persons acting for or on behalf of the Department of Defense is prohibited," advises a new Pentagon Instruction.

See "Alteration of Official DoD Imagery," DoD Instruction 5040.05, June 6, 2006:

[http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/i5040\\_05.pdf](http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/i5040_05.pdf)

"The days of total air superiority by friendly forces are over. Our potential enemies now may have as many or more aircraft than we do," according to a new Army correspondence course on defending against attacks from the air.

"Our potential enemies will gain air superiority over sectors of the battlefield for certain periods... Successful small arms defense against air attack is an essential element of survival on the battlefield."

See "Small Arms Defense Against Air Attack," US Army Air Defense Artillery School, May 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/man/eprint/sad.pdf>

Some recent Congressional Research Service items include:

"Peacekeeping and Related Stability Operations: Issues of U.S. Military Involvement," updated May 18, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/natsec/IB94040.pdf>

"Periods of War" (on the official beginning and ending of war)  
May 1, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RS21405.pdf>

And for no extra charge: "Net Neutrality: Background and  
Issues," May 16, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RS22444.pdf>

TIME OUT

I will be away for much of the next ten days.

---

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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul)  
with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)

Secrecy News is archived at:  
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/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](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](http://www.fas.org/sgp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:21:17 -0300  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:08:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Ledger

>From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:48:28 EDT  
>Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>For those interested in A.I. and Robotics,

>Tonight, on The Discovery Science Channel, the program "Robo-  
>Sapiens: The New (R)Evolution" will air twice.

>The show is dedicated to informing the public of the  
>advancements in the field and where we as a society are heading.

>Topics such as Implants, Artificial Telepathy, "The Matrix", and  
>Neural Interfaces will be addressed.

>An actual quote from the program; "I may have been born a  
>human, but I will die a Cyborg."

Hi Jason,

A.I. Re-inventing the wheel. When the science of A.I. gets to the end of that road, they will likely have recreated a biological entity. We call them them humans beings. It's difficult to say what some ETI would call them.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - White

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:36:01 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 18:10:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien... - White

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:51:38 -0500  
>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 20:32:12 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

<snip>

>>Thanks, Fern. I am disturbed that newspapers, and TV (including  
>>major networks) are so willing to report junk stories like this,  
>>tongue-in-cheek stories, while totally ignoring serious UFO  
>>reports and related evidence.

>The preceding is fact. I cannot see but that this could not be  
>the design of a \_jealous\_, non-elected, and remotely  
>intelligent... scientific, institutional, governmental, and  
>spiritual leadership.

Sometimes I think those entities quack too.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## UFO-Related Video Clips On-Line

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 07:49:28 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 07:49:28 -0400  
Subject: UFO-Related Video Clips On-Line

With thanks to Pierre Juneau

ebk

-----

1) Dan Akroyd interview on UFOs and close encounters  
broadcast on June 9, 2006, on CNN's 'Anderson Cooper':

<http://tinyurl.com/gg3y9>

Running Time: 12:03

2) Interview on the Jon Stewart comedy show with ABC's Peter  
Jennings on February 23, 2005, the day before his two hour  
Primetime broadcast on UFOs:

<http://tinyurl.com/my8zq>

Running Time: 12:35

3) Video of Dr. John Mack interviewing young children at the  
Ariel Primary School in South Africa in 1994. 62 children had a  
daylight encounter with a UFO and aliens who gave them a message  
about the future of the environment if we don't change:

<http://tinyurl.com/gf2ck>

Running Time: 03:44

4) Video of Discovery Channel Canada's report on Hon. Paul Hellyer's  
September 2005 Toronto Exopolitics disclosure that a retired USA  
Airforce General confirmed to him directly that UFOs are real  
and the Roswell UFO crash took place:

<http://tinyurl.com/zh7k3>

Running Time: 05:10

5) Unexplained Mysteries reports on the UFO waves over  
Washington in 1952:

<http://tinyurl.com/rvkb8>

Running Time: 04:19

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 00:16:02 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 07:58:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 14:48:38 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 17:34:07 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

<snip>

>And we're all eagerly waiting for you to do so. Meanwhile please  
>feel free to ignore the above theoretical DoF figures. They may  
>be revised, but as far as I can see they are at present all  
>we've got, and a value of ~ 40 degs, not 30 degs, is the best  
>FOV figure we've got. At least perpetuating poor guesses is not  
>going to help anyone.

>>We can expend energy on two fronts if we want.

>Seems like it's just as well to do so.

Hi Martin,

I'm not ignoring anything? I immediately bought the camera because I anticipated and recognized the scope of the problem. There is no other way to convince someone without being able to show someone. That's the end result. The missing ingredient is apparent. In this case, the complement of reason is experiment. The goal is to bring about closure to a presented problem. I can play numbers all day, but in the end it's experiment that has the slim chance of marrying disparity, of probing the unexpected, of sorting opposing view points... of bending a branch with an unexpected wind... from an unexpected direction.

I explained my reason's for under estimating and you don't have to get so overly perked up about it. I would rather underestimate than overestimate when there are several variables to consider. And now you sound as though you're demanding a time table from me?

30 or 40 degree isn't going to change the size of a wheel by much... so it's consistent with the scale while at the same time anticipatory of a few variables I see in front of me. Forty degrees is correct, as I've already stated, but I want to remove the other nagging doubts first then move toward it.

We can't explain every detail all at once and at every intervening opportunity... so let's not pretend we can.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 12:21:04 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:00:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:48:05 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>Furthermore, as I pointed out in my paper at my web site, if you  
>take the locations of the oil wells and use this to predict what  
>the pattern or array would look like on the FLIR assuming they  
>could all be seen, you get a pattern that does not exactly match  
>what was recorded. This would be strong evidence that not all of  
>the lights were oil fires if one could be certain of the  
>reconstruction. However, it has to be proven that, in fact, the  
>oil fires can (or can't) be seen under the conditions of the  
>sighting.

The patterns or array based on the data you used in your  
appendix were based on one transponder location for each  
platform and does not take into account the multiple gas flares  
distributed on each large platform. Thus I am not surprised the  
patterns you calculated did not match.

I went to a lot of effort to get the coordinates from Landsat  
images. Each image was georeferenced so I did not have to do the  
latitude and longitude conversion myself. If you want the  
website where the images are located I will post them again.  
Other common and recently popular satellite image servers may  
have this data too.

I also went to a lot of effort to translate these coordinates,  
the aircraft coordinates and the aircraft camera  
angle/magnification into 3D format to match the pattern of  
lights seen in the FLIR video. They match very well allowing for  
some variation in gas flare height, the one data set I don't  
have.

There may be some lights that do not match existing platforms  
(this may be based on the age of the Landsat images), but surely  
the primary ones... the fleet... are completely explained.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Beasley

From: **Craig Beasley** <[fallingleaf.nul](mailto:fallingleaf.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 00:22:35 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:03:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - Beasley

>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:46:06 +1000  
>Subject: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters?

>Can List members recommend any sources of information on  
>auditory effects heard during UFO sightings or other 'high  
>strangeness' (abduction, entity/fairy/mothman sighting)?

<snip>

In his book, Unconventional Flying Objects, Paul Hill speculates that it would not be uncommon for UFO propulsion fields to directly vibrate a person without acoustic waves. That would go towards explaining why some people describe "feeling" sounds more than hearing them during encounters.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 07:23:14 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:06:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:30:17 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>I agree it's very frustrating. It's also complicated, because  
>whereas the original Polaroids are in the control of Ann Druffel  
>the high-res scans of them are in the control of Ed Kelson for  
>continued use in his forthcoming second JSE paper. Kelson  
>declined to share the scans; however Bob Wood did tell me that  
>the original Polaroids are "in principle available for research  
>under controlled conditions". That means checking that Bob Wood  
>is speaking for Ann Druffel here and then going to California to  
>study them under supervision. That might be possible for you,  
>not for me.

What I am suggesting is that she, or someone she trusts, take them to my friend's lab in Boston. Sure, he could go to California, but his lab couldn't. If I went to California, about all I could accomplish is to look at them and say, "yep, them's old Polaroid prints, you betcha!"

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## UFO Pictured In UK Carnival Flypast

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:11:50 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:11:50 -0400  
Subject: UFO Pictured In UK Carnival Flypast

Source: Grantham Today - Lincolnshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/kxqor>

20 June 2006

[Image at site]

UFO Pictured In Carnival Flypast

Amateur photographer Ray Gilbert reckons he caught more than one flying object on camera when a Dakota aeroplane completed a flypast over Grantham Carnival on Saturday.

Mr Gilbert, of Montrose Close, Grantham, discovered a mysterious dot on one of the digital pictures he took of the flypast.

He said the dot has a flat top and a red rim around it only visible when he zooms in on it on his computer.

Ray, who claims to have seen a UFO last year when he was travelling to Lincoln, said: "I took more photos of the flypast but this is the only one with a dot on it.

"When I saw it a chill went down my back and everyone I've told says I should inform the Ministry of Defence. I know it's a UFO and I'm wondering if anyone else saw the same thing."

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 11:49:07 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:13:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Hall

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 21:10:13 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:11:42 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>>It may be rather strong, but from my hardline empiricist  
>>>viewpoint, the stronger the better. What I was objecting to was  
>>>this (from Richard Hall's post of June 9):

>>>"The people who are included as sociologists or political  
>>>scientists or anthropologists include many who follow  
>>scientific  
>>methods, both in theory construction and compilation of  
>>empirical evidence"

>>>In other words, the idea that a discipline can be regarded as  
>>>scientific on the basis of the way its theories are  
>>constructed.

>>Of course, that is not what I said! I said nothing about `the  
>>way' theories are constructed. Cathy quotes me accurately, and  
>>then turns around and totally distorts what I said, which was  
>>that many of the social/behavioral scientists indeed do use  
>>scientific method. Cathy originally denied that theory  
>>construction was part of scientific method, and now pretends not  
>>to have said that or not to actually have meant that.

>As I read it, Dick, you're claiming there is such a thing as a  
>scientific method of theory construction (as opposed,  
>presumably, to other, unscientific methods of theory  
>construction).

>If that's what you're saying, then I think you're wrong, for the  
>reasons already given. If you're saying something else, perhaps  
>you could clarify what it is.

Cathy,

I just did clarify it! Please re-read my comment above. Where  
did I say anything about "scientific method of theory  
construction?" That is one of those semantical confusions and I  
never used words anything like that. All I said was that theory  
construction is part of the scientific method, and it is.

Obviously there are ways in practice whereby scientists (and  
anyone who behaves scientifically) go about developing their  
theories, As I said before, it essentially consists of  
inferential reasoning from a body of data. You imagine what  
might have caused the data to be observed and fashion your  
proposed explanation(s) in testable fashion.

The ground is wet except where covered by an umbrella. How can  
we explain that? Theory: Rain fell from the sky? The neighbor's

sprinkler sprayed into my yard? Someone climbed on a ladder and dumped a pail of water on my yard? Obviously it can get much more complicated than that, but the same general principles apply.

Now if you want to be a stickler for details, I suppose you could say that there are unscientific ways to construct a theory (and therefore implicitly scientific ways as well). Pursuing a pet belief as first choice. Choosing randomly from a list. Tossing a coin. No self-respecting scientist (or practitioner of scientific method) would engage in that sort of random guesswork. A theory should flow directly from the data and be logically connected to it.

However, that was not what I was talking about in the above case. When I formally studied scientific method it was called the hypothetico-deductive method. Overall, the method invariably proceeds in the same way no matter how simple or complex the question. Data are primary. Inference and theory construction can go haywire (scientists are human), but are an essential part of the method.

One of my favorite quotes on this matter is from the empirical philosopher Charles S. Peirce:

"One can stare stupidly at phenomena; but in the absence of imagination they will not connect themselves together in a rational way."

This was not a pro-rationalism statement, simply an acknowledgment of the role of imaginative reasoning in science.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## US Patent Application For Black Budget

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:33:36 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:33:36 -0400  
Subject: US Patent Application For Black Budget

Source: Uncensored Magazine - Christchurch, New Zealand

<http://tinyurl.com/zfh69>

20 Jun 06

[Numbered items below, are linked to Patent Office info  
from site above...]

Patent Applications by Aerospace Manufacturers May Betray the  
Existence of Black Budget Aerospacecraft and Explain Some UFO  
Sightings.

Lockheed patent for "Aircraft Thermal Protection System," a.k.a.  
hexagonal, super alloy, honeycomb material, may reveal secret  
"Aurora" hypersonic aircraft. Patent is #5,560,569, granted 1  
October 1996.

1. perspective view of hypersonic space launch vehicle/exploded  
view of thermal panel
2. full text of patent application

Lockheed continues work on development of pulse detonation  
engines as evidenced by patent #6,439,503, granted 27 August  
2002, describing the use of pulse detonation clusters.

1. full text of patent application

Incredible New Lockheed Martin Patents Shed Light on a Blimp-  
Type Craft, a Possible Follow-On to the Dark Star UAV, and  
Stealth Cruise Missiles:

Lockheed Martin Palmdale continues to demonstrate an  
extraordinary interest in lighter-than-air vehicles as evidenced  
by three new patents dating from September, October, and  
November of 2001. The vehicles depicted are substantially  
similar to that shown in the patent issued 11 January 2000,  
described below. These patents may represent the previously  
unclassified lighter-than-air freighter that the Skunks were  
reported to be working on in the 25 August 1999 issue of Flight  
International. Such a vehicle may account for sightings of a  
huge blimp-like craft over the Antelope Valley, California area,  
the Skunk Works' backyard.

Lockheed Martin submitted the following drawings with a patent  
application for a "propulsion system for a semi-buoyant vehicle  
with an aerodynamic [sic]" on 21 December 1999 and the  
application was granted on 13 November 2001. The vehicle looks  
like a bug-eyed monster with propellers. Patent #6,315,242.

1. perspective/front views
2. side/rear views



3. top view
4. cross-sectional views
5. patent abstract
6. full text of patent application

Lockheed Martin submitted the following drawings with a patent application for a "pressure stabilized inflated air transport vehicle" on 28 August 2000 and the application was granted on 16 October 2001. Patent #6,302,357.

1. patent abstract/perspective view
2. full text of patent application

Lockheed Martin submitted the following drawings with a patent application for a "pressure stabilized gasbag for a partially buoyant vehicle" on 21 December 1999 and the application was granted on 25 September 2001. Patent #6,293,493.

1. patent abstract/perspective view

Lockheed Martin submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the ornamental design of a "partially buoyant aerial vehicle" on 22 June 1998 and the application was granted on 11 January 2000. Patent #D418,804.

1. top right side and front perspective view
2. right side elevational view
3. top plan view
4. bottom plan view
5. front and rear elevation views
6. top right side and front perspective view of a second embodiment of the vehicle
7. patent abstract

A Lockheed Martin patent from early 2001 may depict a follow-on to the canceled Dark Star UAV, possibly with UCAV capabilities, judging from what appear to be bomb-bay doors on the underside of the vehicle. The patent application was submitted 4 January 1999 and the application was granted 6 February 2001. Patent #D437,284.

1. top left front perspective/right side elevational views
2. top plan view
3. bottom plan view
4. front/rear elevational views
5. patent abstract

The above Lockheed patent cites an earlier Northrop patent for what appears to be a stealthy UAV patterned roughly after Tacit Blue. Northrop applied for the patent on 6 June 1995 and the application was granted on 14 January 1997. I refer to this aircraft as the "Penguin" (see the bottom perspective view). Patent #D377,333.

1. top perspective view
2. bottom perspective view
3. top plan view
4. front elevation view
5. rear elevation view
6. left side elevation view
7. patent abstract

Lockheed Martin submitted the following relatively unrevealing illustrations with a patent application for "rocket and ramjet powered hypersonic stealth missile having alterable radar cross section" on 3 June 1998 and the application was granted on 9 May 2000. Patent #6,058,846.

1. missile structure that typifies the ramjet engine technology known prior to the present invention/preferred embodiment of the hypersonic missile of the present invention/enlarged sectional view of the inlet portion of the missile and the translatable inlet plug

2. patent abstract

3. full text of patent application

On 9 April 1998, the U.S. Air Force and Navy announced their selection of Lockheed Martin to develop and build the JASSM (Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile), an advanced cruise missile that will "dominate precision strike warfare in the next century," according to this press release. Lockheed Martin submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the ornamental design of a JASSM on 3 August 1998 and the application was granted on 14 December 1999. Perhaps this design may bear a resemblance to any secret stealth cruise missile on which the skunks are working. Patent #D417,639.

1. right and left side elevation views/top plan view

2. bottom plan view/front and rear elevation views

3. perspective view with wings in deployed position

4. patent abstract

Lockheed Martin Obtained the Following Patents Related to Pulse Detonation Engine Technology, Rumored To Play a Role in the Aurora Hypersonic Program, and Laser Propulsion During the Mid to Late 1990s:

Lockheed submitted the following materials with a patent application for "pulse detonation engine" on 24 June 1994 and the application was granted on 12 December 1995. Could such an engine be responsible for the loud, low, rumbling noises heard coming from Groom Lake during the early 1990s? Patent #5,473,885.1. patent abstract

2. full text of patent application

Lockheed Martin submitted the following materials with a patent application for "dual rotor pulse detonation apparatus" on 26 July 1995 and the application was granted on 1 April 1997. The application states that "the rotational speed of [a given] valve sleeve . . . is selected to create pulses at a rate of approximately 100 cycles per second," which may account for the low rumbling sound. Patent #5,615,548.

1. patent abstract

2. full text of patent application

Lockheed Martin submitted the following materials with a patent application for "pulse detonation igniter for pulse detonation chambers" on 27 November 1996 and the application was granted on 17 August 1999. Patent #5,937,635.

1. patent abstract

2. full text of patent application

Lockheed submitted the following materials with a patent application for "apparatus powered using laser supplied energy" on 24 June 1994 and the application was granted on 6 August 1996. The application states: "the apparatus includes a chamber having air disposed therein, a pulsed laser for converting an energy source into light pulses, and a lens for receiving the light pulses and directing the light pulses toward a focal point within the chamber. Each light pulse converges in a region which is proximate to the focal point and causes molecules within the air which are at the region to disassociate. Disassociation of

the molecules generates pressure waves which provide thrust for powering the object to move." Intriguing. Patent #5,542,247.

1. patent abstract
2. full text of patent application

Previous Patent Discoveries:

Northrop Grumman submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for an "aircraft with variable forward-sweep wing" on 19 June 1998 and the application was granted on 16 November 1999. Perhaps this aircraft bears a relation to the black budget swing-wing which Steve Douglass describes as the "Switchblade" in the March 2000 issue of Aircraft Illustrated. Patent #5,984,231.1. top plan view showing essentially unswept position with phantom lines showing wing in some intermediate swept position/top plan view showing wing in full-forward swept position

2. side view
3. patent abstract
4. full text of patent application

Lockheed submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the "ornamental design for a single stage to orbit vehicle" on 1 March 1994 and the application was granted on 12 September 1995. Whether these illustrations depict an early, likely military, version of the X-33, or a transatmospheric hypersonic vehicle akin to the rumored Aurora is unclear. Because Lockheed submitted somewhat different illustrations that look more like the X-33 with a subsequent patent application for "the ornamental design for single stage to orbit spacecraft" (see infra), one is inclined to believe that these earlier illustrations depict a black budget version. The front view looks particularly menacing. Patent #D362,234.

1. front perspective view
2. rear perspective view
3. front view
4. rear view
5. side view
6. top view
7. bottom view
8. patent abstract

Lockheed Martin submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the "ornamental design for single stage to orbit spacecraft" on 5 August 1996 and the application was granted on 4 August 1998. These illustrations apparently depict the X-33. Patent #D396,685. UPDATE: NASA has not renewed funding for the X-33.

1. perspective/side views
2. top/front views
3. bottom/back views
4. patent abstract

Lockheed Martin submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for a "shock suppression supersonic aircraft" on 21 January 1997 and the application was granted on 10 August 1999. The airplane is a flying wing and looks somewhat similar to Northrop's B-2 without the saw-tooth trailing edge. Patent #5,934,607.

1. perspective view/front view
2. planform view

3. cross-sectional view illustrating the positional relationship of the various jet sheet plenums to the center strut, struts and vertical stabilizers

4. patent abstract

5. full text of patent application

Boeing submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the "ornamental design for an airplane" on 23 June 1997 and the application was granted on 5 May 1998. The aircraft shown has a B-2-shaped wing section on a fighter-type fuselage with an unconventional tail. I refer to this aircraft as the "Pterodactyl." Patent #D394,039.

1. top, front, left side elevational/top plan/front elevational views

2. left side elevational/bottom, front left side elevational views

3. bottom plan/rear elevational/right side elevational views

4. patent abstract

Northrop submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the "ornamental design for an aircraft" on 29 October 1992 and the application was granted on 28 December 1993. The illustrations appear somewhat similar to what Steve Douglass has described as the "Flying Artichoke" or perhaps an F-117 follow-on. Patent #D342,717.

1. top perspective view

2. bottom perspective view

3. top plan view

4. front/rear elevation views

5. left side elevation

6. patent abstract

Northrop Grumman submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the "ornamental design for an airplane" on 9 September 1994 and the application was granted on 26 December 1995. This design has been referred to as Northrop's "Advanced Manned Concept" and may be a follow-on to Northrop's canceled YF-23. Patent #D365,545.

1. top perspective view

2. bottom perspective view

3. top plan view

4. bottom plan view

5. left side elevation

6. front/rear elevation views

7. patent abstract

Lockheed Martin submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the "ornamental design for unmanned aircraft" on 28 May 1996 and the application was granted on 26 August 1997. This airplane looks like a smaller, unmanned version of the B-2 bomber. My guess is that this is the supposedly canceled, prohibitively expensive Tier 3 UAV, which may be the same as the rumored "Q." Lockheed's subsequently developed, subsequently canceled Tier 3- Darkstar UAV bears a resemblance to the UAV shown here. Patent #D382,851.

1. perspective/side views

2. front/rear views

3. top view

4. bottom view

5. patent abstract

Boeing submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for a "horizontal-takeoff transatmospheric launch system" in a mothership/daughtership configuration on 14 October 1986 and the application was granted on 7 February 1989. Patent #4,802,639. There has been speculation that the rumored Aurora consisted of such a mother/daughter combination, with the mothership bearing a resemblance to the XB-70 bomber prototype.

1. booster aircraft flying by itself/orbiter vehicle flying by itself/booster flying with orbiter integrated into its underside

2. top plan view of booster

3. top plan view of orbiter/elevational view of booster with orbiter integrated into its underside

4. booster and orbiter on the ground and in alignment ready to be mated/orbiter being towed into the cavity in the booster/orbiter all the way in position in the cavity

5. schematic representation of the flight profiles of booster and orbiter

6. elevational view of booster and orbiter at the beginning of the takeoff operation/elevational view of booster and orbiter at ignition of booster and orbiter rocket engines/elevational view of booster and orbiter as the orbiter is swinging out of the cavity in the booster/detail of one of the strut ends/elevational view of the booster and orbiter just after separation/detail of one of the strut ends and associated pins

7. side elevational view of a second preferred embodiment of the booster and orbiter mated/rear elevational view of booster and orbiter/top plan view of booster and orbiter/side elevational view of orbiter/top plan view of orbiter

8. patent abstract

9. full text of patent application

Teledyne Ryan submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for an "aircraft of low observability" on 21 July 1975 and the application was granted on 26 April 1977. The illustrations show a pure delta-wing flying triangle. The full text of the application contains a rather candid discussion of the principles of radar cross-section reduction (stealth technology). At that early date such technology was not highly classified. Patent #4,019,699.

1. top plan view of typical aircraft incorporating the low observability features/enlarged sectional views/side elevation view/front view

2. front view of aircraft with radar beams indicated/side view of an aircraft adapted to low altitude flight and shielded from radar originating from above/enlarged sectional view of a typical surface skin structure of aircraft/enlarged sectional view of an alternative skin structure/polar graph of a typical radar cross section signature of aircraft

3. patent abstract

4. full text of patent application

The late Interceptor John Andrews of Testor Corporation submitted the following illustrations with a patent application for the "ornamental design for an airplane," presumably a model airplane, on 20 April 1994 and the application was granted on 28 November 1995. The aircraft depicted appears to be the Testor model known as the "XR-7 Thunder Dart" and looks similar to what has become known among Interceptors as the "Fastmover." Patent #D364,600.

1. top perspective view

2. top plan/left side elevational views

3. bottom plan/front elevational/rear elevational views

4. patent abstract

Remarkable Patent May Explain Some "Chemtrails":

David R. Criswell of Houston, Texas (interestingly, Houston is a hotbed for "chemtrail" sightings) submitted an application for the patent of a "vehicle propulsion system with external propellant supply" on 1 July 1991 and the application was granted on 6 July 1993. The first illustration shows a conventional leading jet aircraft spraying from its wingtips trails of fuel which are ingested by the engines of a trailing craft, which in one embodiment appears as a spaceplane. The description of the invention states that the trails may extend for up to 285 miles. The description states "the propulsion system can be used for space, aerospace, and atmospheric flight operations. Point-to-point hypersonic flight in the atmosphere should be enabled by this system because of increased economy and the reduction of sonic booms . . . ." "The use of a propellant trail laid in free space to drive an aerospace plane provides a new method of hypersonic flight that can avoid or greatly minimize the operational and technical limitations of aerospace planes which must carry all their own propellant as a major component of their initial gross mass. The present technical problems in such planes greatly limit their range, payload capabilities, and structural design possibilities." "Between approximately 25 km and 47 km, in the mesosphere, the temperature of the atmosphere increases with altitude. The supersonic Concord flies at the top of the stratosphere and the bottom of the mesosphere. The SR-71 Mach 3 reconnaissance jet and the U-2 subsonic reconnaissance jet fly in the mesosphere. This mesosphere portion is extremely stable against turbulence and is extremely dry. Thus, contrails do not show but fuel/air trails would be very stable. Only winds at that altitude would be of concern and adjusted for during the laying out of a trail. . . . In summary, the trails can be laid over a very wide range of altitudes and lengths. The short trails can be laid as a single length and altitude by a single craft and with minimum worry about distortion. The longer trails will have to be laid down by several craft and the winds along the trail will have to be accounted for and the launch vehicle started at a precise time." "The stream or spray of propellant will be in the form of a mist of very small droplets, solid particles or ices for mixing with the atmospheric air to produce a combustive mixture, for example gasoline, JP4, diesel oils, ethanol, methanol, ammonia, chlorinated solvents, hydrazine, and the like." Could this explain any or all "chemtrails"? Photos of "chemtrail" aircraft doing their thing can be seen here. Frankly, I just don't buy it. Patent #5,224,663. 1. perspective view of a vehicle propulsion system according to a first embodiment of the invention (leading vehicle shown spraying propellant trail)/vertical cross-sectional view of the trailing, fuel ingesting vehicle

2. side elevational view of a fuel ingesting aerospace plane according to another embodiment of the invention/cross-section of the jet engine of the aerospace plane

3. patent abstract

4. full text of patent application

The records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office can be searched here:

<http://www.uspto.gov/patft/index.html>

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## John Paul II Told Stephen Hawking

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 10:22:15 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 10:22:15 -0400  
Subject: John Paul II Told Stephen Hawking

Source: North West Florida Daily News -  
Fort Walton Beach, Florida, USA

<http://www.nwfdailynews.com/articleArchive/jun2006/hawkingpope.php>

2006-06-15

Famous British Astrophysicist Stephen Hawking Says Pope Told Him  
Not To Study Beginning Of Universe

By Min Lee  
Associated Press Writer

HONG KONG (AP) - Famous astrophysicist Stephen Hawking said  
Thursday that the late Pope John Paul II once told scientists  
they should not study the beginning of the universe because it  
was the work of God.

The British author \_ who wrote the best-seller "A Brief History  
of Time" \_ said that the pope made the comments at a cosmology  
conference at the Vatican.

Hawking, who didn't say when the meeting was held, quoted the  
pope as saying, "It's OK to study the universe and where it  
began. But we should not enquire into the beginning itself  
because that was the moment of creation and the work of God."

The scientist then joked during a lecture in Hong Kong, "I was  
glad he didn't realize I had presented a paper at the conference  
suggesting how the universe began. I didn't fancy the thought of  
being handed over to the Inquisition like Galileo."

The church condemned Galileo in the 17th century for supporting  
Nicholas Copernicus' discovery that Earth revolved around the  
sun. Church teaching at the time placed Earth at the center of  
the universe.

But in 1992, Pope John Paul II issued a declaration saying that  
the church's denunciation of Galileo was an error resulting from  
"tragic mutual incomprehension."

Hawking is one of the best-known theoretical physicists of his  
generation. He has done groundbreaking research on black holes  
and the origins of the universe. He proposes that space and time  
have no beginning and no end.

His hourlong lecture to a sold-out audience at Hong Kong  
University of Science and Technology was highly theoretical and  
technical. During the question-and-answer session, Hawking was  
asked where constants like gravity come from and whether gravity  
can distort light.

But there were several light, humorous moments.



Hawking \_ who must communicate with an electronic speech synthesizer \_ said he once considered using a machine that gave him a French accent but he couldn't use it because his wife would divorce him.

The astrophysicist is wheelchair-bound and uses an electronic voice because he has the neurological disorder called amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or ALS.

Hawking was asked why his computerized voice has an American accent.

"The voice I use is a very old hardware speech synthesizer made in 1986," he said. "I keep it because I have not heard a voice I like better and because I have identified with it."

But Hawking said he's shopping for a new system because the hardware he uses is large and fragile. He also said it uses components that are no longer made.

"I have been trying to get a software version, but it seems very difficult," he said.

He urged people with physical disabilities not to give up on their ambitions.

"You can't afford to be disabled in spirit as well as physically," he said. "People won't have time for you."

The moderator at the lecture told the audience that at a recent dinner, she asked Hawking what his ambitions were. He said he wanted to know how the universe began, what happens inside black holes and how can humans survive the next 100 years, she said.

But she added he had one more great ambition: "I would also like to understand women."

Hawking ended his lecture saying, "We are getting closer to answering the age-old questions: Why are we here? Where did we come from?"

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 13:29:50 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 14:40:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shough

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 07:23:14 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:30:17 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>I agree it's very frustrating. It's also complicated, because  
>>whereas the original Polaroids are in the control of Ann Druffel  
>>the high-res scans of them are in the control of Ed Kelson for  
>>continued use in his forthcoming second JSE paper. Kelson  
>>declined to share the scans; however Bob Wood did tell me that  
>>the original Polaroids are "in principle available for research  
>>under controlled conditions". That means checking that Bob Wood  
>>is speaking for Ann Druffel here and then going to California to  
>>study them under supervision. That might be possible for you,  
>>not for me.

>What I am suggesting is that she, or someone she trusts, take  
>them to my friend's lab in Boston. Sure, he could go to  
>California, but his lab couldn't. If I went to California, about  
>all I could accomplish is to look at them and say, "yep, them's  
>old Polaroid prints, you betcha!"

I've told you all I know Bob. I suggest you contact Ann Druffel  
directly and make the offer. Maybe if your friend's lab can  
improve on whatever gear Kelson is using they'll be amenable.  
Can't hurt to try.

<http://www.anndruffel.com/>  
<[ann.nul](mailto:ann.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: UFO Pictured In UK Carnival Flypast - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 13:45:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 14:41:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Pictured In UK Carnival Flypast - Shough

>Source: Grantham Today - Lincolnshire, UK

><http://tinyurl.com/kxgqr>

>20 June 2006

>[Image at site]

>UFO Pictured In Carnival Flypast

>Amateur photographer Ray Gilbert reckons he caught more than one  
>flying object on camera when a Dakota aeroplane completed a  
>flypast over Grantham Carnival on Saturday.

>Mr Gilbert, of Montrose Close, Grantham, discovered a mysterious  
>dot on one of the digital pictures he took of the flypast.

>He said the dot has a flat top and a red rim around it only  
>visible when he zooms in on it on his computer.

Can't see the flat "top" (which way is up?) or the red rim at  
this resolution. But if it was a carnival, and there were no  
other UFO reporters, then maybe a balloon drifted by?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 14:12:37 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 14:42:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Heflin UFO Photos - Shough

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:15:17 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Heflin UFO Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 18:59:58 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Heflin UFO Photos

>>>From: Kyle King <[kyleking.nul](mailto:kyleking.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 14:18:18 -0500  
>>>Subject: Heflin UFO Photos

>>>The anonymous poster who has sent messages regarding the  
>>>Heflin Photos has written to me to ask that I send you a  
>>>link to my blog where I have posted some information  
>>>regarding this case.

>><snip>

>>>While I remain neutral as to the validity of the Heflin  
>>>story, I think the information I've found might help in the  
>>>discussion.

>>>At any rate, Mr. Anonymous seems to think so.

>>K: Another "Anonymous" posting has been submitted to UFO  
>>Updates regarding the Heflin photos. While the post is getting  
>>run through the ringer by Martin Shough, Don Ledger and  
>>others, the protestations seem rather flat compared to the  
>>relative ease of testing the points brought forth by  
>>"Anonymous".

>What are you dragging me into this for Kyle? I don't recall  
>running anonymous through the ringer. My contribution has been  
>minimal-power pole heights, haze notes and the difference in  
>the train wheel flange size and the Heflin photo object's  
>"flange" if you will.

>Do you know this "anonymous"?

Don

Who cares? Even the tiniest piece of information would be worth  
checking an informant's bona fides for. But what has that  
nameless poster told us? Absolutely nothing. Check it out  
again. Nothing. In fact less than nothing: His/her only  
contribution (apart from stirring the pot) was to obfuscate  
information that was already under discussion.

Martin Shough

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 09:59:11 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 14:44:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Smith

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:48:05 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:01:42 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>Still, my purely subjective impression is that objects in the  
>>FLIR images seem much too bright to be the distant oil wells no  
>>matter how many assumptions of super infrared seeing conditions  
>>one makes. Whether this is true or not would depend on obscure  
>t>echnical details of the FLIR imagers, which I don't know.  
>>Perhaps Bruce Maccabee and James Smith would care to comment.

>The "lights" are bright, especially the pair which I called "the  
>Twins." I agree that they are surprisingly bright considering  
>the distance if oil field fires. A calculation from "first  
>principles" could be attempted if I knew the radiation intensity  
>of an oil fire in the band range of the FLIR and if I knew the  
>actual sensitivity of the FLIR.

Reviewing my records, an unknown light (that seems on the ground  
and also seems on the mainland near the coast) was viewed with  
Medium FOV at 16:45:21 thru :29 and from 16:46:30 thru :34. This  
coincides with the location of the Atasta gas recompression  
station which has four elevated flares and one ground flare  
(100m by 40 m). That distance is about 80 miles. The oil  
platform gas flares are no more than 120 miles away. The  
brightness of both sets of lights seem similar but perhaps that  
is due to some automatic setting on the FLIR. The size of the  
Atasta light would have been much bigger than the other lights  
if viewed on the Narrow or greater magnification, but they only  
used Medium.

Its too bad that people like Mr. Garza refuse to accept the  
possibility that gas flares could be seen by the aircraft. Would  
he believe even a duplicate flight that showed the gas flares? I  
doubt it. No in his mind the gas flares  
are a "hoax". Very sad.

>The twins were also accompanied by lesser lights below which are  
>marginally consistent with being reflections in the water from  
>light/heat sources several hundred feet above water (burning  
>gas).

>All of the flares are at about the same distance so I don't know  
>why the twins were so much brighter than the other lights.

Different burn rates? Acquiring the DMSP images for that night  
could confirm this (\$60 a frame). Perhaps the burnrate data is  
available to Mexican researchers (for pollution monitoring). But  
then, Mr. Garza and his "team" have their minds made up.

Regarding the radar readings, I have always agreed that some  
lights and some radar readings may be from unknown  
causes/sources (e.g. UFOs) and have not analyzed them much

because they were not interesting to me. But the entire "fleet UFO" video segment which was what really caused the world-wide furor (and spooked the crew), had no such radar returns.

Mr. Garza should admit that fact rather than try to lump it all together. His rude remarks to anyone who doesn't agree with him does not reflect well on the Mexican UFO research community. Captain Franz has done a hell of alot more than Mr. Garza in the investigation of the case and has alot more patience than most of us in dealing with their belittlement and derision. It seems that Garza's research is primarily the spoon-fed acceptance of information from the military including some interviews to round out their "massive" files.

Sadly, it is not in Garza's best interest to disprove the "fleet UFOs". Perhaps he can inform us what possibilities other than ball lightning he is (or has been) willing to consider and how he has ruled them out. It would be illuminating to examine what methodology he uses to eliminate possible causes. Does he use logic or armwaving? Does he need to perform an experiment/test or rely on intuition?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 13:09:25 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 19:21:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 07:01:31 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>So the next step is to determine What standard or standards you  
>would recommend in determining that flying saucers are ET in  
>origin? Considering that even so-called scientific "laws" may,  
>in the end, turn out to be fallible and yet high-level theories  
>only, which standard would you accept?

I'm not looking to determine that "flying saucers are ET in origin." I'm looking to determine the truth about the about their nature and origin, whatever that may be. You're starting off with a 'given' (flying saucers are ET in origin") and looking to prove your 'given.' That's the whole problem!

I'm not cutting away and ignoring - merely calling irrelevant - a huge category of UFO cases (the non-high tech vehicle cases), not cutting away and ignoring - merely calling irrelevant - another important category of UFO cases (the blur zone cases of 'high tech vehicles' with bizarre characteristics that hint they may not be high tech vehicles at all), not cutting away and ignoring - merely calling irrelevant - the abduction scene cases that contain characteristics that don't perfectly fit the 'aliens abducting humans' scenario, not cutting away and ignoring - merely calling irrelevant - research that obviously has direct bearing on the UFO/Abduction phenomenon but which leads to the notion that some other process is active during the UFO/Abduction experience, and I'm not just writing off all the anomalies and unexplained elements in the reports we get as being due to the superior technology of an advanced alien civilization ("I expect advanced civilizations to have developed the world of the mind and the soul as well as technology sufficient to come here and to avoid our defense systems") without determining this to actually be the case.

What standards do I recommend? How about, for starters, not ignoring the cases, categories, and research that exists but which is not so suggestive of ET spaceships? How about considering all the data and not excluding anything until you know it is not applicable? That might be a good standard to start with. How about ruling out all the other possible explanations before saying we're dealing with ET spaceships? That might be a good standard to continue with.

Another 'standard' might be to maybe do some actual scientific research while seeing if other factors or solutions apply? Like repeating Lawson's research in more depth? Like devising scientific experiments to try and answer some of the questions that exist regarding the phenomenon - you know, actually try to tie up the loose ends and cut away the strings that tie in other possibilities?

Like, maybe, actually deal with the whole phenomenon as it presents itself to us rather than trimming most of it away that doesn't fit a certain picture until you're left with perfect cases that describe the scenario you like - calling it "gold ore" or "fissionable element" or "disease-curing chemical" in



the process - and 'proclaiming' that the data proves we're dealing with ET spaceships because some of the data (a small percentage of the whole data that is conflicted by other parts of the data) suggests it might be?

More standards? Maybe not start off trying to prove a particular explanation (as is your approach)? You may never get beyond your "even so-called scientific "laws" may, in the end, turn out to be fallible and yet high-level theories only" obstacle if you do it this way. But if you actually do some science before making proclamations, you might get to the point where all the other possibilities have been reasonably eliminated and you may have enough answers to the questions that stand in the way of the solution to be sure enough that it actually is the solution. You might never be one-hundred percent sure but you might have done enough research to get answers to the messy things that stand in the way of being sure, instead of just cutting away and ignoring - merely calling irrelevant - those messy things.

Maybe 'answering up' regarding the 'messy things' is just a formality! Maybe some UFOs are ET spaceships. Then again, maybe the 'messy things' are clues pointing to another solution to the UFO phenomenon (the whole UFO phenomenon - including the 'high tech vehicles' which may not be separate from the 'high tech vehicles' in the blur zone, all of which may not be separate from the non-high tech vehicles), excluding the IFOs and misperceived mundanes.

Maybe not 'try to prove a solution' (as you are prone to do) but 'eliminate solutions based on scientific research and fact'?

But then again, my "logic" is hard to follow!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 13:31:55 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 19:24:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Ledger

>From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 14:01:01 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:48:28 EDT  
>>Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>For those interested in A.I. and Robotics,

>>Tonight, on The Discovery Science Channel, the program "Robo-  
>>Sapiens: The New (R)Evolution" will air twice.

>I also need to make a correction. "RoboSapiens" will air on the  
>Discovery Channel on July 20th and not June 20th as I originally  
>indicated above.

>I should indicate that the July 20th broadcast may be a  
>completely different program. The information I have come across  
>concerning it's content did not appear on the program airing on  
>The Discovery Science Channel last night..

Without picking on Jason, might I remind listers that UFO  
UpDates receives emails worldwide and that simply typing - as in  
the above example - the Discovery Channel, or the History  
Channel does not impart all of the information required. Is  
Jason in The United States, Canada or the UK - these all have a  
Discovery Channel.

Often UFO reports denote city and town locations without  
mentioning a country. A quick look at an Atlas's index will show  
how many places in the world have the same name, particularly  
those settled by England or France.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond -

From: Ed Gehrman <[egehrman.nul](mailto:egehrman.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:59:47 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 19:27:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond -

>From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron\\_510.nul](mailto:corycameron_510.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:25:38 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:23:40 -0400  
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>>Source: Barb Campbell's SPPRC Site - Saskatchewan, Canada  
>><http://www.ufo-connection.com/reports/database/2006/24.html>

>>June 19 2006

>>Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>>Date: 2nd or 3rd week of June, 2006

>>Discovered: morning of June 16, 2006

>>Time: unknown

>>Location: near Hillmond (exact location withheld)

>>-----

>>Full report & many images at site

>>-----

>Seeing these pics this morning brought back to me some chilling  
>memories from a few years ago,

Hi Cory,

Yes, for me also. I found a mutilated cow very similar to this  
in early March of 2003, on our farm in Mountain Grove, Missouri.

I had just arrived for a long visit and my Aunt complained that  
the farm dog had been coming home covered with blood.

I went looking for the source and found the gruesome scene about  
a quarter-mile away but within sight of the farm house.

Eventually seven other cows and two calves and the farm dog died  
from still undetermined causes but only one cow was mutilated.

The others died several days to three weeks after the mutilation  
event.

The farmer who rents the pasture thought it was from bacteria in  
the new spring grass, or from a reaction to nitrogen that had  
been spread a few days before a spring snow. He and his sons  
thought the mutilation marks were caused by possums.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 12:45:58 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 19:29:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Maccabee

>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 21:57:13 +0100  
>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 18:41:01 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

<snip>

>>>>To borrow your phrase, "anyone with a grain of common sense"  
>>>>would know that hiding a coffee cup is not in the same league  
>>>>with damaging a police car.

>>>Not necessarily. We would need to know a great deal more about  
>>>Johnson in order to consider whether or not such an  
>>explanation  
>>was plausible.

>>What more would need to know? Perhaps you think that the police>  
>>department knew next to nothing about Johnson? we know that the  
>>police department trusted him. How much more do we need to know?

>The police department would not tell the world everything they  
>knew about Johnson. Personal details would be kept confidential,  
>as is the normal procedure in most organisations.

>>>My classification of this case: Unexplained - insufficient  
>>>information.

>>But, of course!

>>The American Air Force would be proud of you.

>Yes the US Air Force got it right where UFOs were concerned.  
>It's no use trying to wriggle out of it; in this case the  
>evidence points to the damage to the car being done either by  
>Johnson or by someone else (with or without his knowledge).  
>However, it is unlikely that all the relevant facts will ever  
>become available.

PJK recycled!

Very well.

In the interest of the preservation of law and order you should  
write to the Chief of Police in Warren, Minnesota to tell him  
that all evidence points toward Val Johnson (or someone else  
known or unknown to him) as the cause of the damage to the  
police car and that he should therefore be punished.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 15:06:56 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:33:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

>From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:36:01 -0400  
>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...  
>

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 15:51:38 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

>>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 20:32:12 +0000  
>>>Subject: Re: If It Quacks Like An Alien...

><snip>

>>>Thanks, Fern. I am disturbed that newspapers, and TV (including  
>>>major networks) are so willing to report junk stories like this,  
>>>tongue-in-cheek stories, while totally ignoring serious UFO  
>>>reports and related evidence.

>>The preceding is fact. I cannot see but that this could not be  
>>the design of a \_jealous\_, non-elected, and remotely  
>>intelligent... scientific, institutional, governmental, and  
>>spiritual leadership.

>Sometimes I think those entities quack too.

Not where the consolidation of illegitimate power is concerned,  
Ma'am. Then it's a horrific growl. The "quackers" to which you  
refer are the design fail-safe and cut-off man handily  
manipulated by those without oversight or responsibility. None  
dare call it conspiracy. Thanks for the note, Ms. White.

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - White

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:37:12 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 08:49:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters? - White

>From: Craig Beasley <[fallingleaf.nul](mailto:fallingleaf.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 00:22:35 -0500  
>Subject: Re: Auditory Effects With UFO Encounters?

<snip>

>In his book, Unconventional Flying Objects, Paul Hill speculates  
>that it would not be uncommon for UFO propulsion fields to  
>directly vibrate a person without acoustic waves. That would go  
>towards explaining why some people describe "feeling" sounds  
>more than hearing them during encounters.

Over here in the advanced electronic harassment camp, localized and rather powerful vibration of body parts and objects (such as a computer keyboard) is much more common than outright levitation. In my vibration experiences, these were felt only, and measured by computer monitored vibration switches or simply holding a glass of water against the vibrating object.

(No, it's not vibration from the PC - this keyboard vibration is very powerful, making it impossible to even type. The keyboard dances around the desk top when vibrated by the advanced tech perps. No vibration detected by the water glass method a few inches from the keyboard.)

It appears that technology exists which can precisely control some sort of gravity, at a distance, and that vibration is one signature of this technology. I have had objects in contact with my body "flipped" several feet. These objects vibrate for a second or two before they take off.

I can't remember the fellow's name - he's now a physics prof, but years ago when he was a USAF enlisted man, a weather observer at Indian Springs AFB, so he claims, (outside but close to Area 51,) he met "tall whites" from a UFO base there. I'm not assigning any credibility rating to his story, however, what was interesting is his assertion that the "tall whites" revealed a hint about their gravity propulsion: They circulate "subatomic particles" in tubular guides to create thrust.

As I mentioned in a previous email here, I have an untested idea that circulating positive and negative ions in a partitioned circular duct at high speed could create a huge magnetic field.

One wonders \*if\* subatomic particles could be caused to stay in existence for a while, whether forcing one or some of them in a circular path might do something similar in creating a powerful gravitic field.

These thoughts come to mind when the "humming" and "feeling more than hearing" it are discussed.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe -

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:20:59 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:01:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe -

>From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron\\_510.nul](mailto:corycameron_510.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:20:34 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:39:07 -0400  
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

>>Source: Rocky Mountain News - Denver, Colorado, USA

>><http://tinyurl.com/odu5p>

>>June 17, 2006

>>It's Often Too Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe  
>>Linda Seebach  
>>Rocky Mountain News - Opinion

>>Michael Shermer, skeptic-in-chief, has a new book titled  
>>Science Friction: Where the Known Meets the Unknown, about all  
>>the ways in which people deceive themselves or allow themselves  
>>to be deceived by irrational beliefs.

>>"As pattern-seeking primates," he says in the introduction, "we  
>>scan the random points of light in the night sky of our lives  
>>and connect the dots to form constellations of meaning.  
>>Sometimes the patterns are real, sometimes not."

>><snip>

>>At least on the topics of UFOs and Cryptozoology I feel I don't  
>>have a willingness to believe in these things. As a matter-of-  
>>fact, I would be happy to find out these things didn't exist.

>>Human sightings and testimonials are one thing because they may  
>>be prone to falsehood but what happens when these cases are  
>>combined with photographs and film that are not touch ups and  
>>support the testimony of the eye-witnesses?

Of course. Then there's Occam's Razor, which I like to apply to  
the bulk of witness experiences. It's impossible to support the  
notion that everybody, everywhere is always wrong about what  
they experience and describe. Always?

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 22:23:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:05:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:35:09 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>As I read that paragraph he is saying that it can be regarded as  
>scientific on the basis of two things, the way its theories are  
>constructed and the way it deals with "empirical evidence".  
>You may disagree about the practice, but I can't find fault with  
>the statement of principle.

Well, I'm afraid I do find fault with it, Martin. Apart from the  
minor quibble about "empirical evidence" (what other kind of  
evidence is there?), I have serious difficulties with anyone who  
tries to present the scientific method as anything more, less,  
or other than pure empiricism.

>You say it makes no difference how theories are constructed. I  
>think it does. If it really didn't matter how they were  
>constructed they would not exist.

It makes no difference to the scientific character of a theory  
how it's constructed. However a theory is constructed, there'll  
always be a wholly unscientific theory which can be constructed  
in exactly the same way.

>Why go to the bother, if all that is necessary is the testing of  
>individual questions? Well the answer is in the question isn't  
>it. If you quantise the process into individual questions you  
>find you have to assume an infinite number of them, but you have  
>no idea what most of them are and no idea how one answer relates  
>to another. Worse than that, you have a presumption that none of  
>them do relate to one another. Ah, but that's a theory isn't  
>it? So we should test it, right?

That sounds to me like a very odd sort of theory, but if such a  
theory were to exist, I'd certainly agree that it ought to be  
tested.

>How do we do that? By proposing that A never varies as a  
>function of B etc., but what do you know, turns out it does, and  
>bingo, pretty soon we have a different class of theory - all  
>these information bits are related after all, and we find this  
>is actually a very useful kind of theory because it is  
>productive of new questions that weren't in existence even among  
>the infinite set of quantised questions we started out with (a  
>bit of a paradox there!).

As we apparently had no idea what most of the original questions  
were, I don't see how we can ascertain that our newly-discovered  
questions weren't in the original set ;-)

But I'm afraid I think this is all apropos of nothing in  
particular, Martin. Theories might be useful, powerful,  
productive and a great many other things, but in order to be  
scientific, they have to be testable. And the only  
characteristic which differentiates a scientific theory from an  
unscientific one is the property of being testable. Or do you  
disagree with this?

<snip>

>To deny that the construction of  
>the theory to be tested plays any part in the scientific process  
>seems to me to be negative, abstract, a rather scholastic and  
>anti-historical point of view.

Ok then, I'm just a negative, abstract, scholastic and anti-  
historical kinda gal I guess.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:39:42 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:07:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Tim

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:21:17 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 11:48:28 EDT  
>>Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>An actual quote from the program; "I may have been born a  
>>human, but I will die a Cyborg."

>A.I. Re-inventing the wheel. When the science of A.I. gets to  
>the end of that road, they will likely have recreated a  
>biological entity. We call them them humans beings. It's  
>difficult to say what some ETI would call them.

Oh, but it's a nice, new shiny wheel that will be able to do a  
lot more than we can. For instance, our silicon-based offspring,  
our intelligent mechanical great-great-grandchildren, will be  
able to make that long journey to the stars that we squishy  
little water bags will never accomplish. All they'd need to do  
is shut themselves off for a few hundred years, go into "sleep"  
mode, then click back on when they get where they're going.

Our clever little self-replicating Von Neumann machines will be  
able to fly off to distant planets, analyze the available  
resources, do some quick mining and manufacturing and create a  
happy little colony of their very own, specifically suited to  
the environment. And on and on, forever. They'll also have a  
shot at virtual immortality, which always eluded us meat  
puppets.

What would ETI call them? Probably "viruses", or "parasites".  
Maybe "world destroyers". And maybe our offspring will feel bad  
about that for a little while. But we will have programmed them  
to be curious and keep exploring, so unless another batch of  
more aggressive world destroyers hunts them down and kills them,  
they'll continue on. Survival of the fittest and all that. Maybe  
it would be a good idea to arm them with some kind of laser  
cannons or something when we send them out. You know, just in  
case. Never know what you might run into.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 19:20:08 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:24:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

>From: James Smith <[lunartravel.nul](mailto:lunartravel.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 12:21:04 -0400 (GMT-04:00)  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 20:48:05 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update>

<snip>

>I also went to alot of effort to translate these coordinates,  
>the aircraft coordinates and the aircraft camera  
>angle/magnification into 3D format to match the pattern of  
>lights seen in the FLIR video. They match very well allowing for  
>some variation in gas flare height, the one data set I don't  
>have.

I have asked for height data... but none has been provided.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Nielsen

From: **Rick Nielsen** <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 20:20:58 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:28:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Nielsen

Are there different observable flight characteristics between the different types of UFOs? Can the types of UFO's be classified by flight behaviors? In other words, do discs fly differently than cigars; do spheres fly different than triangles, and so on? Or do all UFOs fly the same?

Is there a credible classification of UFO's by shape, compared to corresponding flight characteristics?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 00:14:04 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:31:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Maccabee

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:56:25 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:31:38 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

snip

>As I understood you mentioned the following: Radar and oil field  
>flames. What does this tell me? A connection, a link.

>So here we go again but just to this specific issue that you  
>seem to be trying to link. When I said the radar was detecting  
>objects to the front and the right of the airplane it means  
>precisely in direction to the mainland. The Cantarel oil wells  
>zone is on the ocean, different direction.

The radar operator reported two detections: the first at 16:42  
was the radar target that the plane followed for about 10  
minutes heading northwestward and then had on radar for another  
5 minutes as the plane headed eastward while the radar target  
continued northwestward. This is the "radar TRUFO."

The second radar target was first mentioned about 18 minutes  
after the first one went beyond the radar range. This second  
target was at 1 o'clock (30 deg to the right) at 17 min, 15 sec  
into the video and over the next 10 minutes its direction  
rotated around from 1 o'clock to about 3 'clock. It's speed was  
given as abot 60 mph, which is the speed of a land vehicle on a  
road. IT could have been a vehicle on the ground. There is no  
way to determine its altitude, if any, above ground. But it was  
moving too slowly to be a fixed wing airplane. There was no FLIR  
light associated with this target (the FLIR operator looked for  
one and couldn't find it).

At the same time there was a FLIR light at 9 o'clock that was  
unrelated to the radar target. That light was many miles away.  
It could have been on the ground since the elevation angle was  
between 0 and -2 degrees. There was no radar contact associated  
with this light.

>Can you tell me what could have been the objects the radar was  
>detecting?

First radar target: TRUFO

Second radar target: could have been a ground vehicle

>Very simple. Besides we have the radar operator  
>statements during the interviews same that were published  
>extensively in May 2004 during our investigation. Have you read  
>them?

>I will just mention a short segment that I consider most  
>relevant but remember, he is a military trained radar operator

>officer.

Yes, but he is making the statement based on his memory of the events rather than based on the audio track of th video.

>Lieutenant German Ramirez Marin:

>Initially, only one target was detected by the RADAR. Then  
>another target appeared at one 'o clock, that's how we describe  
>the position that is in the front but slightly to our right. And  
>then a third one in back of the plane.

He correctly states the detection of the first radar target.

He leaves out the fact that there was about 18 minutes until there was the second radar target.

He leaves out the fact that there were no radar targets in the direction of the "family" of FLIR lights which were considered to be unidentified (but might have been oil fires) And he refers to "a third one in back of the plane".

Perhaps he is referring to the FLIR light behind the airplane.

The transcript I have of the audio, a transcript that includes your translation, does not explicitly mention detection of a radar target at the rear. If there was such a detection it might or might not have been associated with the last FLIR light, which was seen to the rear of the airplane.

>Our data information - most of all, the icons (blips), the  
>clusters - were always there on the screen, but the information  
>on their movements was heavily changing. Their speed changes  
>were sudden, 60 -120- 300 knots, according to the RADAR  
i>nformation.

He refers to "clusters" which suggests multiple radar targets at one time on the screen. There is nothing about multiple radar blips in the transcript.

There are clusters of FLIR lghts, however (twins and family and then the "triplets" and "family"). The changing speeds detected by radar apply to the detection of the first radar target which did seem to change speed abruptly and erratically.

>The same happened with their flight paths. The flying paths  
>showed first 90 degrees and suddenly 130 degrees in the RADAR  
>screen.

Don't know what the above refers to if it is not to the first radar target. Might be an erroneous recollection of the erratic flight of the radar TRUFO.

>This means that the target changed direction constantly at great  
>speed. There is no aircraft that can perform such direction  
>changes so quickly. (End)

I presume this refers to the first radar target, since the second target was reported as moving at speeds around 50-60 mph.

>As you can see these objects performed unusual movements and  
>changes not conventional and this element was one of the most  
>relevant in this investigation. And the objects were over the  
>mainland not the ocean. Do I need to be more specific?

According to the information I have as presented in the transcript at my web site, there was one radar target that made "unusual movements."

>This sterile discussion is going nowhere and still remains the  
>ignorance of the escence: The oil wells story was a hoax !! It  
>was revealed, proved and exposed long time ago with evidences  
>and the self-exposure of the hoaxer himself. It's a dead topic  
>and forgotten here in Mexico.

>The mystery of the C26A flight remains just like many other  
>unsolved mysteries in Ufology.

There are arguments pro and con relative to the oil fire explanation. Still awaiting data to prove one way or another.

Example: if we had "up close" FLIR data on the oil flames so that we could determine how much IR power such a flame emits, we could make an estimate of how bright a fire would appear after the radiation traveled over 100 mi along a slant path in the atmosphere (i.e., a calculation such as proposed by Rudiak).

But, better yet, would be video obtained as the plane flew from a location over the fires to a location along the track where the UFO video was obtained. This should be done during comparable weather conditions and at the same altitude.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Druffel

From: Ann Druffel <[Anndruffel.nul](mailto:Anndruffel.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 01:39:52 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:39:40 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Druffel

[Non Subscriber-Post]

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 07:23:14 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:30:17 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>I agree it's very frustrating. It's also complicated, because  
>>whereas the original Polaroids are in the control of Ann Druffel  
>>the high-res scans of them are in the control of Ed Kelson for  
>>continued use in his forthcoming second JSE paper. Kelson  
>>declined to share the scans; however Bob Wood did tell me that  
>>the original Polaroids are "in principle available for research  
>>under controlled conditions". That means checking that Bob Wood  
>>is speaking for Ann Druffel here and then going to California to  
>>study them under supervision. That might be possible for you,  
>>not for me.

>What I am suggesting is that she, or someone she trusts, take  
>them to my friend's lab in Boston. Sure, he could go to  
>California, but his lab couldn't. If I went to California, about  
>all I could accomplish is to look at them and say, "yep, them's  
>old Polaroid prints, you betcha!"

I wanted to explain again that Dr. Kelson is writing a second  
paper on his re-analysis of the Heflin photos, with expanded  
information on the enhancement results, besides those given in  
the 2000 JSE paper. A scientist has every right to keep his  
data to himself until he's finished his work, and this is all  
that Dr. Kelson is asking. (By the way, Dr. Kelson's first name  
is Eric, not Ed.)

When Bob Wood wrote you that "the original Polaroids are 'in  
principle available for research under controlled conditions'"  
he meant that after Dr. Kelson is finished with his second  
paper, the originals will be available to be viewed at my home.  
I promised Rex Heflin that I would preserve them for perpetuity  
for the use of the UFO community, so I could not let them out of  
my own archives, although they will be available for study, as  
Bob Wood says, under controlled conditions.

All best wishes,

Ann Druffel  
[anndruffel.nul](mailto:anndruffel.nul)  
[www.anndruffel.com](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 11:13:09 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 10:16:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update - Shough

>From: Santiago Yturria Garza <[syturria.nul](mailto:syturria.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 16:56:25 +0000  
>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:31:38 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: Mexican FLIR Footage Update

>>>I have no horse in this race, but in point of fact it  
>>>is possible that radar could detect oil field flames.  
>>>But I know nothing of the radar type or other essential  
>>>details of the case so won't comment further.

How much clearer could I be? This was a general correction FYI  
of a general mistake (remark that oil fires could not return  
radar echoes). Apparently I could have been even clearer and  
wondered whether it was a "language issue", so I repeated the  
assurance, reminding you that

>>Without prejudice to the question of what may or may not have  
>>been detected in this particular case,

my post was

>>limited only to commenting in general terms on your  
>>assertion that "to argue that radar can detect oil field flames  
>>would be nonsense", not on particular details of echo azimuths  
>>etc etc in this case, which as I said I haven't studied.

Now even that isn't clear enough?

>As I understood you mentioned the following: Radar and oil field  
>flames. What does this tell me? A connection, a link.  
>So here we go again but just to this specific issue that you  
>seem to be trying to link.

My conclusion now is that it is not a language issue, but a  
logic issue. Listers may see this failure to comprehend a simple  
distinction as going to the question of your judgment.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik [Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 08:38:26 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 19:34:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 07:23:14 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:30:17 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>I agree it's very frustrating. It's also complicated, because  
>>whereas the original Polaroids are in the control of Ann Druffel  
>>the high-res scans of them are in the control of Ed Kelson for  
>>continued use in his forthcoming second JSE paper. Kelson  
>>declined to share the scans; however Bob Wood did tell me that  
>>the original Polaroids are "in principle available for research  
>>under controlled conditions". That means checking that Bob Wood  
>>is speaking for Ann Druffel here and then going to California to  
>>study them under supervision. That might be possible for you,  
>>not for me.

>What I am suggesting is that she, or someone she trusts, take  
>them to my friend's lab in Boston. Sure, he could go to  
>California, but his lab couldn't. If I went to California, about  
>all I could accomplish is to look at them and say, "yep, them's  
>old Polaroid prints, you betcha!"

Hi Bob,

I've pointed out early on the need to conduct at least 2,000 dpi scans at 'true' 16 bit depth: One has to exceed what's present in order to manipulate it reliably. I've already offered Ann a place to do these scans without benefit to myself. I recently received 16 bit B&W scans at 5,000 dpi. The ability to do that was only recently established since I had tried only one year earlier to do the same from all the best manufacturers: When I asked the right types of questions I eventually received the proper responses from the technical staffing before inadvertently jumping to conclusions about actual vs real capabilities.

With 2,000+ dpi we could do much more with the sub crop of the object and assign more individual colors to a wider spread of gray scale present at 16 bit. 16 bit has the ability to detect (if present) at least 64,000 shades of gray. This is far superior to 8 bit which is only 256 shades of gray. To the human eye, both 8 bit and 16 bit scans would appear identical because of the limitations of human perception. But, in actuality, we could scale the greater numbers of shades, apt to be present, in the 16 bit. Obviously some scanners may achieve 10, 12, or 14 bit any of which would be better. And, with higher bit depth and resolution, we might be able to double or triple the practical capability of what we currently are able to perceive and manipulate.

In the JSE article it states that they used a 16 bit scanner and I've asked Ann to verify that. Often scanner companies report the capability of the reader but forget to tell customers that

the file is then analog to digitally converted to only 8 bit. The reason 16 bit B&W is not popular is for the simple reason that humans can't perceive more than 200 shades of gray in the most ideal situation on photographs, which I've already pointed out on an earlier post: Who would be able to correct the lies of manufacturers since most people can detect such subtleties anyway? It was a neat advertising ploy. To achieve 16 bit, the head probably has to be cryogenically cooled anyway.

Another problem with providing customers 16 bit B&W or Color capability is the tremendous file sizes required. This again makes it impractical to the average customer.

I believe that the strings I detect in two of the three photos would have a better chance of being presented or dismissed with a far superior bit depth and scan line resolution - both with the original and comparative test photos. Unfortunately, the cost of high dpi and 16 bit B&W scans is expensive.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark.nul](mailto:jkclark.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:27:39 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 19:43:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight - Clark

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 12:45:58 -0400  
>Subject: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>From: John Harney <[magonia.nul](mailto:magonia.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Sun, 18 Jun 2006 21:57:13 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 18:41:01 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: 'UFO Car' Beams Into Spotlight

>>Yes the US Air Force got it right where UFOs were concerned.  
>>It's no use trying to wriggle out of it; in this case the  
>>evidence points to the damage to the car being done either by  
>>Johnson or by someone else (with or without his knowledge).  
>>However, it is unlikely that all the relevant facts will ever  
>>become available.

>PJK recycled!

>Very well.

>In the interest of the preservation of law and order you should  
>write to the Chief of Police in Warren, Minnesota to tell him  
>that all evidence points toward Val Johnson (or someone else  
>known or unknown to him) as the cause of the damage to the  
>police car and that he should therefore be punished.

In order to "solve" UFO cases pelicanist-style, it always helps

(1) to have had no involvement whatever in the investigation  
(conducted in what anybody with any common sense - to borrow a  
phrase - would recognize as a thorough fashion by Allan Hendry  
[whom pelicanists, knowledgeable readers will note with  
amusement, customarily regard as the last word whenever he  
rendered a conclusion they want to hear] almost immediately  
after the incident's occurrence);

(2) to live an ocean away from the scene and the persons  
involved, therefore ensuring that no inconvenient reality  
interferes with the joy of airy speculation and character  
assassination;

(3) and, to of course, to possess a beak, wings, and the ability  
to squawk in convincingly avian fashion and to the satisfaction  
of fellow flock members, if to nobody else's.

I would say that this thread has been a waste of time and band-  
width, Bruce. You did a fine job, but it was, as is so often the  
case with these birds, utterly without point or purpose. One  
could as easily deflect the moon from its course via  
psychokinetic powers as to challenge a pelicanist's touching  
faith that all is safe and ordinary in the world Next time, just  
try to resist the temptation. I, of course, lay claim to no  
perfection in this regard, but I'm trying, too.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond -

From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron\\_510.nul](mailto:corycameron_510.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 11:26:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 19:06:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond -

>From: Ed Gehrman <[egehrman.nul](mailto:egehrman.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 09:59:47 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>>From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron\\_510.nul](mailto:corycameron_510.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:25:38 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:23:40 -0400  
>>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>>>Source: Barb Campbell's SPPRC Site - Saskatchewan, Canada

>>><http://www.ufo-connection.com/reports/database/2006/24.html>

>>>June 19 2006

>>>Strong Healthy Cow Mutilated Near Hillmond

>>>Date: 2nd or 3rd week of June, 2006

>>>Discovered: morning of June 16, 2006

>>>Time: unknown

>>>Location: near Hillmond (exact location withheld)

>>>-----

>>>Full report & many images at site

>>>-----

>>Seeing these pics this morning brought back to me some chilling  
>>memories from a few years ago,

>Hi Cory,

>Yes, for me also. I found a mutilated cow very similar to this  
>in early March of 2003, on our farm in Mountain Grove, Missouri.

>I had just arrived for a long visit and my Aunt complained that  
>the farm dog had been coming home covered with blood.

>I went looking for the source and found the gruesome scene about  
>a quarter-mile away but within sight of the farm house.

>Eventually seven other cows and two calves and the farm dog died  
>from still undetermined causes but only one cow was mutilated.

>The others died several days to three weeks after the mutilation  
>event.

>The farmer who rents the pasture thought it was from bacteria in  
>the new spring grass, or from a reaction to nitrogen that had

>been spread a few days before a spring snow. He and his sons  
>thought the mutilation marks were caused by possums.

Thanks Ed for sharing your story,

A little more than ten years ago - I was a teenager then and living with my parents on a country road bordered by several farms. My best friend at the time, one of my brothers and I discovered several gruesome scenes over a few days.

Four cattle had died of mysterious circumstances on one of these farms. I remember those days well because the farm animals were acting very very strangely that week.

When we came upon the first scene, it was of a young calf in the middle of the field. One of the ears had been removed along with a portion of the jaw - just as in many classic mutilations. A few hundred yards to the North-West of this calf was a full grown cow that had died earlier in the week, I was told by the farmer. We approached but could not make out many details as it was far too decomposed.

The next, at about 1.5 km distance, a pregnant cow had died during pregnancy. What makes this second scene rather odd was that both the newborn calf and cow had their jaw and rectum removed.

I've read that the first parts to decompose are the mouthes and rectums of animals due to the laying of fly larvae in those extremities. This may have been the cause but to me it looked rather like surgical precision.

In both of these cases, what sticks out in my mind were the strange actions of the animals in the vicinity of the dead cattle. In the first case I noticed that no cattle would come within the immediate area. They were keeping a distance of at least 30 metres or more away from the dead animals in all directions.

We became aware of the second scene with the mother cow and calf after seeing and hearing a herd of cattle bawling and circling something, presumably on the ground. We watched from my parents' driveway for about five minutes and decided to investigate.

The second scene was about half of a kilometre away and when we got to within a short distance of the herd, we saw they were circling a couple of dead cattle.

What happened next is straight out of the 'Twilight Zone'.

We got to within maybe a few hundred feet of the herd when they suddenly became aware of our presence. And they charged towards us! Coming at us were around 20-25 cattle. We ran towards a nearby thick brush/treeline for protection. Had it not been for my brother Chris' insistence on bringing his shepherd/collie mix dog named 'Laila' with us, I'm not sure I would be here writing this down right now. When the dog saw the cattle running towards us she took off in their direction, herding the cattle by running a staright line back and forth. After several minutes of this, the cattle 'calmed down' and left.

We approached the dead animal and got to examine it.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**





# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 19:11:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:21:19 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 09:36:53 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>Brief update: I have established that the Ed Riddle identified  
>>>is indeed the same guy and I am in correspondence with him.  
>>>He has already offered two quite interesting additions to his  
>>>story which I will pass on to the list ASAP.

>>Hi Martin, Dave,

>>I can't see the comparison matching the Heflin photos matching a  
>>model train wheel. The flange on the model is shorter than that  
>>in evidence in the photos.

>>Mark Cashman also did analysis of the Heflin photos. His site is  
>>still up and running.

>>See: <http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/report/650803.htm>

>>His site shows the three photos together in a panarama from  
>>scans.

Hi Don,

>The train wheel photos posted by John Scheldroup and Kyle King  
>do not resemble the Heflin object, just as you say. The cross  
>section drawing found by John is closer, though proportions  
>still appear to be different by a few percent. More importantly  
>there is no apparent evidence on the Heflin photos of the "hub"  
>claimed by Scheldroup (on the basis of a digital artefact).

Since there's the presence of an off axis protrusions, as I've  
already pointed out, this cannot be dismissed so lightly. Train  
wheels have off axis protrusion... this is what allows them  
to be rotated with the proper engine torque. I believe David  
noticed this already too but hadn't tied it to the possibility  
of a train wheel.

>But I suppose there are many different types of model train  
>wheels in different scales and styles from different  
>manufacturers, not to mention that some enthusiasts turn their  
>own wheels etc on lathes and maybe engineering tolerances vary  
>for different track gauges and patterns - some hobbyists  
>probably even make their own track as well. The chances seem to  
>me to be remote of proving that there are no toy train wheels  
>out there identical in proportion to the Heflin object.

As I pointed out already, Black filmed Heflin's trains in the 1968 video. This is a good point at which to pick up the trail of evidence. This is also suggestive that Heflin had such parts available. The shape is adequate to formulate a counter hypotheses (the weight and attachment point might also infer this design/see below). The fact that earlier investigators had not presented such scenarios to Heflin is unfortunate. Not likng the messenger has no place in real investigative work.

>But the point is that Kyle and his anonymous sponsor have been  
>urging us to forego futile analysis of the images and just hunt  
>down the exact same train wheel, so this can be photographed to  
>test their case that the Heflin photos are identical. And why is  
>this method to be preferred? Because measurements of the Heflin  
>images have unreliably large error bars due to problems of  
>digital resolution, motion/focus blur, exposure saturation etc.  
>There is some truth in this, but it begs the question: How will  
>we know it's the exact same train wheel? By comparing physical  
>meausurements of the train wheel with the Heflin images? Well  
>no, because these images are said to be too poor to measure  
>reliably. So the method would be to collect a whole bunch of  
>train wheels and photograph them all in different conditions  
>until we get a result from one of them that looks like the  
>Heflin images.

>Unfortunately this is not a scientific test of the hypothesis  
>that Heflin photographed a train wheel. It would be (if it were  
>to succeed) a demonstration that it is possible to simulate the  
>Heflin object by controlling the appropriate co-variables of  
>object shape, objec size, object composition, object texture,  
>lens distance, focus distance, sky brightness etc. This would  
>tell us no more than we already know right now: - Based solely  
>on optical evidence, they could be fakes.

Since, I was the one that pointed out the need for such tests (see below), the only thing you can do is Compare and Correct the current images for distortion before proceeding to measurement. Doing that reliably is hard work and requires an understanding of the variables at play. As an example: Martin was using strings far away telephone poles to infer resolution of strings at close proximity to the camera. Others were using digital cameras. This shows a complete lack of understanding of the depth of field, focus space, film saturation, film speed, lens characteristics, and the need to use the actual camera and film... all of which I had pointed out. Now he's making it appear that this is all mapped out and reinventing himself again... in the process... slowly turning over and rolling... this has been one of the more entertaining aspects of this case and is a marvelous example of human behavior in a cornered box.

>Now if further digital analysis finds evidence of support  
>strings then maybe the train wheel is in business and we could  
>start to assemble a case. (I think there are a couple of  
>unconvincing hints of possible linear features on the JSE images  
>as I pointed out long ago, but these wait to be confirmed or  
>eliminated on the originals or very high-res full-image scans)  
>Or if Viktor's tests with a 101 and fine support lines show that  
>they ought to show up where they don't, then we'd maybe have a  
>different kind of case. But in either case the hunt to produce  
>identical images of train wheels would have a very secondary  
>role, and even if successful could not be probative on its own.

Martin knows I detected what appear to be strings supporting the object in two of the photos and didn't know about one particular structure before hand . . . except for one of them: This is nothing new since others had detected that one too, so don't be fooled ... his comments are being opportunistically and conveniently dropped here... as though he has all the leads mapped out. As I pointed out long ago - two strings at a vetex pont may be supporting the object or an object supported on a clothesline . . . a loop with a string through it ... perhaps one of the strings went limp (coiled up depending on the composition) on one side of the object, creating what appearances looks like trailing smoke... who knows? If you weren't looking for two strings, you could easily overlook that aspect too... Since train wheels have been presented... this has to be one of the scenariois tested and is probative because of it's relevance.

This is not mysterious nor difficult to do...

Anyone can do this with the originals, but you have to be willing to engage in such activity. The hard part is making it convincing to people that may not have the time to do this... too make it believable in a step by step process absent all the learned activity... make the foreign seem less intimidating.

The weight of the object and how it's attached can have a bearing on pro and con evidential review of the facts and on use of a train wheel. The attachment means may also infer the design of the object (train wheel). The fact that Heflin had a Radio also implies that he had an antenna wire available as a possible attachment point. All of which may or may not have already been investigated.

The fact that the UFO is not in focus has been one of the mysteries as compared with the surrounding... though this can easily be explained without resorting to advanced characteristics of the UFO:

If the object was placed outside the focus enveloped (close enough to the camera), as I've already pointed out... this has just as much merit as any other hypothesis and is the more likely. But, it must be ruled out first: This is the reason I bought the camera ... this is the only way to entertain the more complex interplay of variables... by narrowing them down and eliminating them! You can conjecture all you want... but the meat of this case is in experimentation.

If there's a consistency of evidence, then it builds a strong signal on which to formulate convincing evidence along each competing pathway. We have to pursue both of them using a single solitary object (the camera). This is the unifying ingredient.

But, we currently have two scenarios:

One places the object at Close range and the other is at a Much farther range.

Therefore, given this WIDE disparity in the real world perhaps it is within the means of photographic evidence to DECOUPLE these two scenarios with actual tests: confirming one or the other possibility.

Currently, so to speak, they're fused within a single plane on the film. Separating out these two extremes seems a reasonable possibility to pursue and within the scope of possibilities given the camera and film set.

The 3D stereo already hints of a near by object... and, at the same time, suggests the improbability of him aligning up such coincidences with a far away moving object (one of my first posts). The blur can also imply close proximity to the lens as I've already pointed out on my first few postings. If strings can be detected (see above) this is also consistent with an object at close proximity. If we can see strings in two of the photographs that's also of interest. If the support means looks similar in both photographs, that also has interest level.

In any case, these two extremes are is what had drawn me into this case in the first place:

Therefore, this case has a tremendous side benefit and is not a waste of time in either direction: this is the attraction. Can methodology be honed and convincingly communicated by proof through example with the support of calculations. If it passes muster, all the better for Heflin. If not, all the better for methodology. I'm just willing to go that extra step to see what emerges... to see if a real proof emerges.

We also have to be able to express and pursue evidence without fear or ridicule. The train wheel is not a bad proposal given what has so far emerged. So, why rule out anything at this point.

Viktor Golubik

BTW - Please let it be known that I have two cameras and had already offered one of them to both David and Martin early on.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Karl Pflock Revisted

From: Don Ecker <[decker0726.nul](mailto:decker0726.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 10:27:09 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 19:14:42 -0400  
Subject: Karl Pflock Revisted

The untimely demise of Karl Pflock on June 5, 2006 caused me to recall my relationship with Karl back in the early 1990s, at the height of the Roswell hysteria then jamming the UFO airwaves.

In July of 1993, I invited Karl to appear on my weekly radio show UFOs Tonite! to answer a lot of questions. A central one:

Did Karl's background in the CIA or as an Asst. Secretary of Defense impact on his UFO interest and research? During the Show Karl appeared to answer all the questions in a very straightforward manner. We took calls from the listeners, and toward the end of the program we received one very surprising call from Bill Cooper masquerading as "John" from Atlanta, Ga.

When I figured out the caller was Cooper, I said something that - even with time delay - made it out to the airwaves.

<VBG> It caused Cooper to try to burn up the station's FAX machine and got me in 'Dutch' with station management!

All in all, a very memorable evening.

I invite you all to go to:

<http://www.darkmattersradio.com>

and listen to this show and the others that are up there. We are producing new interviews that will be placed up on the site weekly. Thanks for your ear!

Don Ecker

[www.UFOMAG.com](http://www.UFOMAG.com)  
[www.PastSins.Net](http://www.PastSins.Net)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:10:34 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 19:17:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Kasten

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:39:42 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

<snip>

>Oh, but it's a nice, new shiny wheel that will be able to do a  
>lot more than we can. For instance, our silicon-based offspring,  
>our intelligent mechanical great-great-grandchildren, will be  
>able to make that long journey to the stars that we squishy  
>little water bags will never accomplish. All they'd need to do  
>is shut themselves off for a few hundred years, go into "sleep"  
>mode, then click back on when they get where they're going.

>Our clever little self-replicating Von Neumann machines will be  
>able to fly off to distant planets, analyze the available  
>resources, do some quick mining and manufacturing and create a  
>happy little colony of their very own, specifically suited to  
>the environment. And on and on, forever. They'll also have a  
>shot at virtual immortality, which always eluded us meat  
>puppets.

>What would ETI call them? Probably "viruses", or "parasites".  
>Maybe "world destroyers". And maybe our offspring will feel bad  
>about that for a little while. But we will have programmed them  
>to be curious and keep exploring, so unless another batch of  
>more aggressive world destroyers hunts them down and kills them,  
>they'll continue on. Survival of the fittest and all that. Maybe  
>it would be a good idea to arm them with some kind of laser  
>cannons or something when we send them out. You know, just in  
>case. Never know what you might run into.

Tim:

Normally, I think it is a waste of band width to comment on  
someone's message. But, I find your writing style fun to read  
and your messages interesting. In my opinion, not the usual  
droning on.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 23:40:37 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:21:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 22:23:38 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 15:35:09 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>As I read that paragraph he is saying that it can be regarded as  
>>scientific on the basis of two things, the way its theories are  
>>constructed and the way it deals with "empirical evidence".  
>>You may disagree about the practice, but I can't find fault with  
>>the statement of principle.

>Well, I'm afraid I do find fault with it, Martin. Apart from the  
>minor quibble about "empirical evidence" (what other kind of  
>evidence is there?), I have serious difficulties with anyone who  
>tries to present the scientific method as anything more, less,  
>or other than pure empiricism.

>>You say it makes no difference how theories are constructed. I  
>>think it does. If it really didn't matter how they were  
>>constructed they would not exist.

>It makes no difference to the scientific character of a theory  
>how it's constructed. However a theory is constructed, there'll  
>always be a wholly unscientific theory which can be constructed  
>in exactly the same way.

But what is an "unscientific theory"? I think the only thing you  
can mean, according to your own definitions, is that an  
unscientific theory is a theory which fails to produce testable  
predictions. But when do we know that a theory is incapable of  
producing a testable prediction? Do we give the theorist a week?  
A month? Can we rigorously sort the ideas that scientists have  
into scientific and unscientific by this criterion? I think this  
is really difficult.

People have a lot of ideas as part of the process of doing  
science and they are testing them all the time against one  
another and other peoples' ideas as well as experimental facts.  
You come up with a notion that you think might lead somewhere;  
you think about it some more and realise it has implication x,  
but then you realise that a whole class of ideas has implication  
x. Back to the drawing board. Your conjecture that this might  
lead to a falsifiable theory has been falsified. Have you been  
doing non-science?

It is not only perfectly possible, but absolutely necessary to  
the practice of science, that most ideas are sterile or wrong.  
That cannot make them part of a process which is unscientific,  
or else we demand that theorists must always be right if science  
is to exist. The method we call science is the process inclusive  
of the theories which lead somewhere and those which don't, and  
it isn't always the case that only right theories lead somewhere  
whilst wrong theories don't (think of Kepler for example). The  
wrong guesses are an essential part of finding what the right



guesses are.

Analogically it's a bit like QM itself: The measured trajectory represents a sum over all the possible trajectories that do not eventuate. The one which does eventuate is only determined in the act of measurement, but its likelihood depends on interference among all possible paths.

>>Why go to the bother, if all that is necessary is the testing of individual questions? Well the answer is in the question isn't it. If you quantise the process into individual questions you find you have to assume an infinite number of them, but you have no idea what most of them are and no idea how one answer relates to another. Worse than that, you have a presumption that none of them do relate to one another. Ah, but that's a theory isn't it? So we should test it, right?

>That sounds to me like a very odd sort of theory, but if such a theory were to exist, I'd certainly agree that it ought to be tested.

>>How do we do that? By proposing that A never varies as a function of B etc., but what do you know, turns out it does, and bingo, pretty soon we have a different class of theory - all these information bits are related after all, and we find this is actually a very useful kind of theory because it is productive of new questions that weren't in existence even among the infinite set of quantised questions we started out with (a bit of a paradox there!).

>As we apparently had no idea what most of the original questions were, I don't see how we can ascertain that our newly-discovered questions weren't in the original set ;-)

Well I did say it was paradoxical!

>But I'm afraid I think this is all apropos of nothing in particular, Martin. Theories might be useful, powerful, productive and a great many other things, but in order to be scientific, they have to be testable. And the only characteristic which differentiates a scientific theory from an unscientific one is the property of being testable. Or do you disagree with this?

I can't abstract the test event from reality in the way that you can. A process which does not include testing could not be scientific, of course; but neither could a bunch of tests without any predictions, and you need theories for that. The principle of the test has no meaning without the process in which it is embedded because it cannot lead by itself to any intelligible connection of ideas. And that is the essence of science IMO.

Not all scientific theories are testable in all their forms all the time and in every part, but they don't necessarily become unscientific because of it. To take the extreme example, cosmological theories tend these days to be very complex things, full of moving parts and interpretations and their direct points of contact with reality via test may sometimes be few, or very far off along some chain of inference that connects them with other theories. The situation often arises where all that can be done for a long time is to test one prospective theory against the predictions of other theories that are regarded as more solidly grounded. Does that mean science isn't going on? When they are worked out and some testable implication is finally extracted, is science suddenly starting again? What was happening in the meantime? Much of the work of refining theories seems to be done in this limbo. Sometimes the labour starts to look disproportionate to the likely result, and people working on more tractable problems can criticise. But by sticking at it they do get somewhere. Then incredibly complex and expensive and time-consuming processes of observation are designed and built. Why? Because they have confidence in the theory-building process.

Science isn't constructed just from experimental facts (it never was; nature had to invent ideas before she could invent the concept of knowledge). It's constructed from complexes of densely theory-related observations and principles that are granted the status of facts in science. These meta-facts are what mostly constitute the "body of knowledge", not the

botanical lists of pressure differentials and acceleration rates or whatever that end up in the tables in the back of reference books. Theories are tested for consistency against these meta-facts and through them make indirect contact with nature before ever being tested in direct physical experiment, and this is part of how successful new theories can emerge, in competition largely with one another.

Junk this very refined socio-historical process, and you are reduced to randomly sticking a pin in your list of theories - oh, except that you don't have any theories to list in the first place. :-)

Martin

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 16:38:43 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:22:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 13:09:25 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 07:01:31 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>So the next step is to determine What standard or standards you  
>>would recommend in determining that flying saucers are ET in  
>>origin? Considering that even so-called scientific "laws" may,  
>>in the end, turn out to be fallible and yet high-level theories  
>>only, which standard would you accept?

>I'm not looking to determine that "flying saucers are ET in  
>origin." I'm looking to determine the truth about the about  
>their nature and origin, whatever that may be. You're starting  
>off with a 'given' (flying saucers are ET in origin") and  
>looking to prove your 'given.' That's the whole problem!

<snip>

>Maybe not 'try to prove a solution' (as you are prone to do)  
>but 'eliminate solutions based on scientific research and  
>fact'?

>But then again, my "logic" is hard to follow!

Thanks Eugene! I think I understand you now.

I understand science this way: First, you observe something.  
Then you make a theory about why it happens. Then you test that  
theory for validity. If the theory seems to hold, you draw a  
conclusion and publish it. If it doesn't hold, you make another  
theory and test it.

If I understand your "hard to follow" logic correctly, you're  
looking for answers by not using science. Is that correct?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 06:15:09 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:26:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Shell

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 08:38:26 EDT  
>Subject: The Truth About Heflin

>I've pointed out early on the need to conduct at least 2,000 dpi  
>scans at 'true' 16 bit depth: One has to exceed what's present  
>in order to manipulate it reliably. I've already offered Ann a  
>place to do these scans without benefit to myself. I recently  
>received 16 bit B&W scans at 5,000 dpi. The ability to do that  
>was only recently established since I had tried only one year  
>earlier to do the same from all the best manufacturers: When I  
>asked the right types of questions I eventually received the  
>proper responses from the technical staffing before  
>inadvertently jumping to conclusions about actual vs real  
>capabilities.

There are scanners and then there are scanners. Consumer  
scanners fall into one category, professional scanners into  
another. Consumer scanners generally for \$ 1,000 or less.  
Professional scanners can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.  
When I was running Shutterbug magazine, our in-house scanner was  
a professional drum scanner that cost us around \$ 100,000.  
Needless to say, the companies that make those scanners could  
not sell them if they weren't dramatically better.

>With 2,000+ dpi we could do much more with the sub crop of the  
>object and assign more individual colors to a wider spread of  
>gray scale present at 16 bit. 16 bit has the ability to detect  
>(if present) at least 64,000 shades of gray. This is far  
>superior to 8 bit which is only 256 shades of gray. To the human  
>eye, both 8 bit and 16 bit scans would appear identical because  
>of the limitations of human perception. But, in actuality, we  
>could scale the greater numbers of shades, apt to be present, in  
>the 16 bit. Obviously some scanners may achieve 10, 12, or 14  
>bit any of which would be better. And, with higher bit depth and  
>resolution, we might be able to double or triple the practical  
>capability of what we currently are able to perceive and  
>manipulate.

Absolutely. Scanning at 32 bit depth is not unknown, either. The  
point is that a digital scanner must convert a continuous  
gradient into steps. 256 in the case of 8 bit, as you say, but  
millions of steps in the case of 16 and 32 bit.

>In the JSE article it states that they used a 16 bit scanner and  
>I've asked Ann to verify that. Often scanner companies report  
>the capability of the reader but forget to tell customers that  
>the file is then analog to digitally converted to only 8 bit.  
>The reason 16 bit B&W is not popular is for the simple reason  
>that humans can't perceive more than 200 shades of gray in the  
>most ideal situation on photographs, which I've already pointed  
>out on an earlier post: Who would be able to correct the lies of  
>manufacturers since most people can detect such subtleties  
>anyway? It was a neat advertising ploy. To achieve 16 bit, the  
>head probably has to be cryogenically cooled anyway.

There you go with those 200 shades of gray again! ;-) Obviously,  
I disagree about that. The real reason that 16 bit scans were

not popular is that until recently Photoshop and most other image editing applications could only handle 8 bit. Photoshop has recently been upgraded to handle 16 bit, as have other imaging applications, and demand for 16 bit scanners and cameras is now increasing as a result.

But more importantly, any technical paper like that from JSE should give more information. Brand and model number of scanner and the name and version number of the software driver should be stated. It wouldn't hurt to know the driver settings, as well.

>Another problem with providing customers 16 bit B&W or Color >capability is the tremendous file sizes required. This again >makes it impractical to the average customer.

Again, the difference between amateur and professional. I often work with very large files. I suspect most people have a hard drive holding 60 GB or so as their total storage. My computer has a 60 GB hard drive in it, but I have five 300 GB external drives, and they're getting full so I need to add more. I know professionals in the imaging business who have more than ten times the storage that I have. If we are to be serious about studying images in UFO research, we must deal with professional-level tools.

>I believe that the strings I detect in two of the three photos >would have a better chance of being presented or dismissed with >a far superior bit depth and scan line resolution - both with >the original and comparative test photos. Unfortunately, the >cost of high dpi and 16 bit B&W scans is expensive.

Agreed. It's time to cut the crap and get some good scans to look at. Until then, we're just spinning our wheels in the mud.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## We're Just Following Orders

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:43:20 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:43:20 -0400  
Subject: We're Just Following Orders

Source: Black Press Group - Surrey, British Columbia, Canada

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/hug4>

Jun 21 2006

A weekly roundup of newsbites from the "truth is stranger than fiction" department.  
By Andreas Ohrt

"We're Just Following Orders"

Alien abductee researcher Preston Dennet has compiled a list of things that aliens sometimes say to their abductees.

Dennett admits that face-to-face encounters with aliens are by far the rarest type of UFO experience, and extraterrestrials are very reluctant to talk to their abductees.

However, in 20 years of research he has found a handful of cases where aliens have actually spoken.

Generally, he says, aliens don't speak, and when they do speak, they often repeat themselves, saying the same few phrases to all of their abductees.

Here then, are some of the top alien phrases:

"Do not be afraid, we won't hurt you"

"You won't remember this"

"We need babies" "our emotions are different than yours"

"We are from a place you don't know about yet"

"We've been here a long, long time"

and

"It is very important we do this"

(Llewellyn Journal)

[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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:49:56 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:49:56 -0400  
Subject: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site -  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

<http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

15 June 2006

[Several images at site]

Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake  
by Dirk Vander Ploeg

Received a very interesting report from Piotr Cielebias of the NOL-Eastern European UFO Journal, concerning a sighting by retired Lt. Col. Robert G. The following is my adaptation of the original report from the Lt. Colonel and his photographs.

Name: Lt. Col. Robert G. retired (last name withheld at the request of the witness)  
Place: Zywieckie Lake, Wojewodztwo Slaskie, Poland  
Date: May 22, 2006

It had been a beautiful bright day and now in the early evening Robert decided to give in to his passion of fishing. So he and his son Maciek gathered the rods and supplies and left for their favorite spot on Lake Zywieckie. The lake was nearby and they arrived at 7:20 pm.

He had retired from the military as a Lt. Colonel some time ago and became a passionate fisherman. He considered himself to be 'even keeled' and straight-headed, not prone to panic, over reaction or flights of fantasy. Robert enjoyed his family and friends and was at a great point in his life. All of this was to change and he would never be the same again.

Good God, Aliens don't exist!

After settling down to fish, Robert unexpectedly decided to experiment with the new digital camera Maciek had received as a gift from his parents for his first communion. He reached into his bag of supplies and took out the camera, then both he and his son began walking along the shore of the lake looking for things to photograph.

Maciek suddenly stopped and asked his father, "Did you hear that?" He admitted to himself: it was very strange sound indeed. It was high pitched, something like a whistle, and not very loud. They followed the sound making their way between shrubs and after traveling only a few meters come to a small beach. There before them was the source of the sound and Robert was stunned!

A huge shining disk, suspended in mid-air, hung over the lake.

It reminded him of a flying saucer typically seen on TV.

His first reaction was to run to get away... to escape. He never gave a thought to their fishing equipment or supplies. Grabbing Maciek's hand they began to leave when his son screamed, "Dad, Stop! It is an UFO."

Robert was scared, disorientated, shivers ran down spine and he was covered in cold sweat. He couldn't breathe. He head felt empty and his brain wouldn't function. His heart was pounding madly and he realized he had to calm down, take control. Out of the corner of his eye he noticed the object moving slowly, spinning on its axis like a toy top.

Maciek turned the camera on and asked his father to take a photo. Taking the camera from his son he centered the view finder on the craft and clicked the shutter as it moved slowly to his right. "We'll show Mom," his son exclaimed.

Trance-like, the father, continued to take photos. The world was gone - only the object remained. The flying saucer had stopped maneuvering and was swinging side to side, its movements reminding Robert of a leaf floating in the air. A thought now crossed Robert's confused mind: Good God, Aliens don't exist! Just then the craft vanished. Robert hurriedly searched the sky, but there was no sign of the craft.

It was then, only then, after the craft had disappeared that Robert discovered he had wandered in the water taking pictures. He noticed people on the opposite bank and wanted to call to them... but didn't. He knew how people reacted to stories of UFOs and didn't want to become the brunt of one their jokes.

Looking at the camera he was amazed to discover that the camera's memory was completely filled and realized he had continued taking photos of the lake and the sky long after the craft had gone. He didn't actually remember taking the shots, just knew that he did.

Mentally exhausted he sat down on a tree trunk with his son and asked, "Maciek, what was it?" Gesturing with his arms to describe the object he replied, "UFO, I just said it! Let's quickly go home and tell Mom about it." We packed up the poles and gear and went home.

Maciek described the entire experience to his mother, giving her all the details. Robert, camera in hand, walked down to a friend's house that had a computer and could download the photos. Robert was happy that his friend and neighbor was so understanding. He asked if he had actually witnessed the object and then Robert told him the entire story. His friend stated that some people took this phenomenon seriously and suggested that he contact someone familiar with the subject. But, first he had to write down his recollections of the event and it is these that allow me to write his story.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 08:46:30 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 05:02:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Shell

>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:10:34 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:39:42 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>Normally, I think it is a waste of band width to comment on  
>someone's message. But, I find your writing style fun to read  
>and your messages interesting. In my opinion, not the usual  
>droning on.

I agree 100%. My only criticism of this List is that some people who post here seem to really like to listen to themselves talk. As you say, they drone on and on, sometimes eventually making a point, sometimes not. When I first started writing professionally I had good editors who always said, "boil it down!" Don't use ten words when it can be said just as well in three. You will note that my posts here are usually only a few paragraphs at most. I feel like many posters must have learned to write from old Russian novelists!

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [ufoupdateslist.com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## UFO Research: Findings Vs. Facts

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 05:06:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 05:06:35 -0400  
Subject: UFO Research: Findings Vs. Facts

Source: Space.Com - New York, NY, USA

[http://www.space.com/news/060622\\_alien\\_encounters.html](http://www.space.com/news/060622_alien_encounters.html)

22 June 2006

UFO Research: Findings Vs. Facts  
By Leonard David  
Senior Space Writer

For decades now, eyes and sky have met to witness the buzzing of our world by Unidentified Flying Objects, termed UFOs or simply flying saucers. Extraterrestrials have come a long way to purportedly share the friendly skies with us.

UFOs and alien visitors are part of our culture - far-out phenomenon when judged against those "low life" wonders Bigfoot and the Loch Ness monster.

And after all those years, as the saying goes, UFOs remain a riddle inside a mystery wrapped in an enigma. Why so? For one, the field is fraught with hucksterism. It's also replete with blurry photos and awful video. But then there are also well-intentioned and puzzled witnesses [See Top 10 Alien Encounters Debunked].

Scientifically speaking, are UFOs worth keeping an eye on?

Unusual properties

There have been advances in the field of UFO research, said Ted Roe, Executive Director of the National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena (NARCAP), based in Vallejo, California.

"The capture of optical spectra from mobile, unpredictable luminosities is one of those innovations. More work to be done here but [there are] some good results already."

NARCAP was established in 2000 and is dedicated to the advancement of aviation safety issues as they apply to, what they term Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP).

Roe said that a decade from now, researchers should have even better instrumentation at their disposal and better data on UAP of several varieties. His forecast is that scientific rigor will prevail, demonstrating that there are "stable, mobile, unusual, poorly documented phenomena with quite unusual properties manifesting within our atmosphere," he told SPACE.com.

Paradigm shifting

NARCAP has made the case that some of these phenomena have unusual electromagnetic properties. Therefore, they could disrupt microprocessors and adversely affect avionics systems, Roe explained, and that for those reasons and others UAP should

be considered a hazard to safe aviation.

"It is likely that either conclusion will fly in the face of the general assertion that UAP are not real and that there are no undocumented phenomena in our atmosphere," Roe continued. That should open the door, he said, to the realization that there's no good reason to discard outright the possibility that extraterrestrial visitation has occurred and may be occurring.

"Physics is leading to new and potentially paradigm shifting understandings about the nature of our universe and its physical properties," Roe said. "These understandings may point the way towards an acceptance of the probability of interstellar travel and communication by spacefaring races."

Sacred cows to the slaughter

As UFO debunker Robert Sheaffer's web site proclaims, he's "skeptical to the max." He is a fellow of the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal and a well-known writer on the UFO scene.

Being an equal-opportunity debunker, Sheaffer notes that he refutes whatever nonsense, in his judgment, "stands in the greatest need of refuting, no matter from what source it may come, no matter how privileged, esteemed, or sacrosanct - sacred cows, after all, make the best hamburger."

Sheaffer told SPACE.com, in regards to the cottage industry of UFO promoters, there's a reason there are still so many snake-oil sellers.

"It's because nobody, anywhere, has any actual facts concerning alleged UFOs, just claims. That allows con-men to thrive peddling their yarns," Sheaffer said. "UFO believers are convinced that the existence of UFOs will be revealed 'any day now'. But it's like Charlie Brown and the football: No matter how many times Lucy pulls the football away - or the promised 'disclosure' fails to happen - they're dead-certain that the next time will be their moment of glory."

Trash from the past

"I would have to say that we're stuck in neutral," said Kevin Randle, a leading expert and writer on UFOs and is known as a dogged researcher of the phenomena. There's no real new research, he said, and that's "because we have to revisit the trash of the past."

Randle points to yesteryear stories, one stretching back in time to a supposed 1897 airship crash in Aurora, Texas, long proven to be a hoax by two con men - yet continues to surface in UFO circles.

Then there's the celebrated Thomas Mantell saga, a pilot that lost his life chasing a UFO in 1948. There are those that contend he was killed by a blue beam from a UFO, Randle said "even though we have known for years that the UFO was a balloon and he violated regulations by climbing above 14,000 feet without oxygen equipment. I mean, we know this, and yet there are those who believe that Mantell was killed by aliens."

Randle's advice is to the point: "We need to begin to apply rigorous standards of research - stop accepting what we wish to believe even when the evidence is poor, and begin thinking ahead."

Paucity of physical evidence

"I've no doubt that UFOs are here to stay," said Seth Shostak, Senior Astronomer at the SETI Institute in Mountain View, California. "I'm just not convinced that alien craft are here to stay - or for that matter, even here for brief visits."

"First, despite a torrent of sightings for more than a half-century, I can't think of a single, major science museum that has alien artifacts on display," Shostak said. "Contrast this paucity of physical evidence with what the American Indians could have shown you fifty years after Christopher Columbus first violated their sea-space. They could have shown you all sorts of stuff - including lots of smallpox-infested brethren - s

proof that they were being 'visited,'" he said.

When it comes to extraterrestrial visitors in the 21st century, the evidence is anecdotal, ambiguous, or, in some cases, artifice, Shostak suggested.

Calling it "argument from ignorance", Shostak pointed to the claim that aliens must have careened out of control above the New Mexico desert simply because some classified government documents sport a bunch of blacked-out text. "How does the latter prove the former?"

Sure, the missing verbiage is consistent with a government cover-up of an alien crash landing, Shostak said. "But it's also consistent with an infinitude of other scenarios - not all of them involving sloppy alien pilots," he added.

Shostak said that it is not impossible that we could be visited. It doesn't violate physics to travel between the stars, although that's not easy to do.

"But really, if you're going to claim - or for that matter, believe - that extraterrestrials are strafing the cities, or occasionally assaulting the neighbors with an aggression inappropriate for a first date, then I urge you to find evidence that leaves little doubt among the professionally skeptical community known as the world of science."

Residue of sightings

Why is there precious little to show that world of science that UFOs merit attention?

"Obviously there is not a simple answer, but part of it is reluctance of the scientific community to support such research," explained Bruce Maccabee, regarded as a meticulous researcher and an optical physicist using those talents to study photographs and video of unexplained phenomena.

Why this reluctance?

"In my humble opinion it is largely a result of 'tradition' - tradition set by the U.S. Air Force in the early years when they publicly stated that everything was under control, they were investigating - and finding nothing that couldn't be explained," Maccabee said.

Nevertheless, Maccabee observed, work on the phenomenon will carry on.

"UFO studies will continue until all the old cases have either been explained or admitted to being unexplainable - meaning a residue of sightings that could be ET related - and/or until people stop seeing unexplainable UFO-like events throughout the world," Maccabee concluded.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 12:32:03 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 05:07:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Dickenson

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 23:40:37 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

<snip>

>But what is an "unscientific theory"? I think the only thing you  
>can mean, according to your own definitions, is that an  
>unscientific theory is a theory which fails to produce testable  
>predictions. But when do we know that a theory is incapable of  
>producing a testable prediction? Do we give the theorist a week?  
>A month? Can we rigorously sort the ideas that scientists have  
>into scientific and unscientific by this criterion? I think this  
>is really difficult.

<snip>

Hi Martin,

Don't know if this might help - a definition a pal used to quote  
at me -

"Before it was possible to sample the Moon's surface it would  
not have been 'scientific' to say the Moon was made of green  
cheese. Now it is - because we can check."

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 08:27:26 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 05:08:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 06:15:09 -0400  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 08:38:26 EDT  
>>Subject: The Truth About Heflin

>>I've pointed out early on the need to conduct at least 2,000 dpi  
>>scans at 'true' 16 bit depth: One has to exceed what's present  
>>in order to manipulate it reliably. I've already offered Ann a  
>>place to do these scans without benefit to myself. I recently  
>>received 16 bit B&W scans at 5,000 dpi. The ability to do that  
>>was only recently established since I had tried only one year  
>>earlier to do the same from all the best manufacturers: When I  
>>asked the right types of questions I eventually received the  
>>proper responses from the technical staffing before  
>>inadvertently jumping to conclusions about actual vs real  
>>capabilities.

>There are scanners and then there are scanners. Consumer  
>scanners fall into one category, professional scanners into  
>another. Consumer scanners generally for \$ 1,000 or less.  
>Professional scanners can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.  
>When I was running Shutterbug magazine, our in-house scanner was  
>a professional drum scanner that cost us around \$ 100,000.  
>Needless to say, the companies that make those scanners could  
>not sell them if they weren't dramatically better.  
Yes, when I had the Ramey Memo negatives scanned professionally  
for the first time the scanner was nearly \$250,000. I was just lucky  
to locate one near the archive. BTW, they really didn't scan them per  
my instructions, but then again, I wasn't paying for them.

>Absolutely. Scanning at 32 bit depth is not unknown, either. The  
>point is that a digital scanner must convert a continuous  
>gradient into steps. 256 in the case of 8 bit, as you say, but  
>millions of steps in the case of 16 and 32 bit.

Yes, I don't really think the weight of this has sunk in totally  
with others. When you know of what's possible, it's hard to  
settle for 300 dpi with probably 256 shades of gray... only 8  
bit.

>>In the JSE article it states that they used a 16 bit scanner and  
>>I've asked Ann to verify that. Often scanner companies report  
>>the capability of the reader but forget to tell customers that  
>>the file is then analog to digitally converted to only 8 bit.  
>>The reason 16 bit B&W is not popular is for the simple reason  
>>that humans can't perceive more than 200 shades of gray in the  
>>most ideal situation on photographs, which I've already pointed  
>>out on an earlier post: Who would be able to correct the lies of  
>>manufacturers since most people can detect such subtleties  
>>anyway? It was a neat advertising ploy. To achieve 16 bit, the  
>>head probably has to be cryogenically cooled anyway.

>There you go with those 200 shades of gray again! ;-) Obviously,



>I disagree about that. The real reason that 16 bit scans were  
>not popular is that until recently Photoshop and most other  
>image editing applications could only handle 8 bit. Photoshop  
>has recently been upgraded to handle 16 bit, as have other  
>imaging applications, and demand for 16 bit scanners and cameras  
>is now increasing as a result.

That's okay I'm not upset about it... I just had done my own  
tests and I can't get above 100 shades in some tests. Then, when  
I read this paper it was a reasonable conclusion under the  
arguments presented and under the cluster settings explored. Kind  
of explains why there's no real push for stuff above 256.

Yes, this is one of the other reasons I doubted the 16 bit in  
early 2,000 since 16 bit manipulation was only recently added  
perhaps two or three years now.

>But more importantly, any technical paper like that from JSE  
>should give more information. Brand and model number of scanner  
>and the name and version number of the software driver should be  
>stated. It wouldn't hurt to know the driver settings, as well.

Agreed!

>>Another problem with providing customers 16 bit B&W or Color  
>>capability is the tremendous file sizes required. This again  
>>makes it impractical to the average customer.

>Again, the difference between amateur and professional. I often  
>work with very large files. I suspect most people have a hard drive  
>holding 60 GB or so as their total storage. My computer has a  
>60 GB hard drive in it, but I have five 300 GB external drives, and  
>they're getting full so I need to add more. I know professionals in  
>the imaging business who have more than ten times the storage  
>that I have. If we are to be serious about studying images in UFO  
>research, we must deal with professional-level tools.

Yes! Also, what's nice about True 16 bit is the file size is  
actually smaller than the pseudo 24 bit composed of three sub 8  
bit color files. But still upwards of one Gig. In order to  
manipulate these files you also need some serious RAM too, not  
just storage space: I Gig or better.

>snip>

>Agreed. It's time to cut the crap and get some good scans to  
>look at. Until then, we're just spinning our wheels in the mud.

Yes, eager to hear back from Ann. I think this will only help  
their case if there's nothing to worry about. It's only natural  
that better technology is available... we don't have to throw  
accusations around too much at the earlier investigations  
either.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 08:34:20 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:14:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 18:22:57 -0700  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>Date: Sat, 17 Jun 2006 00:47:22 EDT  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Jun 2006 11:22:09 -0700  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

<snip>

>To resolve this discrepancy, I suggested that maybe the object  
>top, bottom, or both, were elliptical and the different ratios  
>of top to bottom were the result of different perspectives on a  
>noncircular object.

Yes, understood that but wasn't sure how extensive a variation  
there was and whether you were including other aspects of the  
object as adjunct to your point.

>However, I have just gone back and done a lot of ratio  
>calculations using the enlargements in the Druffel et. al. JSE  
>paper I get that the ratio of bottom "flange" to top "dome" for  
>photo #1 is 1.38 +/- .05; for photo #3 1.36 +/- .04, and for  
>photo #2 1.50 +/- .05. However, the ratio for #2 is dubious  
>because the lower part of the slightly flared "dome" is probably  
>partly obscured by the tilted bottom, artificially narrowing it  
>and resulting in an inflated ratio.

Yes, this is where I was getting confused since the perspective  
shift and cover may account for that alone: the top of the UFO  
is rotated away from the camera causing a slight distortion in  
perspective too and, like you said, more importantly hard to see  
that connecting edge between the top and bottom halves;  
Therefore, possibly two points for error, etc.

>The ratios of #1 and #3 are essentially the same within  
>measurement error, suggesting that the object could very well be  
>circular (both dome and flange) instead of elliptical. So now I  
>would say you couldn't rule out a train wheel \_on this basis  
>alone\_, because the object might very well be circular.

Yes, I agree.

>\_However\_, this brings me back to my original position that if  
>the object is indeed circular, then object #3's bottom flange is  
>slightly smaller (by at least 3%) than object #2, suggesting  
>that it is indeed further from the camera. In addition, since  
>the camera is about 5% closer to the van window in #3, this  
>means that if it were a nearby model it would actually have to  
>be at least 8% further away than the model in #2 (5% + 3%) to  
>account for both the difference in camera distance and observed  
>object size different.

Checking before completely responding here...

So, is what you're saying is that once you adjusted the images to match for the van window frame size the objects are 8% different in size? And, is this only with respect to the bottom flange? Did you adjust the image sizes based upon other aspects of the two as well?

>Thus, if a circular model, you can rule out a static position, >such as the model being attached to the window or suspended by a >nylon thread from the window. You would either need Heflin to >move the position of the model between shots #2 and #3, or have >a common suspension point (simpler hoax) and the size and >distance difference be the result of a swinging object.

Yes, I pointed this out also... no need to have two models either... static doesn't have to apply to either scenario.

>However, this raised another conundrum, namely that the >elevation angle of the object in #2 and #3 is exactly the same >(to within about 1%), which is a remarkable coincidence for >either a static or swinging model, because if the camera and >model were at the same height in both shots, the elevation >angles would be markedly different for a nearby hoax model. This >means for Heflin to get them to coincide, he would have had to >be extremely lucky, with either the camera and/or model heights >varying just the right amounts to get the elevation angles to >coincide.

Let me ask you some questions first before responding...

Did you do anything to the photographs prior to establishing elevation angles? At what point did you measure elevation angles? Did you assume both photographs were published on the same scale as the originals?

>On the other hand, if the object was truly distant, this would >not be such a remarkable coincidence and would match Heflin's >story. Heflin said the object was starting to move away in >photo #3 and seemed to be gaining in altitude as it left the >vicinity. This would account naturally for the difference in >size and coincidence of elevation angles. E.g., I measure the >elevation angle at 7.9 deg. If the object were 500 feet away in >photo #2, it would be at an absolute altitude of 69 feet above >the ground in #2. To appear 3% smaller in #3, it would be only >15 feet further away (but on a different course) and would need >to gain only 2 feet in elevation to have the same elevation >angle.

>>To me it may appear that this upper dome favors the >>right side of the object and is off center as expected given the >>above disposition for driving arms in general (Heflin #1.#3).

>The argument about the object being possibly elliptical had >nothing to do with the probably imaginary "drive arms" on the >tippy top. It had to do with the ratio of the prominent top >dome to prominent bottom flange.

Yes, just checking where it was that you were taking measurements.

>>I'm not entirely sure though given that bright reflectance may >>be giving me false readings. It does seem that the upper dome >>area is off center somewhat? Is this your impression too? And, >>if the width ratios aren't proportional from image to image, >>this may also be a determining factor worth considering (see >>below).

>Again, I think you are talking about something else entirely.

Yes, I believe I was referring to an earlier e-mail of yours.

>>In the event the object's isn't perfectly circular, this may >>also account for the apparent thickening of the object's right >>rim during some subset of the inferred rotation pattern or >>simple stationary orientation with respect to the plane of the >>photo: Geometric constraints may simply account for apparent >>thickening associated with what I may have previously assigned >>to movement related blurring on the right half of #1.

>>The reflectance off the right side of #1 may also lend some  
>>credence to your observations if more exact measurements could  
>>be conducted with the given sun angles as they interact with the  
>>skewed geometry. In this way, the thickening on the right side  
>>could be used as a tool to determine the orientation of the  
>>object's long and short diametric axis's in relation to their  
>>"out-of-page" projection. These may also be consistent with the  
>>expected (observed) angle of reflectance outside the plane of  
>>the photo... the angle may be shorter or longer than expected,  
>>etc.

>>Are the width ratios you and Martin observed directly  
>>proportional from one image to the next? Or, are the values  
>>skewed somewhat. An ellipse would imply that some exact  
>>proportions are in order (within the  
>>observational error of the photos)?

>If the object parts were elliptical, the ratios could be all  
>over the map depending on perspective. However, I am now  
>measuring essentially the same ratio in photos #1 and #3 (see  
>above), to within measurement error, which would certainly allow  
>for the object to be circular. #1 and #3 show essentially the  
>same almost edge-on view, and are therefore directly comparable,  
>whereas #2 has the object tilted, showing the oval bottom and  
>hiding part of the upper dome. Therefore, I don't consider my  
>substantially different ratio for #2 to be reliable. That's  
>about all I can say about it.

Yes, I would agree with that... just wanted to establish where  
it was that you currently stood on this.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 15:12:50 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:18:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>>The train wheel photos posted by John Scheldroup and Kyle King  
>>do not resemble the Heflin object, just as you say. The cross  
>>section drawing found by John is closer, though proportions  
>>still appear to be different by a few percent. More importantly  
>>there is no apparent evidence on the Heflin photos of the "hub"  
>>claimed by Scheldroup (on the basis of a digital artefact).

>Since there's the presence of an off axis protrusions, as I've  
>already pointed out, this cannot be dismissed so lightly. Train  
>>wheels have off axis protrusion... this is what allows them  
>to be rotated with the proper engine torque. I believe David  
>noticed this already too but hadn't tied it to the possibility  
>of a train wheel.

Viktor

What have you "already pointed out"?

Exactly what off-axis protrusion(s) on the Heflin object are you  
referring to? And what is it you imagine I have "dismissed  
lightly"?

>As I pointed out already...

>Since, I was the one that pointed out the need for such tests  
>(see below),

>... all of which I had pointed out.

>Martin knows I detected what appear to be strings supporting the  
>object in two of the photos and didn't know about one particular  
>structure before hand . . . except for one of them: This is  
>nothing new since others had detected that one too, so don't be  
>fooled ... his comments are being opportunistically and  
>conveniently dropped here... as though he has all the leads  
>mapped out. As I pointed out long ago

>... as I've already pointed out...

>... as I've already pointed out on my first few postings.

Viktor I think you have some personal issues here and I sense  
some projection going on. I've snipped a whole lot of talk  
because as you keep saying (at great length) you don't want to  
hear it.

>You can conjecture all you want... but the

>meat of this case is in experimentation.

Yes there has been some conjecture, some of it yours. I also think it fair to say that an inordinate number of words have had to be spent lately countering misrepresentations of various kinds. But much of the conjecture has been very useful in establishing what are likely scenarios and which possibilities need investigating. You are focused on experiment now that you have the camera, and perhaps forget the extent of your own contributions.

>Martin was using strings on far away telephone poles to infer  
>resolution of strings at close proximity to the camera. Others  
>were using digital cameras. This shows a complete lack of  
>understanding of the depth of field, focus space, film  
>saturation, film speed, lens characteristics, and the need to  
>use the actual camera and film... all of which I had pointed  
>out.

Did, you Victor, did you? This is becoming tiresome enough that I feel justified in quoting back your own words of June 03:

"The wire depicted stretching off into the distance in photo one could be used as a great reference (agree with Martin) with strings of various thickness as compared to their counterpart if a mock setup at closer distance is entertained."

There's bound to be some error and redundancy in a free exchange of ideas. Untidy and creative. But let's not be so quick to misunderstand and misrepresent one another.

>We also have to be able to express and pursue evidence without  
>fear or ridicule. The train wheel is not a bad proposal given  
>what has so far emerged. So, why rule out anything at this  
>point.

Who's ruling anything out? To coin a phrase "I was the one" who brought the story to your attention in the first place and sought out its originator. I can't have been clearer that I am open to the possibility.

>BTW - Please let it be known that I have two cameras and had  
>already offered one of them to both David and Martin early on.

I beg your pardon? I genuinely squirm to have to do this Viktor, but you should be much more careful of what you say. I hunted back through saved mails to locate this mysterious "offer". I finally found it in an email on June 05. Here is the relevant paragraph:

"I like our sometimes heated exchanges. I don't take it personally. But I love to argue... Italian/Croatian background... what can I say. I'll probably have an extra camera. I won two on ebay. Perhaps David might like one. I'm sure we can lick this thing together."

So in point of fact you did not offer me a camera (I am on the other side of world after all), and on present evidence I would have to say I wonder if you really offered it to David either.

Anyway, please can we forget all this? And rather than another long and defensive riposte, might I respectfully suggest that your time could be better spent?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Hypersonic Craft Seen In UK

From: Chris Parr <[Doodlethug.nul](mailto:Doodlethug.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 11:19:46 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:20:40 -0400  
Subject: Hypersonic Craft Seen In UK

Hello again, EBK and Listers

Today at GMT time 2-21pm, a new technology in aviation was observed over the Irish Sea This diamond shaped advanced technology may be the result of a surge of UFO sightings which are now occurring in Europe.

A wake up call for ufologists! Get the camcorders out!

Chris Parr UK

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Pensioner's UFO Plans Scuppered

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:38:26 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:38:26 -0400  
Subject: Pensioner's UFO Plans Scuppered

Source: The Manchester Evening News - UK

<http://tinyurl.com/lb449>

Thursday, 22nd June 2006

Pensioner's UFO Plans Scuppered

A pensioner went to the Appeal Court to have his design recognised - for a flying saucer.

Bolton inventor Joseph Thompson, 83, believes his idea for a unique flying device challenges the accepted laws of physics and could revolutionise the world's travel industry.

But experts at the Patents, Designs and Trademarks have refused Mr Thompson a patent over the last three years so yesterday a judge heard his bid to appeal against the decision.

Mr Thompson told the court in his written argument: "It will be shown that a perfectly sound idea has for all time in the past escaped the cleverest of scientists, much to their loss and to the loss of the country.

"It constitutes a breakthrough in science that will leave critics breathless in its simplicity and effectiveness."

Lord Justice Jacob, sitting in London, turned down Mr Thompson's application to appeal saying: "There would be, if Mr Thompson's device were to work, a fundamental change in the currently understood laws of physics.

"He believes his device will work but he has not found out if it does work. It is unacceptable for industrial application."

Elitism

But Mr Thompson, who developed an interest in physics and aviation following a varied working career, said he was a victim of academic elitism and challenged physicists to study his designs.

His flying saucer - which was not demonstrated in court - incorporates two counter-rotating discs, which the inventor claims would generate enough lift to carry the device into the air. He claims it could create flying cars or even take people into space. But Patent Office experts said that the ideas could not work saying it breaks at least two laws of physics and have demanded to see a working model.

Mr Thompson said: "The device harnesses the energy of atmosphere. Atmosphere is a conserved energy that can never be used up.

"If I had gone to a university and done this people would listen but because I haven't they assume I'm a crank."

Mr Thompson, who has four children and two grandchildren, has previously invented a "flying wing" device which he claims had been able to lift him some feet in the air.

He vowed to continue with his plans to build a prototype device and criticised the judge for not fully recognising his plans.

He said: "People used to say that the world was flat and the first person to say that it wasn't was laughed at as well."

Copyright 2006 Manchester Evening News.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:54:07 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:42:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:21:19 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>I can't see the comparison matching the Heflin photos  
>>>matching a model train wheel. The flange on the model is  
>>>shorter than that in evidence in the photos.

>>>Mark Cashman also did analysis of the Heflin photos. His  
>>>site is still up and running.

>>>See: <http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/report/650803.htm>

>>>His site shows the three photos together in a panarama  
>>>from scans.

>>The train wheel photos posted by John Scheldroup and Kyle  
>>King do not resemble the Heflin object, just as you say. The  
>>cross section drawing found by John is closer, though  
>>proportions still appear to be different by a few percent.  
>>More importantly there is no apparent evidence on the Heflin  
>>photos of the "hub" claimed by Scheldroup (on the basis of a  
>>digital artefact).

>Since there's the presence of an off axis protrusions, as I've  
>already pointed out, this cannot be dismissed so lightly.  
>Train wheels \_have\_ off axis protrusion... this is \_what\_  
>allows them to be rotated with the proper engine torque. I  
>believe David noticed this already too but hadn't tied it to  
>the possibility of a train wheel.

Martin, Victor,

My only reason for posting was to bring to your attention the seeming difference in profile of the object as to that of a real train wheel and the ratio between the flange and the "run width" as it used to be called when I was a brakeman 42 years ago-or just about the time of Heflin's photograph. I recognize as well that a model wheel would not likely be as precise as the real thing. But the flange does not stick straight down from the main part of the wheel but curves away from the run at an angle then curves into the flange. This facillitates several things such as riding through swith points, taking curves without the deafening screeching being worse than it is, to enable deliberate derailing devices and to prevent derailing by rocks and snow and turns etc. The flange has a definite ratio to the run.

Here's a URL that shows the way a wheel is constructed mathematically. There is a science involved:

<http://www.apta.com/about/committees/press/bulletin/1998-1.cfm>

But that might be a refinement of what was on the trucks 38 years before this paper.

Don Ledger

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 14:12:50 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 07:14:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site - Hamilton,  
>Ontario, Canada  
><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>  
>15 June 2006

>[Several images at site]

>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake by Dirk Vander Ploeg

>Received a very interesting report from Piotr Cielebias of the  
>NOL-Eastern European UFO Journal, concerning a sighting by  
>retired Lt. Col. Robert G. The following is my adaptation of  
>the original report from the Lt. Colonel and his photographs.

>Name: Lt. Col. Robert G. retired (last name withheld at the  
>request of the witness) Place: Zywieckie Lake, Wojewodztwo  
>Slaskie, Poland Date: May 22, 2006

>It had been a beautiful bright day and now in the early  
>evening Robert decided to give in to his passion of fishing.  
>So he and his son Maciek gathered the rods and supplies and  
>left for their favorite spot on Lake Zywieckie. The lake was  
>nearby and they arrived at 7:20 pm.

>He had retired from the military as a Lt. Colonel some time  
>ago and became a passionate fisherman. He considered himself  
>to be 'even keeled' and straight-headed, not prone to panic,  
>over reaction or flights of fantasy. Robert enjoyed his family  
>and friends and was at a great point in his life. All of this  
>was to change and he would never be the same again.  
>Good God, Aliens don't exist!

>After settling down to fish, Robert unexpectedly decided to  
>experiment with the new digital camera Maciek had received as  
>a gift from his parents for his first communion. He reached  
>into his bag of supplies and took out the camera, then both he  
>and his son began walking along the shore of the lake looking  
>for things to photograph.

I don't like it. Why no zoomed shots. Perhaps there are but they weren't published. What happened to the thick dissipating contrail in the first two, not evident in the next two. The strata in the clouds changes as well. How much time elapsed. There is more artifacting around the object than around other objects in the pics, but there again that could be due to some aura around the object which is common enough.

His reasons for not alerting others to the object is a bit weak.

Don

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 12:29:09 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 07:17:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site - Hamilton,  
>Ontario, Canada  
><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>  
>15 June 2006

>[Several images at site]

>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake by Dirk Vander Ploeg

<snip>

Hey, multiple photos! Just for fun, here are a couple of cross-eye stereo pairs, created as the guy slowly walked slightly forward and to the right as he took the pictures:

<http://img237.imageshack.us/img237/9519/122tj.jpg>

<http://img187.imageshack.us/img187/6259/342pb.jpg>

Nice view of the lake in both photo pairs. The UFO doesn't conveniently line up as it did in the Heflin photos, first of all, but they don't often simply sit and hover in one spot.

The rest of the background in photo pair 1-2 line up pretty good. Which is an indication that the photos were taken one right after another. Interesting to notice the dissipating vapor contrail.

Distance and size of the object? Hard to tell, exactly. Interestingly enough, even though the saucer doesn't line up, you can still get a better idea of size and distance than if you were only looking at the separate photos. Funny how the brain works. Anyway, I'd say it was situated about 200 yards out above the lake, and it's a bit longer than a fishing boat, maybe 20 feet in diameter (the aliens must be pretty small). One curious thing. The story says the saucer swayed back and forth like a falling leaf, or pendulum. This may account for this photo pair showing the saucer moving right to left, instead of the opposite, which is what you'd expect from the sequence.

In the second pair (3-4), doesn't line up quite as well. There were significant changes in the water and sky between the two photos, suggesting a longer period of time passed than stated in the guy's story (missing time?). Backing up his story, though, is a flicker of activity on the dock on the opposite shore. Somebody moving around. And you can kind of get a feel for the direction of motion of the saucer, as it moves away from the lake and rises into the sky.

So after a quick review of the photos, they generally seem to back up the guy's story. Although a psychological effect (trauma) was noted in the story, because of the significant change in sky patterns indicative of a time shift, I wonder if perhaps those effects were not a larger component of the sighting than even the participants realize.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:23:58 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 07:24:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Frison

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 16:38:43 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 13:09:25 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

>>Maybe not 'try to prove a solution' (as you are prone to do)  
>>but 'eliminate solutions based on scientific research and  
>>fact'?

>>But then again, my "logic" is hard to follow!

>Thanks Eugene! I think I understand you now.

>I understand science this way: First, you observe something.  
>Then you make a theory about why it happens. Then you test that  
>theory for validity. If the theory seems to hold, you draw a  
>conclusion and publish it. If it doesn't hold, you make another  
>theory and test it.

>If I understand your "hard to follow" logic correctly, you're  
>looking for answers by not using science. Is that correct?

I confess I don't have a clue what you're going on about!

When, in my previous post, I said, "not 'try to prove a solution,'" I meant to 'not start off with your mind made up and then go out to prove what your mind is made up about. You know, quite simply: be objective - don't start off with preconceived notions and then pick and choose evidence that supports what you want to believe! So I don't know how you get "you're looking for answers by not using science" out of it.

I don't know if you're being genuine (doesn't seem like it) when you're replying or if you're just amusing yourself by twisting things around but I've got better things to do than engage in word games with you.

Because when it comes down to it, I really don't care if you want to believe "some UFOs are ET spaceships" or not! Knock yourself out!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 22:09:34 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 07:52:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site -  
> Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

>15 June 2006

>[Several images at site]

>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake  
>by Dirk Vander Ploeg

>Received a very interesting report from Piotr Cielebias of the  
>NOL-Eastern European UFO Journal, concerning a sighting by  
>retired Lt. Col. Robert G. The following is my adaptation of the  
>original report from the Lt. Colonel and his photographs.

>Name: Lt. Col. Robert G. retired (last name withheld at the  
> request of the witness)  
>Place: Zywieckie Lake, Wojewodztwo Slaskie, Poland  
>Date: May 22, 2006

>It had been a beautiful bright day and now in the early evening  
>Robert decided to give in to his passion of fishing. So he and  
>his son Maciek gathered the rods and supplies and left for their  
>favorite spot on Lake Zywieckie. The lake was nearby and they  
>arrived at 7:20 pm.

It has been pointed out to me off-List by Ray Stanford that there may be inconsistencies in these photos. Ray notes that a) The clouds and vapour trails at moderately high elevation in pictures #1 and #2 are near the horizon and much dissipated in pictures #3 and #4 suggesting that a lot of time has passed, and that b) Changes in the surface winds suggested by the altered lake surface also suggest passage of time.

Ray asks me to to add:

-----

Also, please mention that the lighting and the color of the sky suggest that the photos could not have been taken on May 22 at 7:20 p.m. local time. Furthermore, since the vast change of the sky (vapor trails have much dissipated and spread, and ground-level wind direction has changed) suggests (depending on upper-level winds) probably at least (very conservatively) a fifteen to twenty minute later time, for the two final photos, at that late an hour, the vapor trails should have been getting at least somewhat orange or even pink due to sunset, and they are, in fact, very much the same color as in the earlier photos

Could someone (Maybe a 'pelican' trying to show Ufologers as gullible, or just a hoaxer?) be trying to set the stage to claim an abduction with missing time? If so, it will not 'bake', because the sky color shows that the photos (considering, especially, the considerable time period over which the first

and last photos were taken) tell us they were taken at a substantially earlier time of day that claimed.

By the way, look at the pure white sun reflections on the dome and flange of the very plastic-looking object. Is there anyone foolish enough to believe a sun reflection would be that white at 7:20 p.m. in Poland, and (due to sky changes) at least fifteen or twenty minutes later? Well, I'd guess there are a few with sufficient will-to-believe 'pretty photos' who will fall for the claim without due examination.

Yep, I'd bet the 'witness' did get his feet wet, as he claims, but I think he got them wet by going back into the water, again and again, to retrieve a little plastic model.

Caveat emptor!,

Ray

-----

Is a large lapse of time consistent with the story? It's worth mentioning that the shadows on the house on the far shore don't look markedly different at first sight and the overall quality of the light looks similar (however appropriate or inappropriate for a May evening in Poland), so we're not necessarily talking about hours. The witness does claim to have been in some sort of a dissociated state. But given that he says he took the UFO photos early, in succession, and then after the UFO had gone carried on snapping shots of the empty sky in a trance, it doesn't sound as though the pictures ought to have been taken over a long period of time.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 16:40:41 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 07:54:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Lehmborg

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 08:46:30 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:10:34 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:39:42 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>Normally, I think it is a waste of band width to comment on  
>>someone's message. But, I find your writing style fun to read  
>>and your messages interesting. In my opinion, not the usual  
>>droning on.

>I agree 100%. My only criticism of this List is that some people  
>who post here seem to really like to listen to themselves talk.  
>As you say, they drone on and on, sometimes eventually making a  
>point, sometimes not. When I first started writing  
>professionally I had good editors who always said, "boil it  
>down!" Don't use ten words when it can be said just as well in  
>three. You will note that my posts here are usually only a few  
>paragraphs at most. I feel like many posters must have learned  
>to write from old Russian novelists!

You have every right to feel as good about yourself as you can,  
Mr. Shell. It remains that 'boiling' can cook out a lot of  
nutrients, Sir, and the scenic route can be the most  
completely instructive. Moreover, many those old Russians are  
still read, and relevant, today. Perhaps you would have told  
Mozart there were too many notes in his piece, too? On to the  
next sound-bite/data-bit/faux-clarity?

Occam's razor doesn't say the simplest is preferred, does it?  
It says entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity.  
Sometimes the multiplication is necessary, eh? I suspect words  
too, if they're the right word.

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 22:26:42 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 07:58:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site -  
> Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

>15 June 2006

>[Several images at site]

>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake  
>by Dirk Vander Ploeg

>Received a very interesting report from Piotr Cielebias of the  
>NOL-Eastern European UFO Journal, concerning a sighting by  
>retired Lt. Col. Robert G. The following is my adaptation of the  
>original report from the Lt. Colonel and his photographs.

>Name: Lt. Col. Robert G. retired (last name withheld at the  
> request of the witness)  
>Place: Zywieckie Lake, Wojewodztwo Slaskie, Poland  
>Date: May 22, 2006

<snip>

>Maciek turned the camera on and asked his father to take a  
>photo. Taking the camera from his son he centered the view  
>finder on the craft and clicked the shutter as it moved slowly  
>to his right. "We'll show Mom," his son exclaimed.

>Trance-like, the father, continued to take photos. The world was  
>gone - only the object remained. The flying saucer had stopped  
>maneuvering and was swinging side to side, its movements  
>reminding Robert of a leaf floating in the air. A thought now  
>crossed Robert's confused mind: Good God, Aliens don't exist!  
>Just then the craft vanished. Robert hurriedly searched the sky,  
>but there was no sign of the craft.

<snip>

Hi Everyone!

From the above account by Dirk Vander Ploeg, I think it is safe  
to say that from the time Maciek's father took the first of the  
four photos of this UFO and "continued to take pictures" until  
"the craft vanished", only a minute or so must have elapsed.

This is not supported by the actual photos though. The sky cloud  
cover (with jet contrails) and the reflectivity/smoothness of  
the lake surface in the first two photos are very different from  
the last two photos (with missing or displaced jet contrails)  
suggesting that the photos must have been taken over a much  
longer period of time. The back and forth sideways motion of the  
UFO relative to the background in the four consecutive photos  
and the fact that the UFO has a similar shape to Rex Heflin's  
1965 UFO are all consistent with a smaller model being suspended  
and swinging at the end of a thin fishing line.

If Piotr Cielebias of the NOL-Eastern European UFO Journal was sent unedited copies of these four photos, he may be able to check the date and/or time stamp of these four digital camera JPG files to see if my suspicions are justified.

With the growing popularity of small digital/video cameras which many people carry with them everywhere, ufologists have been overwhelmed with many more images of UFOs to look at and try to evaluate or explain. The vast majority of these are of BLURFOs (UFO-like images that appear in the pictures but which were not seen by the person who took the picture with the camera or by any others nearby). Then there are the few very clearer "nuts and bolts" UFOs such as the one taken by this anonymous Polish ex-military man as well as the past "classics" which, from their own inconsistencies, give us reasons to suspect they were hoaxed or that the witnesses were less than honest than those that took pictures of BLURFOs and submitted them as possible UFOs.

This large and rapidly growing collection of mostly unexciting UFO pictures raises a question that we and the skeptical world cries out to be answered. Is there even a single UFO photo in the public domain, either from the flying saucer era of the 1940s and 1950s or from the present, that we can present with absolute confidence to the Doubting Thomases of this world as compelling physical evidence or proof that at least some UFOs are a new phenomenon or to show that some UFOs can only have an extraterrestrial/supernatural explanation since all other prosaic ones were ruled out?

If not, by continuing to embrace all the latest pictures of alleged UFOs as possible new evidence that UFOs are "real", we are only deluding ourselves.

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://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 09:58:48 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 08:00:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site -  
> Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake  
>by Dirk Vander Ploeg

Further to my earlier post, Ray Stanford asks me to forward the following:

-----

Compare the shadow of the tree across the lake on that white house. Although measurement accuracy is constrained by the fuzziness of the images, I have determined that, very roughly, the sun changes angle by a minimum of five, and, more likely six degrees. Using sun position change as 15 degrees per hour, five degrees of change equals 20 minutes of difference in time between photo1 and photo 4.

Of course those figures should be considered quite preliminary and, done in haste, will require a bit of adjustment with more accurate measurements. However, I think that's a pretty good 'ballpark figure' of sun angle change, and, interestingly, it agrees with my earlier estimate of time lag, based upon my experience of observing high-level wind alteration of jet trails.

...the above figures are based on actual measurements of changes in the length of shadow of the large tree in front of the white house, as measured from the top of the tree to where the shadow meets the base of the white house.

-----

Ray emphasises that this measurement is conservative and that 20 mins should be regarded as a minimum.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## UFO Hacker Gary McKinnon Interview

From: Nigel Watson <[nigelwatson1.nul](mailto:nigelwatson1.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 11:44:06 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 08:03:41 -0400  
Subject: UFO Hacker Gary McKinnon Interview

Hi,

My exclusive interview with UFO Hacker, Gary McKinnon, for Wired appears at:

<http://tinyurl.com/gchzz>

Additional comments about this interview are posted at:

[http://digg.com/science/UFO\\_Hacker\\_talks\\_about\\_what\\_he\\_found](http://digg.com/science/UFO_Hacker_talks_about_what_he_found)

A longer article about Gary McKinnon also appears in the July 2006 edition of UFO Magazine.

From comments so far generated by this interview people either regard Gary McKinnon as a saint or a sinner - and those are the polite reactions!

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpDatesList.Com](http://UFOUpDatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## The Other Side Of... Stuart Miller

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 08:24:25 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 08:24:25 -0400  
Subject: The Other Side Of... Stuart Miller

Paul Kimball was in the UK recently, shooting for his upcoming documentary and speaking at Stuart Miller's Conference On Ufology And The Paranormal, June 10th.

Paul interviewed Stuart and the on-line result is here:

Blog: Paul Kimball's The Other Side of Truth  
Post: The Other Side of... Stuart Miller  
Link: <http://tinyurl.com/nowjf>

ebk

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [ufoupdateslist.com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Have We Offended Them?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 08:55:01 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 08:55:01 -0400  
Subject: Have We Offended Them?

Source: The Age - Melbourne, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/ndkl4>

June 23, 2006

Have We Offended Them?  
Jim Schembri

Actually, where have all the UFOs gone?

Earth used to be, like, the hottest place for aliens to visit. They would fly billions of light years across the galaxy in their flying saucers just to see how our civilisation was going and if we'd yet figured out whether there was really any difference between cellulite and plain old fat.

These aliens used to love appearing in the background of our holiday snaps, the advanced design of their ships clear for all to see once the image had been digitally enhanced. Sometimes their ships would even make fleeting cameos in home movies, buzzing in and out with astonishing speeds, just like an alien spacecraft equipped with a trans-light hyperdrive, or a fl y passing too close to the camera lens.

They liked us. In fact, they liked us so much that they would sometimes invite people on to their ships, take them for rides around the universe, tell them all about their alien technology and culture, then insert large probes into their bottoms for reasons that are probably none of our business.

These guests were not selected at random and typically had several crucial features in common: they were always from the country; they had very few friends; they were never in possession of any sort of camera; and they never remembered anything until they were either under deep hypnosis or on television, preferably both.

But it has been a very long time since we've had a decent UFO sighting. Indeed, it's been so long that many people have forgotten what UFOs look like. This has had a deleterious effect on UFO sighting statistics, which have fallen with alarming alarmingness over the past few decades.

It's no doubt happened that people have seen large, perfectly smooth metallic saucers hovering in their back paddock, surgically removing the stomach lining from cattle, and not realised that it was, in fact, a bona fide UFO and not a reminder to finally say no to cold pizza just before bed.

The reasons for the drop-off in UFO sightings are many and complex. Extensive studies by the Institute for Making Up Statistical Trends have established a distinct inverse correlation between alien visitation and the development of human photographic technology.

That is, the better we got at taking sharp, high-resolution pictures of things, the fewer aliens spaceships we saw. Support for this is a matter of record.

Back in prehistoric times when all people could do was paint pictures into cave walls and chisel images into stone slabs, the Earth was positively teeming with aliens.

They helped us build pyramids and temples, and also formed some of civilisation's earliest executive management teams, with much of their unintelligible language still very much in evidence today.

Once cameras were invented, however, the aliens seemed less willing to show themselves. As cameras became cheaper and more plentiful, the aliens seemed even more reluctant to drop in, and now that digital cameras are about as common as teenagers with severe eardrum damage, visits from our alien friends appear to have dropped off altogether, if not totally.

The key question we now face at this point in our ongoing investigation into alien culture is: what does this teach us about the aliens?

Here are several important notes:

(1) Despite their advanced intelligence, the aliens are extraordinarily shy and self-conscious about their appearance. This supports the long-held theory that their visits to Earth are on the urging from a more self-confident and attractive alien civilisation who just want them to get out and meet people, otherwise they're going to end up as the unmarried alien civilisation who lives all alone on the corner in the large house with all the cats.

(2) That human civilisation was a science project by some alien students whose report has been assessed with a passing mark, so there's no need for them to return.

(3) That the last person the aliens abducted had just been to an all-you-can-eat Mexican restaurant, and there's no way they're going to travel 50 billion light years to put themselves through that again.

(4) It's just God messing with our heads again. Infinitely more disturbing is a fifth theory. This holds how the aliens have not stopped visiting us at all. The Government may want us to think they have, but it's far more likely that the aliens walk among us posing as normal Earthlings, trying hard to understand our culture, our society and why we keep buying gym memberships when we almost never go.

What is their plan? Do they come in peace? And should they bring a plate? Will they want to take over our beloved planet, or just rent? All we can do is wait, watch and make absolutely sure that should one of their gleaming spaceships appear before us, to take a nice, sharp photo of it with our phone before passing 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Conversations With Extraterrestrials

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 09:03:33 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 09:03:33 -0400  
Subject: Conversations With Extraterrestrials

Source: Llewellyn Journal - St. Paul, Minnesota, USA

<http://www.llewellynjournal.com/article.php?id=474>

2003-06-06

Conversations With Extraterrestrials  
By Preston Dennett

One of the rarest types of UFO encounter is an onboard experience or a face-to-face encounter with an actual extraterrestrial. In my twenty years of UFO investigations, I have uncovered only a handful of these types of very close encounters. Surprisingly, in the vast majority of these encounters, there is little or no conversation between the humans and the aliens.

In the cases where there is conversation, it is often one-sided and limited to the extraterrestrials giving platitudes to the frightened witnesses. It's the same phrase over and over again. I've heard it a thousand times. It's almost like a broken record. The first word out of the aliens' mouths (or minds) is invariably, "DO NOT BE AFRAID. WE WON'T HURT YOU."

While the aliens are usually very tight-lipped, occasionally they will engage people in brief conversations or relay brief messages. CASE ONE: "You Won't Remember This."

My first case involving conversations between humans and ETs occurred to the Robinson family of Reseda, California. In 1989, the family experienced a series of sightings and abductions by gray-type aliens, culminating in what UFO investigators call "a baby presentation."

The main witness, Kelly Robinson, experienced four consecutive visitations over a period of a few months. During each encounter, she was able to converse with the aliens.

On the first encounter, Kelly awoke to find four gray-type ETs standing around her bed. One spoke telepathically, telling her. "Do not be afraid. Come with us. You won't remember this."

Kelly, however, was a very feisty, independent twenty-year-old, and like twenty percent of abductees, she did remember. She recalled being taken into a small round room and placed on a table. They told her, "We're going to take your memory away. You'll not remember this...Don't be afraid. We're not going to hurt you. You can't remember this."

Kelly screamed at them, "Yes, I will!"

This argument went back and forth, with the aliens telling her she couldn't and wouldn't remember, and Kelly screaming back that she would.

They then cut her arm. She woke up the next morning and immediately looked at her arm. A neat two-inch scar was exactly where she remembered the aliens cutting her.

Two weeks later, the aliens returned, telling her, "We're going to take your memory."

Kelly screamed at them, "No, you're not. I'm going to tell."

They told her, "No, you're not...Your parents wouldn't understand. You better not tell them, you know."

Kelly screamed out that she would tell her father.

They said, "No, no, no! You can't."

A few weeks later, they came again. As usual, they attempted to erase her memory of the incident. They told her, "You're going to forget everything."

However, as usual, Kelly had some recall of the events. Says Kelly, "I don't know specifically what they asked me. They were asking me things about what we do, but you know, I can't specifically say. They [said,] 'this will happen and that will happen.' I think it's about my job or something."

Says Kelly, "It's hard for me to remember. They say, "You're going to forget everything.'...It's totally stressed on, "We're not going to let you remember this. We're going to take your memory of this away."

On her final encounter, the aliens appeared and said, "We need to talk to you. Come with us."

Kelly resisted and threatened to tell her father. They said, "No, you can't tell your dad."

Says Kelly, "I think they're religious. They're not really out to hurt us. They're out to learn. But they're afraid for us to remember because they're afraid we would tell people about them."CASE TWO: "They Have Everything But Love."

Kelly Robinson's mother, Diane, had an experience which she calls a "dream," but is clearly connected to the UFO encounters of her family. Diane recalls being taken into a room where she was shown babies who were genetically altered. First revealed by researcher Budd Hopkins, these rare cases involve abductees who are told to hold and nurture babies that appear to be half-alien and half-human. In most cases, there is little information exchanged. Diane, however, was given a brief explanation.

She recalled being taken to a room where she saw a large contraption shaped like a Christmas tree, but instead of branches there were incubators filled with babies.

Diane was told to pick a baby and hold it. She refused because the babies appeared to be deformed. Says Diane, "Every one of them had something wrong with them. And she said it was sad, because it wasn't planned that way, that they had all these things wrong with them...She said they had everything but love. She said, 'That's why I'd like you to take one and love it...They have problems. They are different. But they still need love.'"

Diane was unable to overcome her revulsion and refused to hold the babies. Following this experience, all the UFO encounters of the Robinson family ended.CASE THREE: "There's Going to be a Rebellion."

During my research into the UFO wave over Topanga Canyon, California (see UFOs Over Topanga Canyon, Llewellyn, 1999), I uncovered several cases involving face-to-face extraterrestrial encounters. Again, in most cases, the aliens either didn't speak or said only, "Do not be afraid, we won't hurt you." However, in a few cases, messages were given. One case is that of the Martin family. It was Sarah Martin, the mother, who actually spoke with the extraterrestrials.

Sarah Martin's encounters occurred during the peak of the UFO wave and involved several close-up sightings and at least one onboard encounter. Sarah recalls being inside a small circular



room surrounded by small robed figures. Says Sarah, "To be honest with you, I can't remember their faces. I just remember talking to them...and they were talking to me. And this is what they said: 'Why are you so involved in this [Ross Perot] campaign? Why are you wasting your time? It's going to fall apart, one by one, and whoever wins, it doesn't matter because the whole system is going to come down around everybody. There's going to be a rebellion. And you're not a part of this, so don't get involved.'"

At the time, Sarah was heavily involved in the Ross Perot presidential campaign. After the experience, she dropped all her political activities. Says Sarah, "This was so incredible. In my mind, I keep going over again what they said: 'You're not a part of this, so don't be a part of it. Get away from all of it.'...The other thing too is something about an earthquake, a big earthquake. Something like that...but the thing that stuck out the most was, 'Why are you so involved? Why are you letting this consume your time? It's not worth it, and it's all going to fall apart.'"

A few years later, the devastating Northridge earthquake struck, destroying several homes in Topanga Canyon. CASE THREE: "We Need Babies."

Interestingly, another Topanga witness received prophetic warnings of the Northridge earthquake the night before it occurred, thereby saving her from serious injury or even death. Marcellina X had had encounters all her life, but it wasn't until she moved into Topanga Canyon that she began to experience face-to-face visitations. Following the earthquake, she had an encounter with a gray-type extraterrestrial in her home.

During the encounter, the ET spoke to her telepathically. Says Marcellina, "It was telling me they were trying to invent ways of intercourse. They needed babies. It was just telling me a bunch of things telepathically. There would be more earthquakes. And then you know, we had all those earthquakes all over the world....I had changed my living room after the earthquake with a whole bunch of pictures I had painted of planets. And they told me that's not exactly the way it looked there...[they said] I would be able to heal myself and I would be able to heal them. If they wanted me to heal them, I would be able to heal them."

Following this experience, Marcellina experienced the missing-fetus syndrome. Well known among UFO investigators, this syndrome involves women who become pregnant following a UFO encounter and then mysteriously lose the fetus. Marcellina also experienced subsequent paranormal healing events. CASE FOUR: "Our Emotions Are Different Than Yours."

Pat Brown is a physical therapist from Panorama City, California. She had never thought of UFOs until 1992, when a vacation to Arizona triggered a series of encounters with gray-type extraterrestrials. For a period of several months, Pat reported terrifying nightly visits by ETs in her condo. Then, one evening, she was taken on board.

To her surprise, she found the experience enjoyable. She was given a tour of the craft and taken to meet "the master." It was then that she was given several messages of a spiritual nature. Says Pat, "I don't know all that they said to me, but I remember them telling me there was something I had to do with my aura."

She was surprised to find that the appearance of the alien had changed to a human male with blond hair. She asked, "Why do you look like that?"

The ET replied, "Because this is the way you want me to look."

Pat was taken out of her body and was shown what her astral body looked like. The ET told her, "That is your soul. That is the part of you that goes through all the lifetimes."

Pat was given further spiritual lessons on vibrations and healing and was then returned to her bedroom.

She soon had further experiences, and suffered several medical effects as a result of her encounters. Her case is also supported by additional witnesses. Her obsession with the subject grew and Pat began a search for information and was led

to a channeler, someone claiming to speak for the ETs.

Pat asked the channeler if people who are abducted make an agreement on some level. The channeler, speaking for the ETs, said that yes, abductees do, in fact, agree to be abducted.

Pat said, "Can you make them stop?"

The ETs replied, "No, you cannot make them stop, but if you become consciously aware, you will be handled in a different way...You need to understand why you have created this. We perceive we are supporting you in your drama. Why did you create this?"

Another audience member asked, "You come here and you get specimens. What do we get from you?"

"You get a jump start in your growth. That's what we give you."

Another member asked about emotions and the ETs replied, "Our emotions are different than yours, but we do have emotions because we accept it as important to us."

The conversation continued until Pat became angry and shouted at them that they shouldn't take her against her will.

The ETs replied, "The experiences you are receiving from this far outweigh the other things you are experiencing, and there's not one person in this room that would not trade places with you."

Pat continues to have experiences, both positive and negative. She is also continuing her quest to understand the reasons for her encounters. CASE FIVE: "We Are From a Place You Don't Know About Yet."

In 1995, a middle-age couple, William and Rose Shelhart, were driving outside Sedona, Arizona, late at night when they spotted a bright light in the sky following them. It soon became apparent that the light was playing a game of cat and mouse with them as it chased them down the road and eventually landed in a field next to them. That was the last thing they consciously remembered.

Their next memory was arriving at a hotel in Sedona, several hours too late. Realizing they had missing time, they later sought out a hypnotist and recalled an incredible onboard UFO experience. They recalled being taken on board the craft and examined by nearly human-looking uniformed extraterrestrials. While William's recall was negligible, Rose was able to recall most of what happened, including an actual conversation that she had with the ETs.

According to Rose, they were "invited" onboard and treated with kindness and respect. Says Rose, "They [the extraterrestrials] were just saying that we are helping you. They told me [William] was in another room getting different messages."

Rose asked where they come from. The aliens gave a typically enigmatic and evasive answer, replying, "We are from a place you don't know about yet."

When asked about their purpose for coming here, their response was decidedly positive. Says Rose, "They said they are helping certain people here because they will help humanity. And something about like, the more we help, the more they help us. But they can't interfere and just take over and fix everything."

Rose was unable to obtain any further useful information. She and her husband continue to have sightings and encounters, and William reports that he was healed of carpal-tunnel syndrome as a result of his interaction with the ETs. CASE SIX: "Don't Worry, We Won't Hurt You."

Jack Stevens (pseudonym), of Everett, Washington, was only twelve years old when he was abducted out of a car and into a large craft. Most of the event was shrouded in amnesia until 1997, when he spontaneously recalled what happened twenty-five years earlier. His memory revealed a harrowing six-hour-long abduction event.

Jack recalled being levitated inside a beam of light and laid out on a table surrounded by short figures. As he was being taken on board, the ETs told him, "Don't worry, we're not going to hurt you."

As they examined him, Jack reports that the aliens conversed among themselves. "I remember two of them going back and forth, and it was like a 'good cop, bad cop' thing. One of them, for all he cared, just throw me off. That's what the impression was, just, 'get him off here.' And the other one was saying, 'No, we are not going to do that.'

"I remember them telling me to open my mouth."

Jack became nervous about his mother and brother who were still back in the car. The beings responded, "Don't worry about it, we don't want them...Don't want them, don't need them...We don't care about them."

At one point, one of the beings attempted to relate a complex message. Says Jack, "He was telling me all kinds of stuff, but it wasn't sinking in. I didn't understand what he was telling me. There were math formula things and something about a lot of triangles and circles. There was a lot of geometry thrown at me. And I'm just sitting there thinking, this is pretty cool, but I kind of want to go home."

After several more procedures, the ordeal finally ended. As Jack was being placed back into his car, a final exchange ensued. Jack said, "You didn't do anything to my mom and brother, right?"

The beings responded, "Right, don't worry."

Jack's case involves considerable physical evidence and numerous other witnesses. The case is still ongoing. CASE SEVEN: "We've been Here a Long, Long, Time."

A very unusual case of extraterrestrial contact occurred to a waitress named Maryann X, of Carpinteria, California. One evening in 1992, following a series of UFO sightings, Maryann was in her home watching TV when she became aware of a presence. Although she couldn't see anything, in her mind's eye she sensed a strange being. The figure was thin, bald, with a large head, gray skin and dark almond-shaped eyes. In other words, the typical gray-type alien.

At that point, Maryann began to experience the phenomenon of automatic writing. Messages which she believed were from the alien began to be transmitted through her.

Says Maryann, "He's very interested in our interest in him and his race. [He says] that they've been here for a long, long time, longer than we have from what I understand...They're vastly interested in us. They're almost more fascinated in us than we are in them. We don't think the same way they do. He said, 'We live in oceans.' They live in the ocean, underwater. Their ships are underwater. They're very benign. They have no nuclear warheads [or] this kind of stuff."

Like many contactees, Maryann was given information about upcoming natural disasters. "He was telling me something about earthquakes. He didn't predict anything else. He just said we're in for some big type of natural disaster. I get the impression, thinking back to what he talks to me about, is that they're almost here to warn us. Not of an impending doom type of thing, like the world's going to blow up, but they're not here to hurt. They're here to observe."

The alien told Maryann that their race is much more numerous than all of humanity. "Lot and lots and lots. This is not just five or ten or twenty ships roaming around. We're talking--from what I get from him--millions and millions of these people. And they've existed before we recorded time and history."

The alien told her that they were conducting a program to contact small groups of people across the planet. "That's the understanding I have. They have jobs like everybody has jobs down here. His job is to find people who are receptive enough that he can talk to. And he was really worried about whether or not I was really scared....I get the impression that I am not

the only one he talks to. In fact, I think that it's like a job for them. That's kind of the impression I got, is they kind of probe different people. It's like his job is to find people who are receptive."

Marianne has made contact with the alien on several occasions, and has been given much more information. CASE EIGHT: "It Is Very Important We Do This."

Melinda Leslie of Los Angeles, California, is an office manager and secretary who has been having ET contact her entire life. Even more amazing is that Melinda has been able to recall many of her experiences consciously, without the aid of hypnosis. She is what UFO researchers call a conscious abductee.

While she has had virtually the entire range of UFO experiences, one of her most dramatic occurred in July 1991 while driving with two friends through the Los Angeles forest. All three experienced a two-hour-long abduction into a metallic craft piloted by grey-type ETs.

Once on board, they were undressed, examined, separated and given separate messages. Melinda Leslie was able to recall the entire event consciously. As she was laid out and examined, she hammered the aliens with questions, none of which they answered.

She saw her friend sitting in a chair with a bizarre-looking headset on him and she screamed out, "What are you doing to him?"

One of the aliens replied, "It's all right, we're giving him information. It's all right. We're educating him."

"Don't hurt him," Melinda said.

"We're not hurting him. He's all right. It's all right."

Melinda continued to let out a stream of questions, however, she was rarely answered, and then, only in an evasive manner. Says Melinda, "They don't give you straight answers. They say, 'It's okay. We need to do this. You understand.'"

At one point, the three friends were separated and placed into different rooms. Melinda found herself in a room with a dozen greys. One stepped up to her and said, "Now, we're going to do something. Don't be afraid, but this is very important that we do this. We're going to put this over your head."

What followed was a bizarre procedure. Melinda was immobilized by a device placed over her head. The aliens stood in a circle around Melinda and pushed her back and forth like a punching clown. Melinda felt she was going to fall, but each time she was caught and pushed again. Finally, she relaxed. At that point, they stopped and removed the device. One of the aliens said, "You needed to learn that....You needed to learn to trust us."

Meanwhile, Melinda's friend, James, was receiving a different message. Says Melinda, "James said when I was out of the room, they came over to him, and they showed him a device, a bunch of stuff. They told him how to make a UFO detector, and they gave him the information. He said, they said because they wanted him to document and videotape them. When sightings happen, they told him he has a mission to document this stuff."

According to James, "They showed me how to do this. And they explained the whole thing technically to me, and I was given the information how to build those. They were done and they made sure I understood. And I said, 'Yes, I understand.'"

Melinda's other friend was unable to recall much detail other than being taken onboard and examined. Melinda continues to have experiences and has lectured extensively about her encounters. CONCLUSIONS

There are many other cases where aliens have conversed with human beings. However, the patterns are usually the same. For the most part, aliens are not only extremely taciturn; when they do speak they are often evasive. When abductee Travis Walton was taken onboard a UFO, he asked numerous questions of the aliens, none of which were answered. When abductee Betty Hill asked her abductors where they came from, they told her, "You wouldn't

understand."

But as the above cases show, the aliens do sometimes reveal information about themselves, their feelings, their intentions, their desires, fears and beliefs. By piecing together these accounts, we are beginning to get a clearer picture of who the aliens are and what they are doing on this planet. The main message revealed by the aliens' conversations is that they have a strong interest in humanity. Whether they are removing genetic material, imparting spiritual knowledge, predicting natural disaster or studying our emotions, the aliens are obviously fascinated by humanity. The conclusion is clear. For whatever reason, they are deeply interested in us. And if the patterns reveal anything, the aliens will remain here for a long, long time.

---

Preston Dennett (California) is a field investigator for the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON). He has more than fifty articles published in most of the major UFO publications and is the author of UFO Healings and One in Forty: The UFO Epidemic. He has worked with the television programs Sightings, National Geographic Explorer, and Encounters.

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:57:44 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:21:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 12:29:09 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site - Hamilton,  
>>Ontario, Canada  
>><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>  
>>15 June 2006

>>[Several images at site]

>>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake by Dirk Vander Ploeg

><snip>

>Hey, multiple photos! Just for fun, here are a couple of cross-eye stereo  
>pairs, created as the guy slowly walked slightly forward and to the right  
>as he took the pictures:

><http://img237.imageshack.us/img237/9519/122tj.jpg>  
><http://img187.imageshack.us/img187/6259/342pb.jpg>

<snip>

Does anyone know the actual or claimed sequence of these photos?

In the vertical order posted (and as numbered on Tim's pairs)  
the object would not be rising away into the sky but descending  
between #3 and #4.

Do we know that he slowly walked forward and to right, and not  
backwards to the left?

The clouds and trails appear to move away from the camera to the  
horizon between the two pairs - if the order is as suggested.

If we knew even basic stuff that should be in any report - like  
which way the camera is pointed and what the winds aloft were  
like - there would be some way to check these things.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:02:35 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:23:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:54:07 -0300  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>Martin, Victor,

>My only reason for posting was to bring to your attention the  
>seeming difference in profile of the object as to that of a real  
>train wheel and the ratio between the flange and the "run width"  
>as it used to be called when I was a brakeman 42 years ago-or  
>just about the time of Heflin's photograph. I recognize as well  
>that a model wheel would not likely be as precise as the real  
>thing. But the flange does not stick straight down from the main  
>part of the wheel but curves away from the run at an angle then  
>curves into the flange. This facillitates several things such as  
>riding through swith points, taking curves without the deafening  
>screeching being worse than it is, to enable deliberate  
>derailing devices and to prevent derailing by rocks and snow  
>and turns etc. The flange has a definite ratio to the run.

<snip>

Don,

I find this whole model train wheel obsession quite amusing, but we must let the techies do their thing. David Rudiak, Viktor Golubik, and Martin Shough all strike me as quite sincere and fair-minded, but I note that they have a hard time getting together on basic technical data, much less overall research methodology.

Just like all techies I have known in the past, they tend to think that their photoanalytical skills provide a magic short-cut to truth without regard to witness information or thorough case investigation. Their motto might be, The Truth is In There (in the pictures themselves) and I will find it, with which I emphatically disagree. (I'm going to post this message, then scurry for the bomb shelter.)

As I told Viktor in private (he didn't buy the argument), the last thing a hoaxer using a model train wheel is likely to do is to allow a skeptical TV producer to interview him in his home and show him his model trains. That just makes no sense at all. Further, as I have tried to point out a couple of the NICAP investigators spent a lot of time in Heflin's home, got to know



him very well, and knew about all of his hobbies and interests. Again, a hoaxer using a model train wheel would not likely be so open about his interest in model trains.

Finally, I am not aware that anyone has made an effort to retrieve Dr. Robert Nathan's research papers on the case from 1965 and later. Maybe they are not available, I don't know, but his work seems to be rather airily dismissed as unimportant. He was not just some stumblebum amateur. I quote from two NASA press releases:

JPL, NASA, Aug. 9, 1966. JPL COMPUTER PROCESS BRIGHTENS SURVEYOR MOON PICTURES. Re: the "sparkling success of Surveyor I in taking television pictures of the Moon's surface....These sharper prints are produced by a computerized system which corrects distortion and improves resolution in original photographs taken by television cameras. The system was developed by Dr. Robert Nathan, who led the JPL video fdigital (computer) data research for NASA. Robert Selzer was in charge of Surveyor picture enhancement." (Is he--Selzer--not the guy now re-examining the Heflin photos for the JSE paper?)

JPL, NASA, Oct. 25, 1985. "[NASA] has presented an award of \$20,000 to Dr. Robert Nathan of Jet Propulsion Laboratory for significant scientific and technical contributions in the field of imaging." The award was for his "Combined Technical Contributions to Planetary and Biomedical Image Processing and Scientific Data Analysis Techniques....In 1976, seeing the need for more advanced technology, he developed techniques to reduce computer time by [a] factor of 100 and established Very Large Integrated Systems use at JPL and emerged as leader in VLIS implementation."

Nathan, who originally was very skeptical, found no evidence of a string or hoax -- twice. In fact, all the techies can do to resolve photo authenticity is find clearcut and unequivocal evidence of a hoax. They cannot prove that a photo is genuine. That sort of proof lies in the character and background investigation and the preponderance of evidence. So the Truth is not in the photois themselves, unless and only if the photo is a demonstrable fake.

Cheers, 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Another UFO Photographed Over Peruvian Volcano

From: Scott Corrales <[lornis1.nul](mailto:lornis1.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 06:47:39 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:27:34 -0400  
Subject: Another UFO Photographed Over Peruvian Volcano

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology  
June 23, 2006

Source: Ana Luisa Cid  
Date: 06.22.06

Photo taken with a cellphone by Narciso Delgado Cabello from the Salinas Huito sector of Arequipa (Peru) on Saturday, June 17, 2006 at 8:00 hrs.

According to a report from the =93Correo de Arequipa=94 newspaper submitted by Dr. Anthony Choy, the objects were seen for some seconds and appeared just as a couple photographed Arequipa=92s tutelary volcanos =96 the Misti and the Chachani.

Silvana Chamba, Narciso Delgado=92s companion, says that she was also able to see the possible UFOs over the volcanic summit. The witness is a memebr of the Regional Civil Defense Committee and took the photo with a Sagem X-7 cell phone.

To researcher Anthony Choy, this evidence is significant, since a similar photo was taken last week in the vicinity of the Ubinas Volcano, belonging to the same volcanic system as the Chachani, the difference being that the latter is presently dormant.

[Images at: <http://tinyurl.com/ewxs7>]

Credits:

Dr. Anthony Choy  
Diario =93Correo de Arequipa=94  
Julio Berlanga, Enigmas Per=FA.  
Fotograf=EDa =A9 Narciso Delgado Cabello

Translation =A9 Scott Corrales Institute of Hispanic Ufology (IHU)  
Special thanks to Ana Luisa Cid

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 13:17:21 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:29:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 22:26:42 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site -  
>> Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

>><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

>>15 June 2006

>>[Several images at site]

>>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake  
>>by Dirk Vander Ploeg

<snip>

>The back and forth sideways motion of the  
>UFO relative to the background in the four consecutive photos  
>and the fact that the UFO has a similar shape to Rex Heflin's  
>1965 UFO are all consistent with a smaller model being suspended  
>and swinging at the end of a thin fishing line.

Here, embedded in an otherwise reasonable comment, is the most  
extraordinary non sequitur. No need to highlight it.

>If Piotr Cielebias of the NOL-Eastern European UFO Journal was  
>sent unedited copies of these four photos, he may be able to  
>check the date and/or time stamp of these four digital camera  
>JPG files to see if my suspicions are justified.

Let's hope he can. The amount of information presented is almost  
zero. No names, no background, no interviews, site measurements,  
weather data etc. This does not yet qualify as a case. It's a  
pictorial rumour.

<snip>

>This large and rapidly growing collection of mostly unexciting  
>UFO pictures raises a question that we and the skeptical world  
>cries out to be answered. Is there even a single UFO photo in  
>the public domain, either from the flying saucer era of the  
>1940s and 1950s or from the present, that we can present with  
>absolute confidence to the Doubting Thomases of this world as  
>compelling physical evidence or proof that at least some UFOs  
>are a new phenomenon or to show that some UFOs can only have an  
>extraterrestrial/supernatural explanation since all other  
>prosaic ones were ruled out?

No. But this is the case with all types of evidence. There is no  
photo case, no radar case, no eyewitness case that any Doubting  
Thomas (or Doubting John) is compelled to be convinced by. There  
are however some intriguing cases in all categories that some  
reasonable people find persuasive.

>If not, by continuing to embrace all the latest pictures of  
>alleged UFOs as possible new evidence that UFOs are "real", we

>are only deluding ourselves.

Fair warning, but I don't see a rush to embrace these pictures -  
not on this List.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 06:59:59 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:30:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers - Nielsen

>From: Eugene Frison <[eugene.frison.nul](mailto:eugene.frison.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates List <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:23:58 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Not All UFOs Are Flying Saucers

<snip>

>I don't know if you're being genuine (doesn't seem like it) when  
>you're replying or if you're just amusing yourself by twisting  
>things around but I've got better things to do than engage in  
>word games with you.

>Because when it comes down to it, I really don't care if you  
>want to believe "some UFOs are ET spaceships" or not! Knock  
>yourself out!

Thanks Eugene. It's okay. I know it doesn't matter whether I  
have a hand in convincing you or you convince me. It's the open  
dialogue that's important. In fact, the greatest fear of open  
communication is that each of us might be changed. I choose  
change over being in a rut. And none of us humans have to fear  
being changed at our fundamental core.

I agree that an open, objective mind is most times best; as  
objective as is possible, to be sure. If one is interested in  
UFOlogy for its own sake, conclusions take on a lesser role.  
That is, when compared to others who are interested in solid  
answers born of conclusions, statistically significant, to be  
taken seriously.

Sincerely, I wish you well, with loads of luck, in all your  
pursuits! As for me, I'll continue to support conclusions  
including some UFO's are under ET control. For now.

Only the best!

Rick

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 11:05:30 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:21:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:54:07 -0300  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>Martin, Victor,

>My only reason for posting was to bring to your attention the  
>seeming difference in profile of the object as to that of a real  
>train wheel and the ratio between the flange and the "run width"  
>as it used to be called when I was a brakeman 42 years ago-or  
>just about the time of Heflin's photograph. I recognize as well  
>that a model wheel would not likely be as precise as the real  
>thing. But the flange does not stick straight down from the main  
>part of the wheel but curves away from the run at an angle then  
>curves into the flange. This facilitates several things such as  
>riding through switch points, taking curves without the deafening  
>screeching being worse than it is, to enable deliberate  
>derailing devices and to prevent derailing by rocks and snow  
>and turns etc. The flange has a definite ratio to the run.

>Here's a URL that shows the way a wheel is constructed  
>mathematically. There is a science involved:

><http://www.apta.com/about/committees/press/bulletin/1998-1.cfm>

>But that might be a refinement of what was on the trucks 38  
>years before this paper.

>Don Ledger

Thanks Don, (see below for JSE imaging link and why)

I think the point you alluded to that toy wheels and actual  
train wheels are probably different, substantially applies in  
this particular case!

The tracks are also different so a different design is warranted  
in that regard too... the two mating halves are also different.  
The weight/physics requirements are also different.

If you look at Heflin #1 you can make out what appears to be a  
floating dot (over to the right side of the object) with a  
slight ascending glow to it: perhaps the cut end of a  
monofilament wire...

You can also see some dark "flaring up structures" coming off  
either side which also hints of a loop like attachment on either  
side of the object. One might infer that the dot/ascending glow  
is part of that very attachment means (knot?).

If one looks for a loop and not a straight line ascending from

the object, much more is understood. A wire can then be seen going through that loop at a higher portion of the photo (not in this blow up) coming from two different directions... Therefore, a single wire doesn't apply to the Heflin case.

You can actually see these structures without enhancements, but the enhancement do help in pointing out where it is one should be looking.

look at the blow up of Heflin #1 located near the bottom half of the article... copy and paste the link below... etc. You can then select a crop from Adobe Reader and dump it into any photo enhancement Software you might wish... try embossing and contrasting changes, etc... have fun. :) If more people see this on their own it is much more impressive ... there's a lot to be said for self discovery.

See the .pdf file:

<http://tinyurl.com/kmdvr>

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:33:15 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:28:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 14:12:50 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site - Hamilton,  
>>Ontario, Canada  
>><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>  
>>15 June 2006

>>[Several images at site]

>>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake by Dirk Vander Ploeg

>snip

>I don't like it. Why no zoomed shots. Perhaps there are but they  
>weren't published. What happened to the thick dissipating con-  
>trail in the first two, not evident in the next two. The strata  
>in the clouds changes as well. How much time elapsed. There is  
>more artifacting around the object than around other objects in  
>the pics, but there again that could be due to some aura around  
>the object which is common enough.

>His reasons for not alerting others to the object is a bit weak.

The extreme pixilation around each of the photographs is very  
suspicious. This same type of pixilation occurs along the sky  
and tree line?

The shots need to be retaken using the same camera/settings. If  
the same pixilation is seen or not seen along this sky/tree  
interface this could sway my evaluation of this artifacting and  
place it within some form of process evaluation.

Perhaps this is normal along striking interfaces of color, line,  
and contrast depending upon what may have already been done with  
them.

Perhaps the images presented have already been manipulated with  
software?

Perhaps this is to be expected from the normal performance of  
the camera. Therefore, I'd like to know if these are the raw  
images as well.

Since they hadn't mentioned what type of camera was used, this  
is also cause for concern... perhaps fearing replication.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:51:31 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:31:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution - Golubik

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 08:46:30 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>From: Kathy Kasten <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:10:34 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:39:42 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: Robo-Sapiens The New (R)Evolution

>>Normally, I think it is a waste of band width to comment on  
>>someone's message. But, I find your writing style fun to read  
>>and your messages interesting. In my opinion, not the usual  
>>droning on.

>I agree 100%. My only criticism of this List is that some people  
>who post here seem to really like to listen to themselves talk.  
>As you say, they drone on and on, sometimes eventually making a  
>point, sometimes not. When I first started writing  
>professionally I had good editors who always said, "boil it  
>down!" Don't use ten words when it can be said just as well in  
>three. You will note that my posts here are usually only a few  
>paragraphs at most. I feel like many posters must have learned  
>to write from old Russian novelists!

>Bob Shell

I also agree and won't get side-tracked any further into  
needless back and forth side tracking. I'm learning to ignore  
certain types who are quick to selectively misrepresent your  
views by regurgitating them back with a self-imposed guise...  
with a malevolent calculation that others hadn't read an earlier  
post.

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**



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## We've Got This Wrong

From: **Stuart Miller** <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 18:15:58 +0100 (BST)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 07:38:55 -0400  
Subject: We've Got This Wrong

Space.com has just published a not very interesting piece on UFOs:

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/3o27>

But a significant event occurred for me as I read it. It was one of those experiences where you might read something many times over the years and then for some reason you read it once more and it suddenly takes on a different perspective. I am referring to this paragraph from the piece:

"And after all those years, as the saying goes, UFOs remain a riddle inside a mystery wrapped in an enigma. Why so? For one, the field is fraught with hucksterism. It's also replete with blurry photos and awful video. But then there are also well-intentioned and puzzled witnesses."

It was the reference to hucksterism that did it and it was probably because I was reading this within what might loosely be called a scientific framework, namely the Space.com web site. And I thought, "You steaming hypocrite".

To be fair to Leonard David, the author, if you were to ask any Ufologist if this was an accurate statement, to a man or woman they would all agree. They would agree without even giving the matter any serious thought. We know it to be true because... well it is, and because we're always being reminded it's true by our more learned and experienced elders. Hucksterism appeared the very moment Ufology appeared in the shape of the triumvirate of Scully/Newton and Dr. G and it went on to produce a prodigious list of successors. So we take the matter for granted and never give it any real serious thought, because it's easier that way.

But two points come to mind. The first is that in the strict sense, it isn't true. Ufology attracted, almost from the very beginning, a slimy collection of dysfunctional, lying, arrogant, smarmy, stupid, utterly revolting reptiles masquerading as men doing the honourable and decent thing in the defence of their marvellous country; namely Rick Doty and his crew. And in the course of protecting their country from the scourge of whatever enemy they dreamed up in their chronic little minds, they played with Ufology as a cat plays with a mouse. So they put out lies and blackmailed or coerced others to do the same. This isn't hucksterism in the sense that we mean; this is disinformation and misdirection. These people were manipulated stooges or paid informers. Sure, there have been a number of glory seeking independent individuals who have trod the path but I would argue that they have been in the minority. And I would also argue that disinfo plants don't count.

On the other hand, it might be helpful to take a gander at The Saviour Of Ufology, namely science, to see what's happened there, safe in the knowledge that it is a subject that will have only been lightly brushed by any "official" meddling. But oh dear, what do we find when we look? Google "Withdrawn Scientific Papers" and watch as 7,530,000 hits come up. Then Google "UFO Hucksters" and stand back aghast as 900 hits appear. Tsk tsk; seems science is riddled with lying, cheating bastards who wish

to deceive the public, their employers and anything else with a pulse. So let's take that paragraph I quoted above and play with just some of the words from a scientific context:

"And after all those years, as the saying goes, science remains a riddle inside a mystery wrapped in an enigma. Why so? For one, the field is fraught with hucksterism. It's also replete with dishonest individuals and serious financial irregularities. But then there are also well-intentioned and puzzled scientists."

Seems fair and balanced to me.

Stuart Miller

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Space.com Article Response

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 13:35:43 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:07:52 -0400  
Subject: Space.com Article Response

On June 21 Leonard David wrote to me about his upcoming article:

-----

It seems that flying saucers are here to stay.

SPACE.com talks to top (credible) researchers in the field of UFOology to find out what's the latest thinking on how real this phenomenon is today and what "breakthroughs" are needed to set >society straight on possible visitors from afar.

But why is it that after decades this field is fraught with snake oil salesmen and women, with seemingly precious little to >show scientifically that UFOs are worth keeping an eye on?

How best to proceed from here...?

Any thoughts you could share, I'd very much like to add them to this story...

-----

My response on the same day as his message:

-----

You didn't say what your time scale on this is, but I presume you want my comments yesterday.

Anyway, I might point out that the phrase "snake oil salesmen and women" might be considered non-PC since most women are not snake oil salesmen or sales-persons.

If you publish a full frame copy of photo 1 or 2 by the Trents then you can credit them.

If you publish only the blowup with non of the background scenery I suppose you can credit me, but please also add my web site address so anyone can find the "rest of the picture."

As for UFOs in general, the stated opinion of serious skeptics is that all sightings which cannot be explained in terms of conventional, if rare, phenomena do not have enough information to allow for identification. The alternative opinion of serious researchers, who also happen to be skeptical, by the way, is that some cases have "more than enough" information for identification if identification were possible. What prevents identification is credible, clearly reported information that conflicts with what would be expected of known phenomena. (The argument over UFO data can get right down to the basic question of epistemology or, how do we learn anything or how is science done.) I have a number of such cases on my web site. I have also written an article called Prosaic Explanations: the Failure of UFO Skepticism, which discusses the non-science or nonsense that results from glib explanations. When I discovered that explanations published by skeptics or debunkers were often provably wrong, I became "skeptical of the skeptics." If all cases could be convincingly explained, then I wouldn't be interested. Note: one may not be able to determine whether or

not a particular proposed explanation is correct. However, one can determine for himself whether or not a particular explanation is convincing.

Consider for example the November, 1986 Japan Airlines Flight 1628 (Boeing 747 jumbo freighter) sighting of Alaska that was investigated in early 1987 by the FAA. In January, 1987 CSICOP published "the" explanation: extraterrestrial bodies were involved, Mars and Jupiter. After the investigation was completed it became apparent that Mars and Jupiter had nothing to do with the sighting. So CSICOP changed the explanation: it was now moonlight reflected from clouds. However, when compared with the details of the sighting, this explanation, too, fell apart. Complete story is at my web site:

<http://brumac.8k.com>.

Why "precious little to show scientifically?" Obviously there is not a simple answer but part of it is reluctance of the scientific community to support such research. And why this reluctance? IMHO largely a result of "TRADITION." Tradition set by the Air Force in the early years when they publicly stated that everything was under control, they were investigating and finding nothing that couldn't be explained. Read at my web site "Legacy of the Year of the UFO" which is a story about what happened in 1952, when the AF more or less levelled with the FBI but not the American people. (They told the FBI that top AF officials were seriously considering "interplanetary ships".) Because the AF was assumed to have some credibility in UFO investigation the scientific community did not get involved. Few people knew of the actual unexplainable cases compiled by the AF. Then when Condon in 1969 wrote the conclusion to the "Condon Study" at U. Colorado he said nothing "ET" had been found in 21 years of investigation and he expected nothing would be found and there was no evidence of a threat so the AF should get out of it. And the AF did in late '69. But the tradition had been set. There is nothing to UFOs.

This tradition even played a role in the publication of the only (so far as I know) UFO sightings that were discussed in the open refereed scientific literature, the New Zealand sightings of Dec. 1978. I wrote a short article/letter that was published by Applied Optics, even though the editor was of the opinion that people who study UFOs are "99/44 100ths percent kooks and nuts." Later I tried to respond to an article published in the Journal of Terrestrial and Atmospheric Physics. That article was based on newspaper reports of the sightings and proposed that the sightings were a result of mirage effects. Since I had thoroughly investigated the NZ sightings to the extent of going there and interviewing witnesses, studying the color movie film that was obtained and analyzing the radar detections, I knew that mirage effects had nothing to do with the sightings. I wrote a letter to the editor explaining that mirages could not explain the sightings, but my paper was rejected by the referee as not containing real science (whereas the original article based on newspaper reports apparently did contain "real science.") This whole story also appears on my web site in an article entitled "Still In Default."

Well, I could say a lot more but this probably is already 500 words beyond anything you could put into your article.

I will close by saying that UFO studies will continue until all the old cases have either been explained or admitted to being unexplainable (meaning a residue of sightings that could be ET related) and/or until people stop seeing unexplainable UFO-like events throughout the world.

-----

David wrote his article and published the next day:

[http://www.space.com/news/060622\\_alien\\_encounters.html](http://www.space.com/news/060622_alien_encounters.html)

After reading the story I wrote to him:

---

Thanks for the message. Nice article. Not surprised that you give top billing to CSICOP/"Top 10 Encounters Debunked"

The debunker knows something... but not much about "flying saucers".

In the article on saucers we find:

-----

The story:

On June 24, 1947, the modern UFO era began when a man named Kenneth Arnold saw nine flying saucers moving at high speed near Mount Rainer, Washington. Soon others began reporting seeing similar UFOs, spawning a flap.

The real story:

The phrase "flying saucer," so familiar to Americans and UFO buffs, is the result of a reporters error. After interviewing Arnold about his sighting, a reporter from the Eastern Oregonian newspaper reported that Arnold saw round, aerial objects (in fact he said they were "crescent shaped"). Arnold stated that the objects "flew erratic, like a saucer if you skip it across the water" not that what he saw resembled an actual saucer. Yet that "saucer" interpretation stuck, prompting many eyewitnesses to repeat (and hoaxers to duplicate) Arnolds nonexistent description. This strongly shows the role of suggestion in UFO sightings; as skeptic Marty Kottmeyer asks, "Why would extraterrestrials redesign their craft to conform to [the reporters] mistake?"

Further reading:

Robert Carroll. The Skeptics Dictionary. Available at:

<http://www.skeptdic.com/saucers.html>.

-----

I note first of all that the debunker hasn't proposed an explanation for Arnold's sighting.

Next I would point out that the claim that Arnold did not report saucer shaped objects is only partially correct: they weren't perfectly circular. Instead, according to the drawing he provided for the air force they had circular front halves and sort of convex pointed rears. You can see the drawing at my web page.

But on the the other hand, there were lots of reports that were not the classic "saucer" shape, and i recent yers we have been plagued with silent flying triangles (vide the police chase case in Ohio/Indiana I think in Jan of 2000). I have had people tell me directly of their experience seeing a triangular shape, silent, sometimes with lights at the corners, pass overhead blocking out the stars.

Anyway, the ending question is just plain stupid in the context of all the details of "saucer sightings" that include radar detections, film, multiple witnesses, ground and air witnesses, etc.

The Air Force knew as early as the fall of 1947 that "saucers" had dynamic capabilities that exceeded our own craft. The Air Force did not ask the FBI to investigate (yes, the REAL X-files) because they thought their pilots and other witnesses were hallucinating "saucers."

Read The Legacy Of 1952 at my web site.

Read the complete story of the Arnold sighting and numerous attempts at explanation over the years at my web site.

Read about the New Zeland sightings of Dec. 1978 which were multiple witness with tape-recordings and film and air and ground radar involved. Read my recently posted study of the Iranian Jet Case of Sept 19, 1976 - F-4 jet electronics temporarily disabled by a bright object they were chasing. This case is featured in the recent MUFON journals.



[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: UFO Hacker Gary McKinnon Interview - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 13:02:26 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:22:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Hacker Gary McKinnon Interview - Shell

>From: Nigel Watson <[nigelwatson1.nul](mailto:nigelwatson1.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 11:44:06 +0100  
>Subject: UFO Hacker Gary McKinnon Interview

>My exclusive interview with UFO Hacker, Gary McKinnon, for Wired  
>appears at:

><http://tinyurl.com/gchzz>

>Additional comments about this interview are posted at:

>[http://digg.com/science/UFO Hacker talks about what he found](http://digg.com/science/UFO_Hacker_talks_about_what_he_found)

>A longer article about Gary McKinnon also appears in the July  
>2006 edition of UFO Magazine.

>From comments so far generated by this interview people either  
>regard Gary McKinnon as a saint or a sinner - and those are the  
>polite reactions!

Well, I'm just glad he was able to download all the verifiable,  
unimpeachable proof he needs to back up his wild stories before  
he was caught. You know, all the high-res images and blueprints  
and coded government emails that show he isn't just some  
attention-hungry stoner making all of this stuff up. Oh, wait...

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Scheldroup

From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:54:14 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:26:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Scheldroup

>From: Viktor Golubik [Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 08:38:26 EDT  
>Subject: The Truth About Heflin

><snip>

>I believe that the strings I detect in two of the three photos  
>would have a better chance of being presented or dismissed with  
>a far superior bit depth and scan line resolution - both with  
>the original and comparative test photos.

String detected or shall I say faint non-contiguous line.

I found a second line/string at the opposite quadrant, while I  
couldn't seem to scan it in image size was huge... and the range  
of gray scale was to deep and wide, but I tried really really  
hard. <g>

The third photo has what appeared to me two strings... be  
working on it and this one over \*again\* this weekend.

Finally, I hope to document my steps depicting the partial fuzzy  
line, so to follow up with some equivalent techniques leading up  
to consistency of reproduction.

Well now I have to run to the kitchen so to make a Sicilian  
pizza crust with help in my bread machine.

Cheers,

Source: <http://tinyurl.com/rq5vt>

Fig. 1. First photograph of Heflin sighting (Heflin Photo 1).

<http://www.frappr.com/ufoupdates/photo/2264177>

John

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Have We Offended Them? - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 13:21:58 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:30:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: Have We Offended Them? - Shell

>Source: The Age - Melbourne, Australia

><http://tinyurl.com/ndkl4>

>June 23, 2006

>Have We Offended Them?  
>Jim Schembri

>Actually, where have all the UFOs gone?

>Earth used to be, like, the hottest place for aliens to visit.

I don't know what this dude is talking about. There are more UFO photos and sightings these days than ever. Every camera-phone photo somebody takes of their dog has a half dozen UFOs floating around in the background.

In fact, it's becoming a real problem, as Nick Balaskas notes in another thread. There just isn't the time or money available to properly analyze the steaming pile of information coming in. As a result, the general public is doing a kind of quick triage on the stuff, using what expertise they have to divide the pile up into 'Photoshop/CGI fake', 'Blurfo of a bird', or 'unknown'.

Unfortunately, while the quantity of UFO material seems to be increasing, the quality is staying pretty much the same. Photos are still mostly showing little blurry or pixillated specks in the sky. Half the time photographers will say they didn't even notice anything when they took the picture. And thanks to cheap imaging programs, even little kids can easily cook up some good-looking fakes. Not tremendously useful.

Well, maybe one of these days we'll reach a kind of 'critical mass' and some good, high-quality cases will arise from all the noise. It shouldn't work that way, though. That would suggest a heavy social-psychological component to the phenomenon.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 13:26:37 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:33:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 09:58:48 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site -  
>> Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

>><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

>>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake  
>>by Dirk Vander Ploeg

>Further to my earlier post, Ray Stanford asks me to forward the  
>following:

>-----

>Compare the shadow of the tree across the lake on that white  
>house. Although measurement accuracy is constrained by the  
>fuzziness of the images, I have determined that, very roughly,  
>the sun changes angle by a minimum of five, and, more likely six  
>degrees. Using sun position change as 15 degrees per hour, five  
>degrees of change equals 20 minutes of difference in time  
>between photol and photo 4.

>Of course those figures should be considered quite preliminary  
>and, done in haste, will require a bit of adjustment with more  
>accurate measurements. However, I think that's a pretty good  
>'ballpark figure" of sun angle change, and, interestingly, it  
>agrees with my earlier estimate of time lag, based upon my  
>experience of observing high-level wind alteration of jet  
>trails.

>...the above figures are based on actual measurements of changes  
>in the length of shadow of the large tree in front of the white  
>house, as measured from the top of the tree to where the shadow  
>meets the base of the white house.

And is it just me, or is the bad focus on the saucer a little  
problematic?

Look at that depth-of-field.

Everything from the nearby bushes to the trees way across the  
lake are sharp as a tack, yet the saucer remains fuzzy. Maybe it  
can be attributed to the motion of the object. Maybe. But the  
blur doesn't seem motion-related.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe -

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 15:10:06 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:35:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe -

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 16:20:59 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

>>From: Cory Cameron <[corycameron.510.nul](mailto:corycameron.510.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 10:20:34 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

>>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 09:39:07 -0400  
>>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe

>>>Source: Rocky Mountain News - Denver, Colorado, USA

>>><http://tinyurl.com/odu5p>

>>>June 17, 2006

>>>It's Often Too Easy To Exploit Our Willingness To Believe  
>>>Linda Seebach  
>>>Rocky Mountain News - Opinion

>>>Michael Shermer, skeptic-in-chief, has a new book titled  
>>>Science Friction: Where the Known Meets the Unknown, about all  
>>>the ways in which people deceive themselves or allow themselves  
>>>to be deceived by irrational beliefs.

<snip>

>>Human sightings and testimonials are one thing because they may  
>>be prone to falsehood but what happens when these cases are  
>>combined with photographs and film that are not touch ups and  
>>support the testimony of the eye-witnesses?

>>Of course. Then there's Occam's Razor, which I like to apply to  
>>the bulk of witness experiences. It's impossible to support the  
>>notion that everybody, everywhere is always wrong about what  
>>they experience and describe. Always?

I think it helps if the complete witness interview process could  
be heard, published (written out), and viewed more often.  
Usually, UFO cases are reported as summaries. A little less  
intervention by ufologist and a lot more real testimony is much  
less likely to be misunderstood and reinterpreted. The real  
value is then made apparent. Having the interviewer becoming  
more prepared and responsible in the process isn't a bad outcome  
either.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:38:15 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:38:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 15:12:50 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>BTW - Please let it be known that I have two cameras and had  
>>already offered one of them to both David and Martin early on.

>I beg your pardon? I genuinely squirm to have to do this Viktor,  
>but you should be much more careful of what you say. I hunted  
>back through saved mails to locate this mysterious "offer". I  
>finally found it in an email on June 05. Here is the relevant  
>paragraph:

>"I like our sometimes heated exchanges. I don't take it  
>personally. But I love to argue... Italian/Croatian  
>background... what can I say. I'll probably have an extra  
>camera. I won two on ebay. Perhaps David might like one. I'm  
>sure we can lick this thing together."

>So in point of fact you did not offer me a camera (I am on the  
>other side of world after all), and on present evidence I would  
>have to say I wonder if you really offered it to David either.

Quite right! I didn't remember receiving an "offer" either, went  
back through my e-mails from Viktor, the last one being dated  
June 03. All Viktor has to say in this e-mail is that he had the  
cameras and film on\_order.

So I didn't even receive a "perhaps David might like one" sort-  
of offer.

However, by Viktor incorrectly stating "I have two cameras and  
had already offered one of them to both David and Martin early  
on," he again makes it sound as if he is the only one who values  
experimentation while we somehow don't or are dodging it.

This has gotten to be a very annoying one-note refrain on  
Viktor's part. Martin and I have actually spent some time  
measuring details in the Heflin photos in order to frame  
arguments. Martin, e.g., first noted that the power lines in the  
photos could be used to test film resolution for threadlike  
objects. I did an experiment on thread visibility with my  
digital camera in order to argue that a thread might very well  
be visible if it were there. (From various lines of argument, I  
also noted that the Polaroid film and my digital camera probably  
had about the same resolution.) I provided Viktor with details  
of the Heflin sighting and the camera that Viktor thought he was  
the first to think of when they were in the literature that

Viktor never bothered to read, such as Hartmann's writeup in the Condon report.

Currently I'm trying to recreate the Heflin photos in a 3D raytracer in order to determine such basics as exact camera positions within the van, likely distances from a hoax model, angles of tilt of such a model, shading, etc. All of this is relevant to various scenarios of hoaxing. (E.g., it would be a waste of time and money taking test Polaroid photos of a model inside the car or suspended from the car window, if the photo details don't support this.) Martin and I have done this and other legwork while Viktor keeps theorizing and lecturing us.

>Anyway, please can we forget all this? And rather than another  
>long and defensive riposte, might I respectfully suggest that  
>your time could be better spent?

I have had conversations with Viktor on other things and like him. He was also very generous with his time and providing me with materials. But he is beginning to get under my skin with his repeated grandstanding on this Heflin redux investigation. I want to work with him, not against him, but he needs to tone down his "Italian/Croatian" style a couple notches.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 17:22:04 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:45:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Golubik

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 20:20:58 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: UFO Flight Characteristics?

>Are there different observable flight characteristics between  
>the different types of UFOs? Can the types of UFO's be  
>classified by flight behaviors? In other words, do discs fly  
>differently than cigars; do spheres fly different than  
>triangles, and so on? Or do all UFOs fly the same?

>Is there a credible classification of UFO's by shape, compared  
>to corresponding flight characteristics?

I think if more emphasis was rightly placed upon such issues we would have a more confident answer. Informed interviewers would be better able to articulate questions and react to subtleties. Falling like a leaf does nothing for me especially if it's repeated over and over again without follow up. Asking a witness to try and sculpt the shape of the UFO with a piece of clay (especially if they had seen different sides), asking the witness to move the object around with his hands the way it moved around in the sky would be novel (a better way to infer actual dynamics/physics), and asking witnesses to describe colors would be better served if you presented them with colors from which to choose from. All this should be routine and would do wonders for my protracted cumulative understanding: My hopes that something useful could now be linked with something solid... brought forth from a consistent pattern of believably answered questions.

Co-operation and data collection methods haven't been systematically controlled and outlined so that comparison here would equal a comparison there. You're more apt to find yourself having to flip open every old case to rediscover the real particulars that should have otherwise had data already squeezed from them. Sometimes the direct questions you wanted to have answered have, instead, to be foggily recaptured from some faded memory or inferred from a series of indirectly recorded questions.

Here's a good one in point: When the chief Roswell witness was asked how big an area the debris field was... no one asked him how densely the field was occupied with debris?

Was it thinly spread, sparsely spread, can you draw me a picture, where some of the pieces blowing in the wind?

Did you fold any of it up?

The density would give you a good feel for how to measure the size of the object... Aren't we after that type of data?

Having the answers to just some of these obvious questions could have easily addressed/settled a huge unknown between Balloon-like Vs. UFO-like etc.

Instead, the case get's dragged out for years because of lack of insight or for lack of a few properly posed questions If this

Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Golubik

guy saw a crashed UFO, I'd be all over him with questions! So the costs resulting from poor questioning is immense!

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 18:41:55 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:50:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 09:58:48 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site -  
>> Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

>><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

>>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake  
>>by Dirk Vander Ploeg

>Further to my earlier post, Ray Stanford asks me to forward the  
>following:

-----

>Compare the shadow of the tree across the lake on that white  
>house. Although measurement accuracy is constrained by the  
>fuzziness of the images, I have determined that, very roughly,  
>the sun changes angle by a minimum of five, and, more likely six  
>degrees. Using sun position change as 15 degrees per hour, five  
>degrees of change equals 20 minutes of difference in time  
>between photol and photo 4.

>Of course those figures should be considered quite preliminary  
>and, done in haste, will require a bit of adjustment with more  
>accurate measurements. However, I think that's a pretty good  
>'ballpark figure' of sun angle change, and, interestingly, it  
>agrees with my earlier estimate of time lag, based upon my  
>experience of observing high-level wind alteration of jet  
>trails.

>...the above figures are based on actual measurements of changes  
>in the length of shadow of the large tree in front of the white  
>house, as measured from the top of the tree to where the shadow  
>meets the base of the white house.

-----

>Ray emphasises that this measurement is conservative and that 20  
>mins should be regarded as a minimum.

Amusing pictures. Clearly the sky changes hardly at all between  
1 and 2.

A big change between 2 and 3 and a smaller change between 3 and  
4, It appears that 1 and 2 were taken from the same location,  
the only difference being the pointint direction. The UFO moved  
to the right and the camera FOV (field of view) also moved to  
the right, but by a smaller amount.

Then for photo 3, comparing the nearby (200 ft?) posts with the  
distant (1000 ft?) trees it appears that the camera was at a  
location some feet to the right of where it was in 1 and 2.  
Photo 4 was taken from a location even farther to the right.

Photo 3 was taken from a location about 21% closer to the posts than photo 2.

Photo 4 was taken from a location a few percent closer than that. There was time between 3 and 4 as shown by the cloud change and the change in the reflective nature of the lake.

I believe I see the tree shadow mentioned by Ray. What seems to be the top of the shadow seems to be higher on building at the right side (garage?) in photo 3 than in photo 2.

One would need much better resolution to determine the change in height with accuracy. Ray could be right. But regardless of the limitations in measuring the change in the tree image the suggestion that there was many minutes between 2 and 3 is clearly correct based on the sky.

As for the image of the UFO itself, looks somewhat like the Heflin or Trent or other shape seen many times before. Pixelation in the images as presented prevents a detailed analysis.

Incidentally, the change in lighting between 2 and 3 could be a result of changes in cloud cover, with more sun getting through in 3 than in 2.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Another UFO Photographed Over Peruvian Volcano

From: Greg Boone <[Evolbaby.nul](mailto:Evolbaby.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:47:07 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:53:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Another UFO Photographed Over Peruvian Volcano

>From: Scott Corrales <[lornis1.nul](mailto:lornis1.nul)>  
>To: "[inexplicata.nul](mailto:inexplicata.nul)" <[inexplicata.nul](mailto:inexplicata.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 06:47:39 -0400  
>Subject: Another UFO Photographed Over Peruvian Volcano

>The Journal of Hispanic Ufology  
>June 23, 2006

>Source: Ana Luisa Cid  
>Date: 06.22.06

>Photo taken with a cellphone by Narciso Delgado Cabello from >the  
>Salinas Huito sector of Arequipa (Peru) on Saturday, June 17,  
>2006 at 8:00 hrs.

<snip>

Outstanding. Primarily the use of a cellphone camera at that!

Millions and millions of these devices worldwide and sooner or later something is going to give. In this case a reported pic of a UFO.

One day if we're lucky an abductee will be slinging their cell phone along and we'll really get a surprise.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 17:07:52 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:56:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Fri, 16 Jun 2006 14:21:19 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Thu, 15 Jun 2006 09:36:53 +0100  
>>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>>I can't see the comparison matching the Heflin photos matching a  
>>>>model train wheel. The flange on the model is shorter than that  
>>>>in evidence in the photos.

Right! In fact, the "flange" in the Heflin photos is way too wide for a typical train wheel. If the main model train wheel was an inch in diameter, the flange would be about 1.38 inches (by my measurements), or about a centimeter wider in diameter. The width of the flange around the rim would be half a centimeter or 5 millimeters. Think about that for a moment. The flanges on train wheels, however, tend to be little more than "nubs" to keep the main wheel on the track. It wouldn't need to be more than 2 or 3 mm wide at most.

>>The train wheel photos posted by John Scheldroup and Kyle King >>do not resemble the Heflin object, just as you say. The cross >>section drawing found by John is closer, though proportions >>still appear to be different by a few percent. More importantly >>there is no apparent evidence on the Heflin photos of the "hub" >>claimed by Scheldroup (on the basis of a digital artefact).

>>Since there's the presence of an off axis protrusions, as I've >>already pointed out, this cannot be dismissed so lightly. Train >>wheels have off axis protrusion... this is what allows them >>to be rotated with the proper engine torque. I believe David >>noticed this already too but hadn't tied it to the possibility >>of a train wheel.

No, this is not what I noticed. The discussion of the object possibly being elliptical had to do with measuring the ratio of widths of the very evident top part of the object, or "dome," and the bottom part, or "flange." Martin Shough and I were getting different ratios for photo #3 (he was doing his measurement indirectly, extrapolating the ratio from photo #1 while I was measuring directly).

None of this had anything to do with an off axis protrusion on the very tippy top that might serve as part of a drive mechanism on a toy train. I can see how some people might interpret the



lighting on photo #1 to support this, but I have yet to hear any comment on photo #3, which actually shows some of the top of the object. There isn't the remotest hint of any sort of protrusion there. At the very least, we should see a clear shadow from such a protrusion (the dome is so shadowed on the bottom rim), but the top instead looks evenly lit.

<snip>

>Since, I was the one that pointed out the need for such tests  
>(see below), the only thing you can do is Compare and Correct  
>the current images for distortion before proceeding to  
>measurement. Doing that reliably is hard work and requires an  
>understanding of the variables at play. As an example: Martin  
>was using strings on far away telephone poles to infer  
>resolution of strings at close proximity to the camera. Others  
>were using digital cameras. This shows a complete lack of  
>understanding of the depth of field, focus space, film  
>saturation, film speed, lens characteristics, and the need to  
>use the actual camera and film... all of which I had pointed  
>out. Now he's making it appear that this is all mapped out and  
>reinventing himself again... in the process... slowly turning  
>over and rolling... this has been one of the more entertaining  
>aspects of this case and is a marvelous example of human  
>behavior in a cornered box.

What Martin and I were doing was trying to demonstrate what the actual Heflin Polaroid photos were capable of resolving. So we used wires and a road white line as test examples. Then we compared them to the resolution of various threads I photographed with my digital camera that were still easily detectable. They were about the same angular thickness. I also argued from film resolution data provided by Polaroid that my 5 Megapixel digital camera had a comparable resolution to Heflin's Polaroid film. All this pointed to the question of whether typical suspension threads might be detectable in the photos if they were actually there.

Originally I took pictures of the threads to demonstrate that they could still be detected even if they were less than the angular size of resolution of the camera. This had to do with objections previously raised (by Bob Shell I think) that threads could be detected at all since they were too thin. I pointed out that this wasn't true, that threads still cast shadows on the "film" that were still detectable even if the thread itself was much narrower than the "pixel element." This is true of the human eye as well as cameras. E.g., with my camera, I was still able to detect a dark hair only about 1/10th the angular size as the pixel element in my digital camera.

In other words, Martin and I were already doing various tests instead of making pronouncements about what or might not be resolvable in Heflin's photos. Of course, the original camera would be best for this. Nobody argues this. We're all aware that without a duplicate camera and film one can't perfectly reproduce various variables. (Even then, one can't perfectly reproduce such things as the original lighting, development time, temperature, all of which affect the exposure.

Frankly I resent your repeated condescending remarks about how only you understand these problems. Now you consider us "entertainment" and a "marvelous example of human behavior in a cornered box." No Victor, we were arguing actual data instead of continuously grandstanding. Photo experts went over these photos 40 years ago and did test shots. You are reinventing the train wheel and are free to do so. No harm in that. We await your results. Just stop claiming you are the first person to ever think of doing this and only you understand the problems. It's gotten, real, real old.

<big snip>

>The fact that the UFO is not in focus has been one of the  
>mysteries as compared with the surrounding... though this can  
>easily be explained without resorting to advanced  
>characteristics of the UFO:

>If the object was placed outside the focus enveloped (close  
>enough to the camera), as I've already pointed out... this has  
>just as much merit as any other hypothesis and is the more  
>likely. But, it must be ruled out first: This is the reason I

>bought the camera ... this is the only way to entertain the more  
>complex interplay of variables... by narrowing them down and  
>eliminating them! You can conjecture all you want... but the  
>meat of this case is in experimentation.

According to most people who have closely examined these photos,  
the UFO appears to be every bit as much in focus as other  
objects in the photos.

The side view mirror in photos 2 & 3 is very sharply in focus  
and a model would be at about the same exact distance as the  
mirror, so why wouldn't the model also be in focus? (The object  
can't be inside the window, because it is sunlit, and can't be  
closer than an inch or two outside the window, or it would  
cast a shadow on the window. This places it at least as far out  
as the mirror.)

Again, you aren't the first person to think of these things. The  
fact that near objects could be in focus in addition to distant  
ones was an important part of arguments advanced 40 years ago  
that the photos could be hoaxed.

<snip>

>The 3D stereo already hints of a near by object... and, at the  
>same time, suggests the improbability of him aligning up such  
>coincidences with a far away moving object (one of my first  
>posts).

No, not so improbable if the object was slowly moving and he was  
shifting photo positions to keep it centered. That would also  
reproduce what is seen and is consistent with Heflin's account  
of what happened.

As I've mentioned several times before, there is a second  
"coincidence" of position that is harder to account for in a  
hoax scenario than in Heflin's narrative. The object in photo 2  
and 3 has the exact same elevation angle (to within measurement  
error). That is easily accounted for in Heflin's narrative of  
the object seeming to gain in elevation as it moved away (photo  
3), but would require a very fortuitous set of circumstances of  
the model and/or camera heights being just right in the hoax  
scenario.

>The blur can also imply close proximity to the lens as  
>I've already pointed out on my first few postings.

You seem to be the only one claiming to see such focus blur. The  
fact that there isn't any such significant blur played an  
important role in arguments 40 years ago, since the camera  
apparently had such a large depth of field that near objects  
(i.e., the UFO and side view mirror) seemed every bit as sharp  
as much more distant objects, such as road lines, power poles,  
and cars.

>If strings  
>can be detected (see above) this is also consistent with an  
>object at close proximity. If we can see strings in two of the  
>photographs that's also of interest. If the support means looks  
>similar in both photographs, that also has interest level.

You are simply stating a truism here: if strings can be detected  
then this is obviously a hoax. So far, no one analyzing first-  
generation prints has seen any evidence of support strings.

>BTW - Please let it be known that I have two cameras and had  
>already offered one of them to both David and Martin early on.

Never happened. Victor's memory seems a little bad here. Please  
see my response to an accompanying post where Martin Shough also  
says he never received such an offer. Even if we had, what's the  
point? Is it again that only you recognize the value of test  
photos? Come on Victor. Knock off some of the attitude and give  
other people a little bit of credit.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 19:39:24 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:58:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:57:44 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 12:29:09 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>>UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>>>Source: Dirk Vander Ploeg's UFO Digest Site - Hamilton,  
>>> Ontario, Canada

>>><http://www.ufodigest.com/zywieckie-ufo.html>

>>>15 June 2006

>>>[Several images at site]

>>>Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake by Dirk Vander Ploeg

>><snip>

>>Hey, multiple photos! Just for fun, here are a couple of cross-eye stereo  
>>pairs, created as the guy slowly walked slightly forward and to the right  
>>as he took the pictures:

>><http://img237.imageshack.us/img237/9519/122tj.jpg>  
>><http://img187.imageshack.us/img187/6259/342pb.jpg>

>><snip>

>>Does anyone know the actual or claimed sequence of these photos?  
>>In the vertical order posted (and as numbered on Tim's pairs)  
>>the object would not be rising away into the sky but descending  
>>between #3 and #4.

>>Do we know that he slowly walked forward and to right, and not  
>>backwards to the left?

I gathered from the story that the guy and his son heard the whistling sound, went to a small beach on the lake, and started taking pictures. And the guy was walking forward, sort of in a trance, taking photos until he found himself actually standing in the water, taking photos even after the thing flew off. I suppose it's possible he zig-zagged as he walked, which would flip some of the photos in their stereo orientation. But I assumed that he walked forward in a relatively straight line, as evidenced by the trees and the change in the apparent size of the objects in the photos. As always, I could be wrong.

>>The clouds and trails appear to move away from the camera to the  
>>horizon between the two pairs - if the order is as suggested.

Yes. There's a very significant change in the sky between photos 1-2 and 3 and 4. Definitely not something that would be expected if he was walking forward, taking photos about as regular and

fast as his finger could push the button. Very problematic, and certainly not supportive of the story. It looks like 1 and 2 were taken together, then 3 much later (per the faint wisp of the remaining vapor trail), then 4 later than that, after the vapor trail was completely gone. How long would it take for that vapor trail to dissipate? 10 minutes? An hour?

The emphasis on and description of the physiological and psychological effects of the sighting are interesting to me in this regard from a possible "missing time" standpoint.

>If we knew even basic stuff that should be in any report - like  
>which way the camera is pointed and what the winds aloft were  
>like - there would be some way to check these things.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Analysing UFO Footage - Parr

From: Chris Parr <[Doodlethug.nul](mailto:Doodlethug.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 20:27:11 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 09:03:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Analysing UFO Footage - Parr

Hello Listers,

I have spent a full day analysing the evidence on UFOs on Youtube, and despite being drawn in by a piece of footage that I had to watch on 81 occasions, the characteristics of the object which had shape-shifting qualities, had eventually showed the characteristics of a potential balloon that was captured out of focus.

It had taken me 81 downloads of footage, yet I have to be objective and administer ufological objectivity.

I miss the valuable skills of Amy Herbert

Chris Parr UK

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 20:58:43 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 09:08:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:02:35 +0000  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:54:07 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

Hi Richard I love your style:) And I don't want to make this needlessly long.

Since you met me already I'm sure you can vouch for my steady and calm resolve. You also now that I didn't even bring up the Heflin case upon my visit until you had wondered why I hadn't. Well, argument is not a heated affair but filled with intrigue and the fair exchange of ideas. My family is a constant source for stimulating discussions. I welcome yours immensely.

>I find this whole model train wheel obsession quite amusing, but >we must let the techies do their thing. David Rudiak, Viktor >Golubik, and Martin Shough all strike me as quite sincere and >fair-minded, but I note that they have a hard time getting >together on basic technical data, much less overall research >methodology.

Well, coming from both an artistic and scientific background, I can understand your confusion. This is actually straight forward. It just requires work and sound planning. It will also make much more sense when you have the patience to ask me the right types of questions. I've already offered to explain some tuff. Just let me know when your ready...

- 1) The actual camera settings have to be determined first:
  - a) I've constructed a strobe to determine the lens shutter speeds at various camera settings.
  - b) I've designed a focusing layout to capture the depth of field.
  - c) The effect of focus has to determined as to it's effects on the Black and White setting and the FOV actually falling on the film frame.
  - d) The effects of the tensioning spring have to be determined as to it's impact on the automated shutter speed.

Now, I'm ready to take Heflin-like photos... Other people make it sound like... just take a photo and be done with it... this has to be done so that real progress can be made with real steps.

- 2) The current computer generated photos have to be corrected for lens aberration then fitted to the correct width to height rations actually found on the photos. I'm the only one to

discuss these aspects and can actually correct for the much more difficult one. I've demonstrated the technique on another case already and feel confident it can be done here as well.

By the way, Ann did confide in me recently that the JSE photos are cropped and this was just one of my reasons for underestimating the width of field below that calculated for the FOV of the lens. Martin... Martin... Martin... get with the program. >Just like all techies I have known in the past, they tend to >think that their photoanalytical skills provide a magic short-cut to truth without regard to witness information or thorough case investigation. Their motto might be, The Truth is In There >(in the pictures themselves) and I will find it, with which I >emphatically disagree. (I'm going to post this message, then >scurry for the bomb shelter.)

There's no magic just hard work. The end result may have already been previewed... just needs to be shown in a believable fashion. Many clarifying points can be extracted from the photos. It is also possible that the truth will also emerge. Like I said, this is not a waste of time either way.

>As I told Viktor in private (he didn't buy the argument), the >last thing a hoaxer using a model train wheel is likely to do is >to allow a skeptical TV producer to interview him in his home >and show him his model trains. That just makes no sense at all. >Further, as I have tried to point out a couple of the NICAP >investigators spent a lot of time in Heflin's home, got to know >him very well, and knew about all of his hobbies and interests. >Again, a hoaxer using a model train wheel would not likely be so >open about his interest in model trains.

Well, as I recall saying in private, we don't really know the real circumstances surrounding the visit. And, I also agreed that these were worthwhile questions.

>Finally, I am not aware that anyone has made an effort to >retrieve Dr. Robert Nathan's research papers on the case from >1965 and later. Maybe they are not available, I don't know, but >his work seems to be rather airily dismissed as unimportant. He >was not just some stumblebum amateur. I quote from two NASA >press releases:

>JPL, NASA, Aug. 9, 1966. JPL COMPUTER PROCESS BRIGHTENS > SURVEYOR MOON PICTURES. Re: the "sparkling success of >Surveyor I in taking television pictures of the Moon's surface. >These sharper prints are produced by a computerized system which >corrects distortion and improves resolution in original >photographs taken by television cameras. The system was >developed by Dr. Robert Nathan, who led the JPL video fdigital >(computer) data research for NASA. Robert Selzer was in charge >of Surveyor picture enhancement." (Is he--Selzer--not the guy >now re-examining the Heflin photos for the JSE paper?)

>JPL, NASA, Oct. 25, 1985. "[NASA] has presented an award of >\$20,000 to Dr. Robert Nathan of Jet Propulsion Laboratory for >significant scientific and technical contributions in the field >of imaging." The award was for his "Combined Technical >Contributions to Planetary and Biomedical Image Processing and >Scientific Data Analysis Techniques...In 1976, seeing the need >for more advanced technology, he developed techniques to reduce >computer time by [a] factor of 100 and established Very Large >Integrated Systems use at JPL and emerged as leader in VLIS >implementation."

>Nathan, who originally was very skeptical, found no evidence of >a string or hoax -- twice. In fact, all the techies can do to >resolve photo authenticity is find clearcut and unequivocal >evidence of a hoax. They cannot prove that a photo is genuine. >That sort of proof lies in the character and background >investigation and the preponderance of evidence. So the Truth is >not in the photois themselves, unless and only if the photo is a >demonstrable fake.

<snip>

Richard, technology has come a long way. How you perceive a string to be and how one actually shows up on film can be two quite different affairs. That's the source of my frustration with the other analyses. That's why actual tests with the camera have to be conducted. Isolated analyses of the film is just one



side of the coin. As, I've said before, the real scope of the problem is in making a convincing case. Demonstrating a possible solution... merging both halves.

A scientific endeavor has to show both sides of the equation. Not just present a presumed solution. To me, without this type of inclusivity, it would be tantamount to a falsification of the first order.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 23:14:31 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 09:11:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Maccabee

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:02:35 +0000  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:54:07 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>Nathan, who originally was very skeptical, found no evidence of  
>a string or hoax -- twice. In fact, all the techies can do to  
>resolve photo authenticity is find clearcut and unequivocal  
>evidence of a hoax. They cannot prove that a photo is genuine.  
>That sort of proof lies in the character and background  
>investigation and the preponderance of evidence. So the Truth is  
>not in the photois themselves, unless and only if the photo is a  
>demonstrable fake.

While appreciating all the technical arguments that have used up  
mondo bandwidth over the last month or so, I must say that  
Richard's comments above are the first I have seen that get to  
the "nub of the issue."

I often start my lectures on photo analysis with the statement  
"A photo a UFO does not make."

I then go on to point out that the BEST a photo can do FOR  
a witnesses is to act as an aide to the memory. (This often  
is the case for daylight photos but most often not for nighttime  
photos of lights.)

The worst a photo can do is contain evidence... clear  
evidence... of a hoax. One thing about a photo: you can't get  
anything out of it that isn't in it. Furthermore, it has been my  
experience that virtually everything in the photo such as a  
string or support can be detected by the experienced  
photoanalyst with the naked eye, although it may require a lot  
of searching and looking at it from various angles (holding the  
photo at varying angles to the eye). What the modern photo  
techniques can do is make obvious to the inexperienced observer  
what is detectable by the experienced analyst. This is why  
Spaulding's photo enhancements in the 1970's caused such an  
uproar. He claimed that his analysis had detected strings were  
no one had seen such before, including Nathan. Then I pressured  
Spaulding to improve his analysis to make these strings even  
more obvious. He came up with color contoured differential  
brightness analysis and sent me (and others) clearly obvious  
straight (slightly tilted) lines above the UO in the photos out  
the side window. However, upon further "pressure" to prove that  
these strings were in good copies of the original (Ralph Rankow  
prints made from negatives) his "strings" sort of faded out. I  
sent him blowups and requested their return after the analysis.  
For some reason when he applied his techniques to MY blowups  
(made by Rankow some 10 years before) he couldn't find such  
convincing evidence no matter how hard he tried (I guess).

His "strings" sort of faded out of the "picture"... and several years later he faded out of the "picture." Ultimately and others wondered if Spaulding had gotten "caught" in his first publicized hoax claim and then, to support his claim, had subsequently "hoaxed the hoax."

Had Spaulding's work been backed up by anyone else, Heflin's case would have bit the dust more than 25 years ago.

What the present researchers are finding out is the same thing that I discovered from years of studying the Trent case. I was given a hint by a lawyer:

A legal case is rarely based totally on the physical evidence because the defense can always find an "expert" to cast doubt on the physical evidence. Instead, the case is made on the circumstantial evidence.

In the Trent case there were arguments over how the Trent's would have done it. The most obvious was a model supported by the overhead wires. (Point 1: the clever hoaxers slipped up by letting the "audience" see the supports). Throwing a model had already been rejected by Hartmann of the Condon study by the time I got into the act in the early 70's. Furthermore, he could find no evidence of a string. Since my involvement there have been perhaps half a dozen concerted attempts to find evidence of a support (me, Sheaffer., Nathan (yes, he digitized the Trent negatives and searched diligently), a guy from Los Alamos. the Brooks Inst. of Photography in Santa Barbara and others).

However, for each failure to detect a hoax there was an explanation for the failure: e.g., they used a light colored thread that was invisible against the sky background, and so on.

The bottom line was that the photos had to evidence that proved it was real. The best one could do would be to try to argue how difficult it might have been (build a model, hang it from a thread, carefully chosen, or luckily chosen, to match the background, devise a story and stick with it for roughly 45 years... ).

Anyone can read my report on the Trent case and see how detailed it gets. One studies things that seemingly have nothing to do with UFOs, such as, what was the actual diameter of the overhead wires (they didn't have to carry much current, yet the kinks in the wires remained for years so they must have been stiff, hence of some typical thickness for power wires) and the most bizarre, what is the effective angular width of the sun when partially obscured by cloud. You'll have to read my paper to find out why I wanted the answer to that question, which I discovered by experiment.

In the Trent case the bottom line was stated by Bill Powell who was the first to interview them. He said, "I blew up the photos every which way and couldn't figure out how they had done it. And then I decided it must be real because they were too (OK I'll be p.c. and use the term "mentally challenged)"). Therefore Powell published the photos in the McMinnville newspaper... and the Trent Saga was off and running.

So now in the Heflin case we have analysts devising scenarios for the supposed hoax and arguing over which is the most likely, what agrees with the data, etc. The bottom line is that they will probably not be able to prove anything about the photos other than that they tend to agree with Heflin's story. A good example of this agreement is Heflin claiming there seemed to be a beam rotating around under it and the photo actually shows a wedge shaped brighter area. Of course, if a model he could have painted the bottom in a wedge shape with white paint. Damn! There I go shooting down a good reason to believe Heflin.

Well, I presume that analysis will go on until people either find convincing hoax evidence or else give up. Incidentally, it is not generally possible to know whether or not an explanation is correct, but it is possible to determine whether or not an explanation is convincing to the analysts.

I suspect, however, that ultimately the Heflin case will rise or fall on the circumstantial evidence surrounding the sighting, including the personality, etc. of Heflin himself. As Richard has taken pains to point out, the initial NICAP investigation

investigated the witness as well as the photos... fortunately!  
So we have a wealth of evidence about Heflin.

One more thing: Heflin claimed that some military guys took his  
photos. Hmmm... men in black?

In the summer of 1950, according to Bill Powell, a couple of  
weeks after he published the Trent photos, "a couple of Air Force  
knuckleheads came and tried to collect from the newspaper the  
negatives and all the prints... and they had the papers to do  
it." However, the negatives were no longer at the paper and  
Powell saw to it that the "knuckleheads" \ didn't get all the  
prints.

(Mrs. Trent told me that several weeks or so after the photos  
were published two guys from the FBI visited her house. They  
went through everything, dumping out drawers and making a  
general mess. Also they threw things into the air and took  
pictures, They also visited Mr. Trent where he worked. It was  
this claim by Mrs. Trent that caused me to write to the FBI and  
ask if they had any file on Trent.

I also included the general statement to the effect of "if you  
have anything else on UFOs, please sent that, too." I didn't  
expect to get anything since Ruppelt had written that the Fbi  
was not interested. Imagine my surprise in the spring of 1977 to  
get a phone call from an equally surprised FBI agent..."we have  
about 1600 pages of stuff..." Anyway, that's another story, but  
its inception is the Trent case. (Postscript: the agent told me  
"off the record" that the FBI had no file on the Trents.)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Have We Offended Them? - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 20:19:44 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 09:13:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Have We Offended Them? - Nielsen

>Source: The Age - Melbourne, Australia

><http://tinyurl.com/ndkl4>

>June 23, 2006

>Have We Offended Them?  
>Jim Schembri

>Actually, where have all the UFOs gone?

>Earth used to be, like, the hottest place for aliens to visit.  
>They would fly billions of light years across the galaxy in  
>their flying saucers just to see how our civilisation was going  
>and if we'd yet figured out whether there was really any  
>difference between cellulite and plain old fat.

<snip>

>Here are several important notes:

<snip>

>(3) That the last person the aliens abducted had just been to an  
>all-you-can-eat Mexican restaurant, and there's no way they're  
>going to travel 50 billion light years to put themselves through  
>that again.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

Thanks Stuart (and EBK)! Excellent break from the everyday! I  
needed a good laugh, especially the part about eating hot and  
spicy food to prevent future abductions! Though I suppose after  
a while even they would get used to it!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## St. John's Day UFOs Birthday & Researchers' Death

From: Loren Coleman <[lcoleman.nul](mailto:lcoleman.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 07:56:37 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 09:24:37 -0400  
Subject: St. John's Day UFOs Birthday & Researchers' Death

St. John's Day

June 24

First day of 'flying saucer' history, Mt. Rainier & Mt. Adams, Washington State (1947). Filmstock fire kills seventeen people, Brussels (1947). Movie theaters evaluated during huge fire, Perth Amboy, NJ (1947). United Airlines plane struck by lightning over Cleveland (1947). Invasion of grasshoppers battled with flame-throwers, Guatemala/El Salvador (1947). Woman attacked and killed by bees or wasps, Seattle (1947). Bizarre aerial sightings near Daggett, California (1950) and over Iwo Jima (1953).

The deaths of various phenomena researchers, writers, and fans:

Frank Scully, June 24, 1964; Frank Edwards, near midnight on June 23, 1967; Arthur Bryant, June 24, 1967; Richard Church June 24, 1967; Willy Ley, June 24, 1969; Jackie Gleason, June 24, 1987.

Mysterious fire erupts in Gallipolis, Ohio resident's car on bridge from Ohio to Point Pleasant, West Virginia (2003). Massive unusual aerial phenomena, Xalapa, Mexico (2005).

For more events for June 24th, please read full post at:

<http://www.cryptomundo.com/cryptozoo-news/stjohnsx/>

(The above was then some way rewritten into the following that included the last two paragraphs, which have nothing to do with anything I've ever said or written - Loren:)

---

WIRELESS FLASH VX3 FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 2006

---

JUNE 24: THE STRANGEST DAY OF THE YEAR?

PORTLAND, Maine (Wireless Flash) - If tomorrow (June 24) turns out to be the strangest day of the year, don't be surprised.

June 24 is notorious for unexplainable events.

That's according to cryptozoologist Loren Coleman, who says some of the stranger occurrences on June 24 past include: the very first UFO sighting in 1947, the fall of a "jelly-like" mass in Eton, England in 1911 and numerous Bigfoot sightings in 1980 and 2002.

There was also a sighting of Chupacabras outside of a disco in Maria Elena, Argentina - while grasshoppers invaded Guatemala and El Salvador.

Also, many famous UFO buffs, including comedian Jackie Gleason, have died on June 24.

Coleman doesn't know why June 24 is so rife with weirdness, but thinks the day may be a "window area" - like Halloween; a time when the line between the physical and the spiritual world is at its closest.

Which is, by the way, why some pagans celebrate it as the holiday called "Beltane".

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:33:23 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:33:23 -0400  
Subject: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

Source: The Guardian - London, UK

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/story/0,,1804926,00.html>

Saturday June 24, 2006

Is It A Bird? Is It A Spaceship? No, It's A Secret US Spy Plane

- Sightings of flying object over Britain worried MoD
- Questions threatened to strain relations with US

James Randerson, science correspondent  
The Guardian

It is the stuff of internet conspiracy theorists' dreams. A top secret, hypersonic, cold war spy plane that was allegedly flown by the Americans in UK airspace without the government's permission.

Publicly, the UK government played down newspaper stories about people who reported seeing UFO-like phenomena. But documents released under the Freedom of Information Act suggest the Ministry of Defence took the rumours much more seriously. Its investigations even threatened to strain the special relationship. "It does show that they were concerned that this thing did exist and the Americans were flying it around willy-nilly over the UK," said David Clarke, a social scientist at Sheffield Hallam University, who obtained the documents. "It certainly suggests that the British government suspected that they were being kept in the dark."

The United States has never confirmed the existence of the mysterious aircraft, called Aurora, which was supposedly designed to sneak at very high speed over the Soviet Union and take covert snaps of what the enemy was up to. It was rumoured to be capable of flying at up to mach 8 and so could reach anywhere on the planet in less than three hours. In the early 1990s there were a string of supposed sightings and strange sounds over Scotland which some bewildered locals attributed to UFOs. Rumours in the press that Aurora was operating secretly out of RAF Machrihanish on the tip of Kintyre prompted Scottish MPs to ask questions in parliament.

Briefing notes given to the then defence secretary Tom King on March 4 1992 show that civil servants did give the idea credence. "There is no knowledge in the MoD of a 'black' programme of this nature, although it would not surprise the relevant desk officers in the Air Staff and [Defence Intelligence Staff] if it did exist."

The response suggested to an MP's question was rather less revealing: "The existence of any such project (or operation) would be a matter for the US authorities." The Americans denied everything, but the reports kept coming.

The most credible witness was Chris Gibson, who had 12 years'



experience with the Royal Observer Corps and was an expert on recognising aircraft. He saw a triangular plane flanked by two US fighters being refuelled in flight by tanker while he was working on the Galveston Key oilrig in 1989. The plane was unlike anything he had ever seen. "There was no precedent for this," he said. "I kind of sussed out that it was something I shouldn't have seen." He reported the sighting to Jane's Defence Weekly in 1992.

On December 22 1992, the air attache to the British embassy in Washington wrote to the assistant chief of the Air Staff in London explaining US reaction to renewed MoD questions prompted by Mr Gibson's sighting. "Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Donald B Rice, was to say the least incensed by the renewed speculation, and the implied suggestion that he had lied to Congress by stating that Aurora did not exist.

"As you will have gathered, the whole affair is causing considerable irritation within HQ [US Air Force], and any helpful comments we can make to defuse the situation would be appreciated."

"The sort of prickly reaction to people not believing their denials is pretty unusual," said Bill Sweetman, an expert on top secret US black projects with Jane's Defence Review. "They generally don't deny things actually because it generally doesn't hurt them too much if somebody thinks they have a capability they don't."

A further batch of sightings on March 31 1993 over Devon, Cornwall, South Wales and Shropshire prompted another investigation by the MoD. These turned out later to be a Russian rocket re-entering the atmosphere, but the MoD investigators at the time suspected Aurora. "There would seem to be some evidence on this occasion that an unidentified object (or objects) of unknown origin was operating over the UK ... If there has been some activity of US origins which is known to a limited circle in MoD and is not being acknowledged it is difficult to investigate further." Mr Sweetman suspects that by the end of the decade the MoD knew about Aurora. Another document from 2000 on the MoD's investigations into UFO sightings - or unidentified aerial phenomena as they prefer to call them - states that "some UAP reports can be attributed to covert aircraft programmes".

The section, which discusses other covert US aircraft such as the SR-71 Blackbird, contains two paragraphs and two illustrations which were censored before its freedom of information release last month. Codes next to the removed material indicate that it was excised in the interests of international relations. "Certain viewing angles of these vehicles may be described as saucer-like," the document 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Tunneling Through Space And Time

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:41:33 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:41:33 -0400  
Subject: Tunneling Through Space And Time

Source: Rosemary Ellen Guiley's Website

<http://www.visionaryliving.com/articles/tunneling.html>

22 November 2005

Tunneling Through Space And Time

By Rosemary Ellen Guiley

c. Visionary Living, Inc.

Imagine being able to send yourself anywhere in the universe in any point in time. You would accomplish that not only with the projection of thought, but actually instantly in the flesh. You wouldn't need a Star Trek transporter beam or warp speed, or a Farscape starburst. You wouldn't need to find a wormhole. And you wouldn't necessarily need to be a saint, yogi or ascended master. Instead, you would be able to move through a region called hyperspace under your own control, making you far superior to the hero of the TV show Quantum Leap, who has no control over where he goes in time and space.

If it sounds impossible, it's not. Science says it is indeed possible. The realization of that potential may be a long way off, but I firmly believe that the more aware we are of our capabilities, the faster we will be able to turn them into reality. Tunneling through time and space is a skill we have to potential to master.

This instant access to all space and time, including other dimensions and parallel universes, is made possible by tunneling, a concept described by quantum physics.

The case for tunneling

The physics of Einstein explains that space is curved due to gravitational fields caused by huge amounts of mass. Quantum physics has allowed us to understand the nature of the subatomic world. The most modern of modern physics theory -- superstring -- attempts to unite quantum and Einsteinian physics under one umbrella. Superstring theory posits that before the Big Bang, there were 10 dimensions to a perfectly balanced universe in which interdimensional travel was possible. This perfect state was unstable, however, and as a result the universe split in two: a four-dimensional realm and a six-dimensional realm. We live in the four-dimensional realm of length, width, height and time. Superstring theory uses higher dimensions to explain phenomena in our four-dimensional world. I believe that our link to the other six dimensions is through our appropriately named sixth sense, our inborn psychic ability.

Einsteinian physics allows for the possibility of wormholes, theoretical holes in space and perhaps time, located at the center of enormous spinning gravitational fields. They connect the curved universe to itself. According to theoretical

physicist Stephen Hawking, wormholes may also connect our universe to an infinite number of parallel universes.

Wormholes may also connect our universe to the higher dimensions, which are beyond our current capability to envision. They have provided many plot devices for science fiction and fantasy.

Tunneling, however, is a different movement through time and space: the ability to pass through barriers by other than normal means. Tunneling is demonstrated by the proven wave action of electron particles. For example, if you put an electron in a box, classical physics says it will stay there. Quantum physics says that the electron can mysteriously find itself outside the box by a phenomena known as tunneling. This is the principle behind quantum leaps. In more mundane but useful terms, this principle describes the tunnel diode of electronics. Its quantum mechanical predictability allows for its use in your stereo, computer, TV, radio and so on.

In terms of paranormal and mystical phenomena, tunneling may explain teleportation =96 the instant transport to a distant location despite the barriers of structures and topology. The literature of yogis, saints and adepts are full of cases of teleportation (Christian literature refers to this phenomenon as "mystical transport"). Somehow the adept can rearrange his electrons to move through barriers that are impenetrable to "ordinary" folk.

Tunneling is not fantasy, but reality; it has been demonstrated repeatedly in experiments. It has survived "every experimental challenge," according to Michio Kaku, a professor of theoretical physics and author of *Hyperspace* and *Beyond Einstein*. Kaku adds, "In fact, a world without tunneling is now unimaginable."

But how likely is tunneling to happen? Kaku says that the odds against a large object such as a human rearranging its electrons and tunneling to some other dimension, place or time, is very remote: the odds of it happening are finite and would take longer than the lifetime of our present universe to spontaneously occur. Kaku does not, however, address how long it would take consciousness itself to breach these barriers. Where consciousness travels, can the body be far behind?

I=92m not daunted by odds Kaku gives. I=92m reminded of the Jim Carrey movie, *Dumb and Dumber*, in which Jim=92s character, a klutz, falls for a beautiful, wealthy, sophisticated woman (played by Lauren Holly). He asks her what are the chances of having a relationship with her. "One in a million," she retorts. He turns away ecstatic. "I have a chance!" he exults. The rest of the story is how he bumbles his way into her heart.

Like Carrey, we should seize the chance despite the odds. We don=92t need to bumble our way to discovering how to do tunneling. I think we will discover it as part of the exponential growth of knowledge and the evolution of consciousness. Kaku observes that since World War II, scientific knowledge has doubled every 10 or 20 years. Futurist Peter Russell, in *The White Hole in Time*, comments that we are "in the midst of an unprecedented period of extremely rapid development." Tunneling may seem like a small possibility now, but we may have an entirely different view even a few decades from now. We can hasten our realization of tunneling through our own conscious awareness of, and belief in, our extraordinary capabilities. The universe, says Russell, is evolving through us.

Michael Murphy, in his comprehensive work, *The Future of the Body*, predicts dramatic changes ahead, driven by rapidly increasing knowledge and changes in consciousness. We will experience psi and mystical states of consciousness as part of "normal" consciousness. And, our developing super-consciousness will change the structure of our body, and our ability to alter our environments through psychokinesis, or mind over matter.

Thus, instant travel through time and vast reaches of space will move from the remotely possible to the manifest.

Tunneling already exists

We already have evidence of spontaneous occurrences of tunneling. Besides teleportation, tunneling may explain some

(but not necessarily all) mysterious disappearances, invisibility, UFO abductions, Men in Black, fairy abductions, Bermuda Triangle disappearances, mediumistic apports (objects materialized by mediums), Bigfoot, Mothman, and a wide range of Fortean phenomena such as sudden appearances of strange creatures, rainfalls of frogs and other oddities.

In the November 2001 issue of FATE, author Scott Corrales writes about "Nonpeople From Nowhere," in which odd people claiming to be from unknown places suddenly appeared somewhere, and just as mysteriously disappeared. And, entire lands, like the Hesperides Islands, have seemed to exist and not exist.

These cases have been documented throughout history and around the world. I think spontaneous tunneling may be the cause.

Tunneling may also account for some ghost experiences. Some ghosts may be remnants or recordings impressed in psychic space, but others may involve living people. Perhaps someone in another place in time doesn't come through entirely, and so we see an apparition instead of something solid.

Not long ago, I visited Winterthur, the bizarre mansion built by Henry Du Pont near Wilmington, Delaware. The mansion is bizarre because the eccentric Du Pont went around the world buying rooms and entire houses he liked, and incorporating them into his mansion. Like many historical places, it is reputed to be haunted, and some of the staff will talk about their experiences there. Du Pont himself has been seen numerous times, especially in some of his favorite areas.

One ghostly encounter in particular may fit tunneling. A staff woman was finishing up after hours and was alone in a section of the mansion believed to be haunted. As she stood in a room, a movement in the long hallway caught her attention. Looking, she saw two ghostly forms, a man and a woman dressed in period clothing. They were engaged in conversation with each other. As she stared at them, they turned and looked at her and jumped in visible fright, as though they had seen a ghost. They scampered into an adjacent room. After a moment, the "ghost" woman peeked around the doorframe to see if the staff woman was still there. Seeing her, the "ghost" quickly withdrew into the room. Steeling her courage, the staffer walked past the room it was the only way out but when she looked into it, the "ghosts" had vanished. Perhaps they were not dead but very much alive in their own timescape, and were swept up in a tunnel that transported them back to their "normal" reality. Perhaps they went on to dine out on their terrifying encounter with a ghostly woman dressed in strange clothing!

So what's new?

Gateways to other dimensions are by no means a new idea. But we need to change our ideas about how to access those gateways.

The existence of other realms has been posited for thousands of years in mysticism, mythology and philosophy. Access to these realms often has been seen as special places, or portals. You have to have the "right stuff" magically or mystically to find or be guided to them. Sometimes access is accidental, such when a hapless person falls asleep near a fairy tree, mound or well. In literature, Alice of Alice in Wonderland falls down a rabbit hole, and in Through the Looking Glass passes through a mirror.

In mysticism, the ability to tunnel is acquired through the development of a highly spiritualized consciousness. In this model, a rare few advance to this capability, usually after years of intense spiritual practice and discipline.

The industrial age brought ideas that technology could transport us through space and time. H.G. Wells had his Time Machine, an idea elaborated upon many times in film and fiction. Much of our modern science fiction uses high technology and wormholes to move characters around the landscape of the universe. Our sci fi heroes have the high tech, but they're often at the mercy of finding wormholes. We've still got to have the right stuff and be in the right place to make transport happen. In Star Trek: Voyager, the Voyager finds itself transported to the Delta Quadrant, a huge distance from home, so far that even maximum warp can't help the crew. They wander about looking for a return, hoping especially to find a wormhole.

The central plot in Farscape also involves wormholes. The American astronaut hero John Crichton, piloting the Space Shuttle, accidentally shoots through a wormhole and gets lost in another universe. He finds himself aboard the living starship Moya occupied by a band of aliens on the run. They're all trying to get to their respective home planets, but don't know where they are. Even the most advanced of the aliens had never heard of Earth prior to meeting Crichton. Meanwhile, the evil character Scorpius is bent on getting the secrets of wormholes, and he thinks Crichton knows them. His desperate hunt leads him to pry into Crichton's mind.

Scorpius actually is closer to discovering the secret than he thinks. But the secret is not in any technology -- it's in consciousness. He'd do better to look into his own mind.

It's all inside

I think that the ability to tunnel will emerge in a combination of science and mysticism. As we race through this exponential growth in technology and knowledge, we will understand more and more how reality is created and altered by consciousness. We already have scientific evidence to establish extrasensory powers and psychokinesis. The concept of "nonlocal consciousness" has been introduced to medicine, in terms of healing at a distance and the power of prayer. Medicine is also dealing with the concept of "intentionality," that is, the set of our intent and will can greatly determine the course of healing. In parapsychology, intentionality manifests as the "experimenter effect": the attitudes and beliefs of the experimenter and the subjects influence the outcome of experiments.

Mystical traditions have long taught that thought -- in other words, our intentionality -- creates reality. Religion gives us the "faith factor": the more we believe in a possibility, the more likely it will come into manifestation. Belief shapes our intentionality.

As more and more of us experience "sixth sense" sorts of abilities, we will expand our horizons of what we believe is possible through the creative power of our own consciousness.

We won't abandon technology by any means. We will have technology that will move us through wormholes. In fact, we will use consciousness to manage and manipulate the technology. But more importantly, we also will develop the consciousness to navigate the time-space landscape on our own, without machines -- through the mastery of tunneling.

In mysticism, the adept attains an advanced state of consciousness that enables the responsible use of higher abilities. Hopefully, our spiritual side will advance, too, as we advance in our exponential growth and experience more powers. We must be capable of using extraordinary abilities wisely.

Will we be able to pop around the world at will and become frequent flyers to other times and realms? Will we visit ourselves in past lives? Go to heaven like Enoch but without needing the help of angels? Or will tunneling be done more as a matter of need? Will tunneling turn our order into chaos, or will we evolve an order that accommodates tunneling? At present, we do not know the answers to these questions.

Death and rebirth

Perhaps the real purpose and importance of tunneling will not be for personal reasons, but for collective survival reasons. Kaku writes that the late physicist Gerald Feinberg speculated that, over billions of years, we would master the ability to travel into higher dimensions and thus save ourselves from death in the Big Crunch. Our four-dimensional universe will stop expanding and eventually collapse. In its final moments we will tunnel to safety in the sister six-dimensional realm. There we will witness the birth of a new universe created by another Big Bang resulting from the collapse and death of our universe.

What you can do

The Big Crunch is a long way off, and meanwhile we have a lot to

accomplish. If you would like to be an active participant in bringing about a bold new world, plant a seed in your consciousness now. You can start by believing in possibilities. The more we believe in possibilities, the more our creativity opens, and we make breakthrough discoveries. If we believe it can happen, it will.

---

First published in FATE magazine, March 2002.  
For more information on FATE, go to <http://www.fatemag.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: We've Got This Wrong - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:32:37 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:48:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: We've Got This Wrong - Lehmberg

>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 18:15:58 +0100 (BST)  
>Subject: We've Got This Wrong

>Space.com has just published a not very interesting piece on  
>UFOs:

><http://tinyurl.co.uk/3o27>

I'm loath to signal agreement because it signals an errant tit  
for tat...

>"And after all those years, as the saying goes, science remains  
>a riddle inside a mystery wrapped in an enigma. Why so? For one,  
>the field is fraught with hucksterism. It's also replete with  
>dishonest individuals and serious financial irregularities. But  
>then there are also well-intentioned and puzzled scientists."

>Seems fair and balanced to me.

But this is so 'right on' I shan't let it escape without jumping  
up and down a little in its regard, dammit.

Back in February I had written:

---

"...I think science is fine for "spin", "rate", "charge", and  
"angular momentum", but I suspect it may err in setting itself  
up as the default arbiter of that which it has itself  
discounted, shall not credit, and otherwise complacently  
ignores.

Moreover, with regard to the ufological et al, science  
assiduously tries to look down the wrong end of the telescope,  
like that was a virtue.

Consider. Science presupposes entropy and heat death for all of  
creation, ignoring the accelerating tendency towards complexity  
and novelty of everything it is, otherwise, trying to measure or  
qualify... in a plethora of asymptotic graph lines.

Moreover, science blithely attempts to obviate the UFO, the UFO  
seeming to regularly, and so effectively, point up science's  
shortcomings in that regard.

With regard to UFOs, Science should recuse itself, or become the  
science it pretends to be.

I add that I am not alone in these thoughts... my thinking seems  
to parallel J. Vallee and the late Terence McKenna."

---

Science insults itself that science is being remotely done in  
the service of UFOs. Thanks Stuart, for helping to kick over the  
rock on same.

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Space.com Article Response - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 07:19:40 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:01:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Space.com Article Response - Hatch

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 13:35:43 -0400  
>Subject: Space.com Article Response

Hi Bruce:

Forgive me for snipping everything that you wrote.

I take exception to the "Top Ten Alien Encounters"

[http://www.space.com/top10\\_alienencounters\\_debunked.html](http://www.space.com/top10_alienencounters_debunked.html)

linked from that same article. The 10 encounters weren't specific sightings as such, but general categories..

It was a sad series starting with: "Space Aliens Engineered Ancient Egyptian Pyramids", followed by Cattle Mutilations; Area-51; Crop Circles; The FACE on MARS; The Alien Autopsy Film(!);

Alien Implants; (I skipped over Flying Saucers, one of my favorites)

Alien Abductions; and of course Roswell.

What a feast. I think a better title would be "Ten Best Strawmen".

Need I elaborate? The mechanism is simple.

Space.com implies that self-styled ufologists buy into these crazy-assed, weak and peripheral hob-goblins, and indeed some of our late-night-radio listeners no doubt do!

The implication ("Top Ten") is that they have covered all the bases, therefore UFOs are bunk.

I am not a religious man, quite the opposite. IF, however, somebody threw up the horrors or religious history, crazy-assed cults and so on, and offered this as proof of atheism I would have to strongly disagree. I might cough up something about string theory and defer to people who know WAY more than I do.

To show or feign even-handedness, space.com finds people who don't sound like blithering idiots. But, the casual reader is still left with surgically cored cow assholes and crop circles in Britain.

For this and other reasons, I usually turn down media inquiries. If I get seen in public its because I got thrown out of a bar. "I've been thrown INTO better toilets than this one!" .. somebody once said, or so I heard later.

There must be hundreds, thousands(?) of good intelligent people like yourselves, patiently chipping away at what I consider an unsolved mystery.

How many of these consider crop circles central to the UFO enigma? Doofuses aside, who pays much attention to the Face on Mars?

Do you think that space.com treated ufology fairly in this piece of theirs? Click on the URL above. Is this you?

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 10:22:06 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:05:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:38:15 -0700  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 15:12:50 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>BTW - Please let it be known that I have two cameras and had  
>>>already offered one of them to both David and Martin early on.

>>I beg your pardon? I genuinely squirm to have to do this Viktor,  
>>but you should be much more careful of what you say. I hunted  
>>back through saved mails to locate this mysterious "offer". I  
>>finally found it in an email on June 05. Here is the relevant  
>>paragraph:

>>"I like our sometimes heated exchanges. I don't take it  
>>personally. But I love to argue... Italian/Croatian  
>>background... what can I say. I'll probably have an extra  
>>camera. I won two on ebay. Perhaps David might like one. I'm  
>>sure we can lick this thing together."

This is getting so silly, as to be ridiculous, contrived on both  
your parts, Martin/David, your trying to make a genuine offer  
appear in the worst possible light, that has been my growing  
concern with both your styles. You manipulate and sculpt such  
harmlessness into something unrealistic. I've been pointing out  
the need for using a real camera, from the beginning, so, no  
harm in that?

Argue doesn't mean with vehemence, argue means with sincere  
interest and exchange of ideas. I can't help it if you don't  
want to hear about the film being over saturated. I just brought  
that up as a point worth considering when doing experiments with  
digital cameras. This is ASA 3200 speed, 40 times greater than  
ASA 80. Therefore, I thought the real camera would be of  
interest. I thought you both might want to discuss who gets the  
extra camera, Is this so argumentative, so uncooperative  
sounding, please! Since I was in contact with Martin, I thought  
he might want firsts, if he didn't bring it up, well, I guess a  
real camera wasn't a real commodity back then . . . which makes  
my point, it had no value?

Martin, I can't help it if you hadn't extended the offer. I did  
make the offer, I work long hours. I can't send e-mails to  
everyone. I presumed this would be a nice offer worth repeating  
to someone your working with. If you hadn't extended the offer  
then my evaluation of your propensities is once again confirmed  
(Martin)

>>However, by Viktor incorrectly stating "I have two cameras and

>>had already offered one of them to both David and Martin early  
>>on," he again makes it sound as if he is the only one who values  
>>experimentation while we somehow don't or are dodging it.

Martin, this is you putting words in my mouth and manipulating  
events to sound how you want them to appear. This is exactly  
my problem with you!

My point has always been using the camera. This is nothing new.  
That was my first issue with both your approaches, sorry! I just  
brought them up, I can't help it if someone new is on the line  
pointing out what you may have otherwise gotten little feedback  
on in the past, not be totally accustomed to, some counter  
approaches worth considering.

My point then was that you can't use strings on telephone poles  
in a different focus zone when comparing strings that may not be  
in focus close to the lens... sorry to spoil your fun, but this  
needed to be brought up, this was obvious oversight.

Nor can you use strings in front of TV screens with automated  
cameras that work completely different than this one... in this  
setting.

<snip>

David/Martin if your responses on all points was not so  
contrived much would be possible, the rest is up to you, ?

I can't help it if I needed to point out some glaring holes.  
There was no need to have read more into that?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

From: **Cathy Reason** <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 15:33:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:07:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Reason

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 23:40:37 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>But what is an "unscientific theory"? I think the only thing you  
>can mean, according to your own definitions, is that an  
>unscientific theory is a theory which fails to produce testable  
>predictions. But when do we know that a theory is incapable of  
>producing a testable prediction? Do we give the theorist a week?  
>A month?

Why d'you want to put a time limit on it? When and if it becomes  
testable, then it becomes scientific. Until then, it's just  
mathematics or philosophy.

>Can we rigorously sort the ideas that scientists have  
>into scientific and unscientific by this criterion? I think this  
>is really difficult.

If you're not sure whether a theory is testable or untestable,  
then I can see why you would have this difficulty.

But hold on a minute - why not test the theory? If you can test  
it, then it must be testable, mustn't it? And if you can't then  
it isn't scientific anyway. So, problem solved, right?

>People have a lot of ideas as part of the process of doing  
>science and they are testing them all the time against one  
>another and other peoples' ideas as well as experimental facts.  
>You come up with a notion that you think might lead somewhere;  
>you think about it some more and realise it has implication x,  
>but then you realise that a whole class of ideas has implication  
>x. Back to the drawing board. Your conjecture that this might  
>lead to a falsifiable theory has been falsified. Have you been  
>doing non-science?

I'm tempted to respond by saying this is a non-question :-) But  
if you were to press me, I'd say that a theory becomes  
scientific at the point where it becomes testable, and not  
before - and exactly the same applies to conjectures about  
theories. This doesn't mean the conjectures are necessarily  
interesting.

>It is not only perfectly possible, but absolutely necessary to  
>the practice of science, that most ideas are sterile or wrong.  
>That cannot make them part of a process which is unscientific,  
>or else we demand that theorists must always be right if science  
>is to exist. The method we call science is the process inclusive  
>of the theories which lead somewhere and those which don't, and  
>it isn't always the case that only right theories lead somewhere  
>whilst wrong theories don't (think of Kepler for example). The  
>wrong guesses are an essential part of finding what the right  
>guesses are.

It seems to me that what you're looking for, is some kind of  
decision rule which always classifies anything to do with the  
process of doing science as "scientific". But I don't see the  
point of such a decision rule.

And even if we had such a rule, it still isn't clear what you would want to classify as scientific. How many scientists are there in the world - many thousands? Well, they've all got to be fed, haven't they? Does that mean you want to classify the whole economic system of agricultural production and resale as "scientific", since the social process of doing science couldn't take place without them?

<snip>

>>As we apparently had no idea what most of the original questions were, I don't see how we can ascertain that our newly-discovered questions weren't in the original set ;-)

>Well I did say it was paradoxical!

Yes indeed. Your infinite sequence of questions already represents an imposed theoretical template (or an "assumption", as it's called in theoretical circles) since there are potentially an infinite number of such sequences, depending on how the questions quantize the continuous system they are inquiring into. (You know, countable vs uncountable sets and stuff.)

And then you have to add questions about questions, and questions about sets of questions, and before you know it we have our very own version of Russell's paradox.

(I'm sort of suggesting this isn't a very profitable way to proceed, in fact it's infinitely questionable.)

>I can't abstract the test event from reality in the way that you can. A process which does not include testing could not be scientific, of course; but neither could a bunch of tests without any predictions, and you need theories for that.

Yes, but whoever came up with a bunch of tests that didn't test anything? Whoever they were, I bet they didn't have many friends.

>The principle of the test has no meaning without the process in which it is embedded because it cannot lead by itself to any intelligible connection of ideas. And that is the essence of science IMO.

It also has no meaning without language in which to express it. Does that make Joyce's "Finnegan's Wake" part of the scientific process? Or the English language generally?

>Not all scientific theories are testable in all their forms all the time and in every part, but they don't necessarily become unscientific because of it.

I think it's rather more accurate to say that no-one worries overmuch whether they become unscientific or not - it just isn't the sort of question which comes up. But I think you have a good point here - there are potentially unscientific assumptions right at the core of the scientific process. And I think you're right. Which is precisely why I believe theory construction should not be regarded as a scientific process. It makes us too complacent about what theory really involves - and it also provides an excuse for social scientists to pass off woolly speculation and ad hoc rationalization as "scientific theory".

>Science isn't constructed just from experimental facts (it never was; nature had to invent ideas before she could invent the concept of knowledge). It's constructed from complexes of densely theory-related observations and principles that are granted the status of facts in science. These meta-facts are what mostly constitute the "body of knowledge", not the botanical lists of pressure differentials and acceleration rates or whatever that end up in the tables in the back of reference books.

Yes, this is why I pointed out to Richard Hall that a corpus of research findings is not the same thing as a corpus of knowledge.

>Theories are tested for consistency against these meta-  
>facts and through them make indirect contact with nature before  
>ever being tested in direct physical experiment, and this is  
>part of how successful new theories can emerge, in competition  
>largely with one another.

>Junk this very refined socio-historical process, and you are  
>reduced to randomly sticking a pin in your list of theories -  
>oh, except that you don't have any theories to list in the first  
>place. :-)

I don't think the process is all that refined, Martin. In my experience it can be extremely hit-and-miss. As you've indicated yourself, theoreticians are not just inferencing machines; in fact, many of us are pretty near barking, to be quite frank about it. A lot of stuff happens to do with incomprehensible diagrams scribbled on bits of paper in coffee-bars, and that sort of thing. (A thought - do we include espresso as part of the scientific method?)

To the extent there is any rigor in the process, the rigor is mathematical, not scientific. (Another reason why social science theories, which are not expressed mathematically, tend to be so subjective and ill-specified.) In my experience, the requirement for generating testable predictions is the only thing that drags most theoreticians back to earth - without it we'd all be writing glorious fairy-tales in the stratosphere. There's something almost bipolar about the theoretical process.

Actually, there is one writer on UFOs who seems to me to capture this almost bipolar quality of the good theoretician - and that's Jenny Randles. Anyone who can write a book like *Star Children*, and follow it up with *Something in the Air*, has definitely got something of the theoretician's mentality about them.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Have We Offended Them? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 08:12:49 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:46:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Have We Offended Them? - Hatch

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 13:21:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Have We Offended Them?

>>Source: The Age - Melbourne, Australia

>><http://tinyurl.com/ndkl4>

>>June 23, 2006

>>Have We Offended Them? Jim Schembri  
>>Actually, where have all the UFOs gone?

>>Earth used to be, like, the hottest place for aliens to visit.

>I don't know what this dude is talking about. There are more  
>UFO photos and sightings these days than ever. Every camera-  
>phone photo somebody takes of their dog has a half dozen UFOs  
>floating around in the background.

Hi Tim:

I don't pay much attention to puff pieces like this. All the  
less so when an obscure newspaperman writes like 'valley girl'  
stuff if you, like, know what I mean.

like,

Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik [Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 11:31:32 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:48:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Golubik

>From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:54:14 -0500  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Viktor Golubik [Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 08:38:26 EDT  
>>Subject: The Truth About Heflin

>><snip>

>>I believe that the strings I detect in two of the three photos  
>>would have a better chance of being presented or dismissed with  
>>a far superior bit depth and scan line resolution - both with  
>>the original and comparative test photos.

>String detected or shall I say faint non-contiguous line.  
>I found a second line/string at the opposite quadrant, while I  
>couldn't seem to scan it in image size was huge... and the range  
>of gray scale was too deep and wide, but I tried really really  
>hard. <g>

>The third photo has what appeared to me two strings... be  
>working on it and this one over \*again\* this weekend.

>Finally, I hope to document my steps depicting the partial fuzzy  
>line, so to follow up with some equivalent techniques leading up  
>to consistency of reproduction.

>Well now I have to run to the kitchen so to make a Sicilian  
>pizza crust with help in my bread machine.

Thanks,

My recent concern was that people had been saying that strings weren't detectable on the original. I just took their word for it. But upon closer examination (JSE images) much of what is seen can be explained by strings of some possible translucent make-up: That associations in the images can be made. If others had been doing the same stuff, presumably, then why wasn't it brought up already,

I think people want to see striking examples of strings and clearly cut evidence, but because this is messy you have to take a seat in a car going two different ways to the same place.

Therefore, this has to be a discussion point, an analysis point, saying that there are no types of strings being detected is not addressing but hiding. Bring it up and dismiss it if you want, but don't ignore it, that's what concerns me.

I'm just being intellectually honest and willing to change my view, I'm not into jumping on the Band Wagon just because I want to party with the in crowd. I'd rather associate with honesty.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:31:59 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:50:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Hall

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 20:58:43 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:02:35 +0000  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>Hi Richard I love your style:) And I don't want to make this  
>needlessly long.

<snip>

>>I find this whole model train wheel obsession quite amusing, but  
>>we must let the techies do their thing. David Rudiak, Viktor  
>>Golubik, and Martin Shough all strike me as quite sincere and  
>>fair-minded, but I note that they have a hard time getting  
>>together on basic technical data, much less overall research  
>>methodology.

>Well, coming from both an artistic and scientific background, I  
>can understand your confusion. This is actually straight  
>forward. It just requires work and sound planning. It will also  
>make much more sense when you have the patience to ask me the  
>right types of questions. I've already offered to explain some  
>tuff. Just let me know when your ready...

So I'm confused and I just don't get it, eh? As I have said  
several times, I am not technically trained and don't speak the  
jargon. I do understand logic. The type of questions that I  
have been asking you (and generally not getting direct answers)  
are non-technical, like the one about your trying to get access  
to the original work of Dr. Robert Nathan (see below) and  
whether or not you are working with JSE magazine photos  
ratherthan early generation direct prints.

<snip>

>Just like all techies I have known in the past, they  
>tend to >think that their photoanalytical skills provide a magic  
>short- >cut to truth without regard to witness information or  
>thorough >case investigation. Their motto might be, The Truth is  
>In There >(in the pictures themselves) and I will find it, with  
>which I >emphatically disagree. (I'm going to post this message,  
>then >scurry for the bomb shelter.)

>There's no magic just hard work. The end result may have already  
>been previewed... just needs to be shown in a believable  
>fashion. Many clarifying points can be extracted from the  
>photos. It is also possible that the truth will also emerge.  
>Like I said, this is not a waste of time either way.

I get the distinct impression that with your loops and hoops  
(whatever) you think you already have established a hoax model,  
so I suspect you are - in time-honored tradition - assuming your  
own conclusion. I never said your work was a waste of time, but  
I'm not going to hold my breath waiting for you to show what you

think you have established 'in a believable fashion.'

>>As I told Viktor in private (he didn't buy the argument), the  
>>last thing a hoaxer using a model train wheel is likely to do is  
>>to allow a skeptical TV producer to interview him in his home  
>>and show him his model trains. That just makes no sense at all.  
>>Further, as I have tried to point out a couple of the NICAP  
>>investigators spent a lot of time in Heflin's home, got to know  
>>him very well, and knew about all of his hobbies and interests.  
>>Again, a hoaxer using a model train wheel would not likely be so  
>>open about his interest in model trains.

>Well, as I recall saying in private, we don't really know the  
>real circumstances surrounding the visit. And, I also agreed  
>that these were worthwhile questions.

What do you mean by this? We know that Heflin was being interviewed for the BBC-TV program (by a skeptic, Dr. Black) and cheerfully was filmed in front of his model trains. What other circumstances do we need to know? As far as I can tell at this point, the only person ever to suggest a model train wheel hoax was the mysterious Dr. Black, who insinuated it while professing to find Heflin entirely sincere.

>>Finally, I am not aware that anyone has made an effort to  
>>retrieve Dr. Robert Nathan's research papers on the case from  
>>1965 and later. Maybe they are not available, I don't know, but  
>>his work seems to be rather airily dismissed as unimportant. He  
>>was not just some stumblebum amateur. I quote from two NASA  
>>press releases:

<snip>

>>The system was  
>>developed by Dr. Robert Nathan, who led the JPL video fdigital  
>>(computer) data research for NASA. Robert Selzer was in charge  
>>of Surveyor picture enhancement." (Is he-Selzer-not the guy  
>>now re-examining the Heflin photos for the JSE paper?)

>>JPL, NASA, Oct. 25, 1985. "[NASA] has presented an award of  
>>\$20,000 to Dr. Robert Nathan of Jet Propulsion Laboratory for  
>>significant scientific and technical contributions in the field  
>>of imaging."

<snip>

>>Nathan, who originally was very skeptical, found no evidence of  
>>a string or hoax - twice. In fact, all the techies can do to  
>>resolve photo authenticity is find clearcut and unequivocal  
>>evidence of a hoax. They cannot prove that a photo is genuine.  
>>That sort of proof lies in the character and background  
>>investigation and the preponderance of evidence. So the Truth is  
>>not in the photois themselves, unless and only if the photo is a  
>>demonstrable fake.

><snip>

>Richard, technology has come a long way. How you perceive a  
>string to be and how one actually shows up on film can be two  
>quite different affairs. That's the source of my frustration  
>with the other analyses. That's why actual tests with the camera  
>have to be conducted. Isolated analyses of the film is just one  
>side of the coin. As, I've said before, the real scope of the  
>problem is in making a convincing case. Demonstrating a possible  
>solution... merging both halves.

This is an incredible response, if I understand correctly what you are saying and implying! So you see no need to examine Nathan's work because technology has changed? By that line of argument I guess we have to recalculate every scientific analysis of anything ever conducted that is more than, what, a month old? With the very sophisticated equipment at Nathan's disposal at JPL, do you really think a supporting string or wire or loop would not have been detected? You don't even know what techniques he used, yet you assume they were worthless.

>A scientific endeavor has to show both sides of the equation.  
>Not just present a presumed solution. To me, without this  
>type of inclusivity, it would be tantamount to a falsification of  
>the first order.

Since I never argued for presenting a one-sided conclusion, I have no idea why you are making this statement. However, you need to see the other side of the equation yourself when it comes to investigation work and analysis that was done at the time. I have no problem at all with your looking for some supporting structure for a model, but I do have a problem with understanding parts of your method and approach that seemingly ignore everything (all prior investigation) other than images of unspecified pedigree.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About Heflin - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:00:43 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:53:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin - Maccabee

>From: John Scheldroup <[jschel.nul](mailto:jschel.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:54:14 -0500  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About Heflin

>>From: Viktor Golubik [Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 08:38:26 EDT  
>>Subject: The Truth About Heflin

><snip>

>>I believe that the strings I detect in two of the three photos  
>>would have a better chance of being presented or dismissed with  
>>a far superior bit depth and scan line resolution - both with  
>>the original and comparative test photos.>

>String detected or shall I say faint non-contiguous line.

>I found a second line/string at the opposite quadrant, while I  
>couldn't seem to scan it in image size was huge... and the range  
>of gray scale was to deep and wide, but I tried really really  
>hard. <g>

>The third photo has what appeared to me two strings... be  
>working on it and this one over \*again\* this weekend.

>Finally, I hope to document my steps depicting the partial fuzzy  
>line, so to follow up with some equivalent techniques leading up  
>to consistency of reproduction.

Caution!

When you are looking for images buried in the noise level you  
are subjecting yourself to a sort of "Rorshach (sp?) Test."  
People can see in noise what they want to see. (same applies to  
hearing, vide, "electronic voice phenomena").

Digging signal out of the noise must also be accompanied by  
a "probability function" that tells you what the probability is  
that you have a real signal and not just a random occurrence. It  
is possible to throw several heads in a row! Only after hundreds  
of throws would one know for certain whether or not a certain  
coin is biased one way or the other. The existence of the bias  
would be equivalent to "information." If the coin always lands  
one side up then the "information" is clear: it is biased. If it  
lands 51% of th time heads and 49% tails after a thousand tries,  
you can assume it is biased, but... what if in the next thousand  
tried the bias goes the other way?

At least with coins you have an "infinite" number of trials  
possible. With a picture you have a finite number of film grains  
or pixels to work with. The best you can do is try to develop  
statistics of pixel correlations (a correlation function) at  
some area where you expect there is no information (no string)  
and compare the statistic (correlation function) in the area  
with the suspected string with another equal sized area where  
there is definitely no string.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 18:12:14 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:59:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:02:35 +0000  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:54:07 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

><snip>

>I find this whole model train wheel obsession quite amusing, but  
>we must let the techies do their thing. David Rudiak, Viktor  
>Golubik, and Martin Shough all strike me as quite sincere and  
>fair-minded, but I note that they have a hard time getting  
>together on basic technical data, much less overall research  
>methodology.

>Just like all techies I have known in the past, they tend to  
>think that their photoanalytical skills provide a magic short-  
>cut to truth without regard to witness information or thorough  
>case investigation. Their motto might be, The Truth is In There  
>(in the pictures themselves) and I will find it, with which I  
>emphatically disagree. (I'm going to post this message, then  
>scurry for the bomb shelter.)

Hi Dick

Well you're nothing if not reliable! Here we go again. First, I mildly resent being characterised as a "techie" which, from context, I take it you define with faint contempt as something like "nerd". I resent being lumped in with Victor and David as a collective lost cause. I resent the accusation that I have an "obsession" with the train wheel. And I resent the assertion that I have had "no regard for witness information" or for the results of case investigation. Now...

>As I told Viktor in private (he didn't buy the argument), the  
>last thing a hoaxer using a model train wheel is likely to do is  
>to allow a skeptical TV producer to interview him in his home  
>and show him his model trains. That just makes no sense at all.

And that is too categorical. What you offer is, as you say, "an argument". Well here's another argument: Maybe a hoaxer enjoys teasing his "victims" - especially those who, like Stephen Black, are on record (see the Ann Druffel article I pointed you towards) as having brought out Heflin's streak of mischievous humour. Maybe a hoaxer thinks it's quite amusing to see a sceptical psychiatrist on TV surrounded by the evidence and quite clueless.

Maybe not. Maybe Heflin didn't have that kind of character. But your conclusion does not follow from your argument without extraneous premises that are just assumed here. Which may still be OK, because you then do move on to draw a similar inference from the NICAP investigators' personal impressions of Heflin:

>Further, as I have tried to point out a couple of the NICAP



>investigators spent a lot of time in Heflin's home, got to know  
>him very well, and knew about all of his hobbies and interests.  
>Again, a hoaxer using a model train wheel would not likely be so  
>open about his interest in model trains.

Some of the same possibilities apply here. But let's see, was he really open about his interest in model trains to NICAP in 1965? I'd like to see some documentary reference for this. You told us back on May 24 in response to Chris Allen's post about the model-making discussed in the Black film:

"Our investigators practically lived with Heflin and checked him out thoroughly, and no model building hobby was found."

Ah. This seems to be a different story. Can both stories be correct? Well possibly what NICAP found was a hobby of building model railways, then, but not a hobby of actually building model locomotives, so in this sense they found "no model building hobby"? But that would be a hair-splitting and unconvincing defence.

Reasonably, either

a) he was not a model hobbyist and NICAP properly observed this (according to your first statement) or

b) he was a model hobbyist and NICAP failed to observe this (according to your second statement).

We know now that Heflin did according to his own testimony (filmed by Black) enjoy model making, and did have a model railway in the house (filmed by Black), so there is evidence in favour of b).

If NICAP did not notice his modelling interests then your argument that "a hoaxer using a model train wheel would not likely be so open about his interest in model trains" loses all force. One could also infer that the NICAP investigators did not know Heflin as intimately as they (and you) thought they did, which goes to the question of whether or not Heflin had the type of character to tease his hoax victims by dangling a metaphorical clue in front of Stephen Black. According to Druffel, Kelson & Wood (JSE p.593) he had "an offbeat sense of humor and joked at times in a deadpan fashion, particularly when irritated".

In these circumstances you may have an opinion that if Heflin was a hoaxer he would not allow his railway modelling to be filmed two years after the original investigations, but you can't demonstrate it; and your sweeping conclusion that it "just makes no sense at all" seems too cavalier. I think most Listers would have to agree that when we unpack your argument things aren't quite so simple.

BTW, just to put the cat back among the pigeons here I note that Chris Allen's original allegation was that "Rex Heflin had a hobby of making models and photographing them." [my emphasis]. I haven't seen this particular claim either supported or challenged.

>Finally, I am not aware that anyone has made an effort to  
>retrieve Dr. Robert Nathan's research papers on the case from  
>1965 and later. Maybe they are not available, I don't know, but  
>his work seems to be rather airily dismissed as unimportant. He  
>was not just some stumblebum amateur. I quote from two NASA  
>press releases:

"Airily dismissed"? Show me one sentence, or even a clause, where I or any of us three (Stooges/Musketeers, delete as appropriate) can be construed as having "airily dismissed" Nathan as "just some stumblebum". This is disgraceful. I have referenced his results in List posts (insofar as I know about them from citations in other sources) several times, explicitly factoring in the fact that his original work detected no strings and also exploring his interesting report of the microtexture of the #1 dark band etc in relation to the "smoke" and cross-referencing certain related points with other cases such as Trindade.

I would never dream of airily dismissing Nathan (or any photoanalyst) as a "techie", whose work, just like that of "all

techies I have known in the past" thought that "photoanalytical skills provide a magic short-cut to truth." That sort of airy dismissal comes easier to you than to me. What I would do though is point out (to any youths on-List who may take fast PCs a little more for granted than us relative dinosaurs) that the state-of-the-art computer processing that would have seemed amazing in 1965 would probably make a schoolboy shrug now.

Nevertheless a 40-year-old technical analysis of second-generation (neg/print) copies has value alongside modern analysis of the original Polaroids. I'd like to know more. But no, I don't know where his research papers are, or where - even if - he ever published anything. I feel a bit better about this because it seems nobody else does either.

As someone who supervised the early investigation this is something you could have helped with maybe several weeks ago when his work was first mentioned here - by you, incidentally. You've cited this valuable work several times. I'd assume you might have some idea where it was published or archived? If not who does? If anyone here should know where to begin to "make an effort" to locate it, as you urge, why shouldn't it be you? You could at least have dropped a clue.

Druffel, Kelson and Wood certainly don't. Their 9-page discussion (p. 590-9) of "The First Photogrammetric Analyses" (actually there is virtually nothing in here about photogrammetry) tells that Nathan found no strings, that he found the brighter patch or wedge on the underside, that he decided the #1 dark band was "particulate matter" and that he also detected some "anomalous blurring". But although there are 27 references at the end of their paper; not one of them references Robert Nathan - not even indirectly, neither a written, verbal, published nor unpublished source.

Maybe there's something on the NICAP website then? Considering the importance of this work (which you describe here exactly as it is described everywhere else - in very vague summary outline) it ought to be at least referenced there surely? But no. There's a link for people to buy your book Dick (which doesn't work incidentally - the link I mean, not the book). But no source for this vital case information.

Well Hartmann actually met and discussed the case with Nathan in 1967-68, particularly at the famous Jan 15 1968 meeting. His own study should be able to send us to the right place surely? Wrong again. Hartmann's report (Condon p.437) has 24 references and sub-references. We have a moment of excitement when we check #8. Yes, this is it! But all it says is "R. Nathan". Very useful.

So maybe you can tell us where we are supposed to pick up the trail Dick.

>JPL, NASA, Aug. 9, 1966. JPL COMPUTER PROCESS BRIGHTENS SURVEYOR  
>MOON PICTURES. Re: the "sparkling success of Surveyor I in  
>taking television pictures of the Moon's surface...These  
>sharper prints are produced by a computerized system which  
>corrects distortion and improves resolution in original  
>photographs taken by television cameras. The system was  
>developed by Dr. Robert Nathan, who led the JPL video fdigital  
>(computer) data research for NASA. Robert Selzer was in charge  
>of Surveyor picture enhancement." (Is he--Selzer--not the guy  
>now re-examining the Heflin photos for the JSE paper?)

No he isn't. That's Eric Kelson.

<snip>

>Nathan, who originally was very skeptical, found no evidence of  
>a string or hoax -- twice. In fact, all the techies can do to  
>resolve photo authenticity is find clearcut and unequivocal  
>evidence of a hoax.

Nathan may have been "very sceptical" - that's something that we have to take your word for. Druffel et al tell us that "At the time, he had considerable private interest in the UFO phenomenon. He often attended LANS meetings and analyzed several photos for the subcommittee." Suggests he may not have been as sceptical as, say, Hartmann or Black. But I'll go with "very" on your say-so. But whatever he was, he was 'it' four decades ago in a digitally very different age; he was looking at copies not

originals; and we don't seem to have a word that he ever wrote in order to refer to, which doesn't seem to be entirely our fault. In these circumstances, re-analysis is not the kind of redundant, self-indulgent, techie thumb-sucking that you want to portray. I don't notice you attacking Kelson for his 2000 digital studies. I'd be reluctant to have to conclude this is because his results were poorly referenced, his work technically under-described, and his conclusions rather uncritical, thus rather harmonising with a strong need on your part to keep the case preserved in 1960s aspic.

>They cannot prove that a photo is genuine.

>That sort of proof lies in the character and background  
>investigation and the preponderance of evidence. So the Truth is  
>not in the photos themselves, unless and only if the photo is a  
>demonstrable fake.

The "Truth" is not anywhere here, in the photos or out. What we have to do is make judgements based on the interlocking of evidence from photographic and testimonial and circumstantial sources. You misrepresent a List debate which has covered ground on a lot of these fronts. And I have said myself that we can't ever prove the photos are genuine. I've also pointed out the probative limitations of simulating them with trainwheels or whatever-wheels (June 19 to Kyle King and June 20 to Don, the very post to which you are responding here disdainfully).

Perhaps you would have preferred if I'd never resurrected the Ed Riddle "trainwheel" affair in the first place? Just keep quiet and hope it stayed forgotten eh? You decried him as a liar and a debunker on no evidence. Should I have then not bothered to find him and ask him for his story? Would that have been a proper "empirical" approach to "character and background investigation and the preponderance of evidence"? Of course once it turned out that his real story was not a strong challenge to Heflin after all, that he very possibly saw someone else's copy-cat fakes, well he didn't seem so much of an ogre so that's all right then.

You can certainly make the strong point that, even after this, the trainwheel story didn't slow down but seemed to gain revs (bowed along by Kyle and his anonymous accomplice). But you should also consider that much of the "techie" discussion does not depend on the trainwheel hypothesis but is general to all kinds of possible small models and is anticipating issues that will arise in connection with work that can't be done yet because we don't have the originals or much necessary information. But it certainly isn't the case that all possible work has been done on these photos in the past. It isn't even the case that all work done can be read about anywhere.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake - Vander

From: Dirk Vander Ploeg <[publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 11:24:48 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 15:06:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake - Vander

To aid in understanding this sighting better I have included links to the original larger photos that I received numbered exactly as shown:

<http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland1.jpg>

<http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland2.jpg>

<http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland3.jpg>

<http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland4.jpg>

Here also is the original statement from the witness, Lt. Col. Robert G. [Retd.]:

<http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland.doc>

-----

I decided to wrote this letter because I concluded the case is worth sharing it with serious people.

I'm a calm, respectable person. I have a family and lots of friends. Since I retired - I'm a former worker of one military department - I became a passionate fisherman and I spend most of my valuable free in that way.

I was a normal person until May 22nd 2006. The thing I recently experienced, changed my life completely.

On that day as usually I went fishing to nearby Zywieckie Lake - I live near Zywiec. Also my son went with me =96 he decided to took some photos with his new digital camera he received as a gift from me and my wife for his first communion.

The weather was bright on that day. About 19:20 we arrived on the spot. When I began fishing, we took the camera off the bag and strolling along the lake banks we were about to took some experimental photos. Suddenly my son stopped and asked whether I had heard. I asked what and then also I heard that strange sound. It was coming from the left side [walking along the banks]. It was as if a whistle. It was high-pitched but no loud.

I'm not able to compare it with anything because it doesn't resemble me anything. We moved several meters forward, then we went by shrubs and we found ourselves on a small beach - one among other similar. I looked toward the place the strange sound was emanating and I was stunned.

A huge, shining disc was suspended in the air over the water. It was identical as those from TV.

At first I grasped my son's hand and I want to escape. I forgot even about the bag and fishing rods. I was scared and disorientated. I wanted to protect my child. But Maciek =96 my son =96 began screaming: Dad, stop! It is an UFO... I felt shivers coming down my spine and I was wet with cold sweat. I couldn't breathe. Complete emptiness filled my head.

My heart was thumping furiously. I calmed down for a while, because I thought that it flew away but I noticed it after a while with the corner of my eye in the opposite part of the sky. It was moving slowly spinning as metal top.

Maciek turned on the camera and nervously pushed some buttons. He screamed: "Daddy, Daddy. Let's take a photo. We'll show it to Mum!" I took the camera and snap a photo. In that time the object flew slowly to right. When I saw that I decided to photograph it, I nervously took several additional shots.

I forgot about the whole world. I even didn't know when I went into the water. The saucer stopped and began swinging aside as a dropping leaf. Its shape resembled a hat, it was huge and real. And then it disappeared again, just vanishing in plain sight.

I thought: "Good God! Aliens don't exist!" But that thought didn't amused me as those when I talk about aliens. I noticed some people on the opposite bank and I wanted to call them but I realized that I could be a laughing stock. I checked the whole sky but there were no traces of the saucer. Despite of the fact I was still taking photos till the memory was filled.

I sat on a trunk. Son sat next to me. I asked: "Maciek, what it was?" He only moved his arms and said: "UFO, I just said it! Let's quickly come back home. We must tell Mum about it.

Regards,

Lt.Col. Robert G. [ret.]

-----

Hope this all helps.

Dirk

UFODigest.com  
11L6 Maple Road  
R.R.2  
Port Colborne, Ontario L3K 5V4  
Canada  
905-834-2177  
Email: [publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: We've Got This Wrong - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 18:21:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 09:26:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: We've Got This Wrong - Shough

>From: Stuart Miller <[stuart.miller4.nul](mailto:stuart.miller4.nul)>  
>To: UFO Updates <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 18:15:58 +0100 (BST)  
>Subject: We've Got This Wrong

>On the other hand, it might be helpful to take a gander at The  
>Saviour Of Ufology, namely science, to see what's happened  
>there, safe in the knowledge that it is a subject that will have  
>only been lightly brushed by any "official" meddling. But oh  
>dear, what do we find when we look? Google "Withdrawn Scientific  
>Papers" and watch as 7,530,000 hits come up. Then Google "UFO  
>Hucksters" and stand back aghast as 900 hits appear. Tsk tsk;  
>seems science is riddled with lying, cheating bastards who wish  
>to deceive the public, their employers and anything else with a  
>pulse.

Google "UFO fake" and you'll get 1,130,000. Google just "UFO"  
and you get nearly 42 million. How many of those 42 million hits  
which don't have the word "fake" in nevertheless relate to the  
ufological equivalent of completely bogus scientific papers? How  
many of the hits on "withdrawn scientific papers" are multiple  
redundant press references to the same scandalous case?

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Nielsen

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 10:38:44 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 09:32:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Flight Characteristics? - Nielsen

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 17:22:04 EDT  
>Subject: UFO Flight Characteristics?

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 20 Jun 2006 20:20:58 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: UFO Flight Characteristics?

<snip>

>>Is there a credible classification of UFO's by shape, compared  
>>to corresponding flight characteristics?

>I think if more emphasis was rightly placed upon such issues we  
>would have a more confident answer. Informed interviewers would  
>be better able to articulate questions and react to subtleties.  
>Falling like a leaf does nothing for me especially if it's  
>repeated over and over again without follow up. Asking a witness  
>to try and sculpt the shape of the UFO with a piece of clay  
>(especially if they had seen different sides), asking the  
>witness to move the object around with his hands the way it  
>moved around in the sky would be novel (a better way to infer  
>actual dynamics/physics), and asking witnesses to describe  
>colors would be better served if you presented them with colors\_  
>from which to choose from. All this should be routine and would  
>do wonders for my protracted cumulative understanding: My hopes  
>that something useful could now be linked with something  
>solid... brought forth from a consistent pattern of believably  
>answered questions.

<snip>

>Here's a good one in point: When the chief Roswell witness was  
>asked how big an area the debris field was... no one asked him  
>how densely the field was occupied with debris?

>Was it thinly spread, sparsely spread, can you draw me a  
>picture, where some of the pieces blowing in the wind?

>Did you fold any of it up?

>The density would give you a good feel for how to measure the  
>size of the object... Aren't we after that type of data?

>Having the answers to just some of these obvious questions could  
>have easily addressed/settled a huge unknown between Balloon-  
>like Vs. UFO-like etc.

>Instead, the case get's dragged out for years because of lack of  
>insight or for lack of a few properly posed questions If this  
>guy saw a crashed UFO, I'd be all over him with questions! So  
>the costs resulting from poor questioning is immense!

Exactly Viktor! I know MUFON and others do well with interviews,  
recording, and reporting. I know that folks like Larry Hatch and  
others do well in tabulating information.

The general view is getting clearer. But we have more to do. The flight behavior question is just one of many needing answers. The governments familiar with the UFO phenomenon probably have those answers already.

I'm grateful to governments who allow the freedom of speech that they do. But life would be easier if those governments were more forthcoming with the info they have. Maybe the best minds include more than those already identified by and contracted with those governments. A larger, more open group seems best for all. Look at what open-source has done for computing and information technology, for example. But maybe it has to with ideas like Mr. Friedman's: governments don't want us to know that they can't control their own airspace and other natural resources; and if we united as humans from Earth, instead of specific nationalities, current power bases would be lost.

No matter. We are here. We are intelligent enough. We are working together. We are asking questions. We are finding answers. We are doing what humans do best.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Conceptualizing UFOs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 09:44:23 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 09:44:23 -0400  
Subject: Conceptualizing UFOs

Source: The NICAP Website

<http://www.nicap.org/concept.htm>

13 August 2003

Conceptualizing UFOs

By Richard H. Hall

Francis Ridge:

I would hope that everyone on the e-mail Lists would read this short but to-the-point article by Richard Hall. The "flame wars" would be avoided and the courteous and scientific debate would guide us to the truth in due time. Richard is the editor of The UFO Evidence, (NICAP 1964), the author of Uninvited Guests (1988), and the more recent The UFO Evidence, Volume II: A 30-Year Report.

---

Richard Hall:

Analyzing UFO data and reasoning about it has been extremely controversial due to a number of factors, primarily disagreement about which data are mutually agreed upon as requiring explanation. In this article I attempt to provide a conceptual framework and guide for thinking about and theorizing about UFOs.

On a related issue, various labels and epithets often have been substituted for rational discussion in characterizing our philosophical opponents. No doubt this is due to the frustrations of trying to deal with a complex and unorthodox subject that has little recognition among scientists, the news media, or other important opinion-makers in society. What does it mean to be "pro-UFO" or a "believer"? How apt are the labels "debunker", "scoffer", or "skeptic" as applied to those who disbelieve in UFOs and/or profess strong criticism of the views (not to mention the motives and intelligence) of "believers"?

Interestingly, the ad hominem arguments tend to emanate far more from the "scoffers" than the "believers". Whereas many of us think that Phil Klass, other CSICOP people, and Donald Menzel before them are mistaken in their professed viewpoints, we do not usually attribute evil motives to them.

Before proposing a conceptual scheme as a guide to thinking about and studying UFO sightings, I will attempt to define some terms and also suggest ways to encourage more civil debate of the issues. People see things in the sky (and on the ground) that they cannot explain and term them "UFOs". Although UFO has long since become a synonym for ET spaceship in the popular mind, let us continue to think of it literally as meaning an

unexplained flying (sometimes landing) object or phenomenon.

The large majority of such reports turn out to have mundane explanations, including aircraft seen under unusual lighting or weather conditions, rocket or missile launches, and fireball meteors. The percentages of explained versus unexplained are scientifically meaningless, but typically are something like 80% to 20%. The scientific question is: Do the sightings that remain unexplained after careful investigation represent one or more phenomena of potential scientific significance? Should time and money be spent in gathering and analyzing better data in a systematic way?

In past years the U.S. Air Force and most self-styled skeptics have extrapolated from the high percentage of explained cases (sometimes artificially high due to ingrained negative attitudes) to the unexplained cases. "If we had more complete data", their argument went, "we could also explain the rest of the cases. Only insufficient data prevents us from explaining 100% of the reports." Of course, this argument totally ignores the content of the unexplained cases.

How do we determine whether the unexplained cases represent something new and important that deserves some level of priority investigation? By spending time and money to test that hypothesis along with its antithesis! However, those already convinced that there is nothing of scientific interest in UFO reports will see no point in investigating further. Their minds are made up. They see only "noise" and no "signal" in UFO reports. A good term to describe a person who takes this position is Scoffer.

On the other extreme are those who accept practically everything seen in the sky as evidence of extraterrestrial visitation. Scientifically oriented UFO investigators resent being labeled as "believers", which implies an uncritical acceptance of dubious data bordering on slack-jawed faith. A good name for the uncritical ones would be Believer.

Practically everyone else fits somewhere in between these extremes. Although a range of attitudes and approaches is involved, a good general term for people in this central category would be Skeptic. (It probably is a losing battle to suggest this terminology since the term "skeptic" has been pre-empted by the Committee for Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP), but it would be a more accurate use of the term in its historical sense. CSICOP members tend to be either Scoffers or Debunkers.) A neutral alternative might be Investigator, though that would exclude anyone who ventures an opinion on the subject without actually doing some investigation, or reading the serious literature, which also applies to many CSICOP members.

Within the center category of people who have some degree of interest in studying or investigating UFO reports, there are several levels of interest and/or attitude. Some of these I will define as:

**Doubter:** Tends to think that UFO reports probably have mundane explanations for the most part, but finds the reports interesting and worth studying.

**Debunker:** Tends to focus on criticizing the foibles of UFO believers and tries to find flaws in hardcore UFO reports.

**Advocate:** Sees UFO reports as potentially very important and argues for careful scientific study and investigation.

**Proponent:** Is strongly convinced that UFO reports represent probable other-worldly visitors and focuses on presenting the data in support of that view.

The reader may use his or her imagination in considering real-life examples of each category. These labels should not be used in a pejorative manner. Members of each category can be entirely rational in discussing and debating the issues, and the sooner that is understood the better chance we will have of engaging in a civil give-and-take that will help all of us to gain an approximation of the truth. Facts, logic, and science should be the means of settling disagreements.

That being said, it would be helpful to confine discussions to one of the two following broad hypotheses which can then be further refined:

(1) Nonexistence. UFOs are a collection of mistaken observations based on sociological, psychological, and other human error factors. If true, this should be of great interest to sociologists, psychologists, and anthropologists given the worldwide nature of the UFO phenomenon.

(2) Existence. UFOs represent a real unexplained phenomenon. The scientific question then would become: What is the nature of the phenomenon? Is it (a) literally a natural phenomenon, (b) evidence of a secret military weapon system, or (c) evidence of some kind of visitors from elsewhere?

If everyone who considers himself part of the rational center (as opposed to the irrational extremes) were to adopt this approach, it would greatly improve communications and expedite scientific research into UFOs. Neither Scoffers nor Believers have very much positive to contribute to a resolution of the UFO controversy. The rest of us in the center, if we could work together and engage in civil discourse, might succeed in accomplishing something worthwhile. And regardless of the outcome, society would benefit substantially from either debunking "the UFO myth" or establishing it as something very important for once and for all.

Richard H. Hall

[Thanks to 'The Norm' 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:44:13 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 09:51:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:38:15 -0700  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 15:12:50 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>>Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2006 11:17:23 +0100  
>>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>I have had conversations with Viktor on other things and like  
>him. He was also very generous with his time and providing me  
>with materials. But he is beginning to get under my skin with  
>his repeated grandstanding on this Heflin redux investigation. I  
>want to work with him, not against him, but he needs to tone  
>down his "Italian/Croatian" style a couple notches.

I feel like I'm a visitor on a Green Acres Episode? Does might  
make right too? These are obvious ploys to the audience. So, at  
least I have an honest assessment - a full awareness of the  
tactics being used.

If you guys spent a little less time patting yourselves on the  
back and trying to put yourselves always in the best light for  
those who don't have time to read all the posts, I think I could  
take all this with a little more seriousness rather than with a  
good hearty laugh.

David, I'm not grandstanding if my points are being cleverly  
ignored and recast with fictional drama. My previous completed  
posts speak for themselves. I trust in what is there.

I asked you a specific question in my earlier response which  
hasn't been addressed yet. At what point did you measure the  
angular altitude of the object in #2 and #3?

I like you guys too, but please a little less ganging up

By the way, some of your responses in some of your other post  
were being addressed to comments I hadn't made, so be careful of  
all the cleverly crafted slice and dice on your film's editing  
floor. Maybe those thrown away pieces speak a better truth, make  
a more honest film, the kind I'd like to watch or sing to. The  
music in this drama is definitely off key.....

I didn't write this comment (See below) yet you respond to it  
like it was from me to make a false impression ... this is what

I'm talking about! It was your first response right off the bat, a cleverly placed artifact. Use names if you're addressing two different individuals, please.

>>>I can't see the comparison matching the Heflin photos matching a  
>>>model train wheel. The flange on the model is shorter than that  
>>>in evidence in the photos.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:19:45 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:15:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Ledger

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 11:05:30 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:54:07 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

><snip>

>>My only reason for posting was to bring to your attention the  
>>seeming difference in profile of the object as to that of a real  
>>train wheel and the ratio between the flange and the "run width"  
>>as it used to be called when I was a brakeman 42 years ago-or  
>>just about the time of Heflin's photograph. I recognize as well  
>>that a model wheel would not likely be as precise as the real  
>>thing. But the flange does not stick straight down from the main  
>>part of the wheel but curves away from the run at an angle then  
>>curves into the flange. This facillitates several things such as  
>>riding through swith points, taking curves without the deafening  
>>screeching being worse than it is, to enable deliberate  
>>derailing devices and to prevent derailing by rocks and snow and  
>>turns etc. The flange has a definite ratio to the run.

>>Here's a URL that shows the way a wheel is constructed  
>>mathematically. There is a science involved:

>><http://www.apta.com/about/committees/press/bulletin/1998-1.cfm>

>>But that might be a refinement of what was on the trucks 38  
>>years before this paper.

>Thanks Don, (see below for JSE imaging link and why)

>I think the point you alluded to that toy wheels and actual  
>train wheels are probably different, substantially applies in  
>this particular case!

Not that different, Victor. The "runs" on the rail wheels for  
instance are flat [parallel to axel] both on the real thing and  
the model wheels. There's a clear tapering of the side of the  
object in the photos and as shown in the drawing [yours"] some  
time ago. An angle like that would have been rolling rails over  
on a regular basis. And I reiterate the "object's" height of the  
flange to the run ratio is to great to match a train wheel,  
model or not.

>The tracks are also different so a different design is  
>warranted in that regard too... the two mating halves are also  
>different. The weight/physics requirements are also different.

Just square cut and don't match that tapering of the wheel  
surface [run].

>If you look at Heflin #1 you can make out what appears to be a  
>floating dot (over to the right side of the object) with a  
>slight ascending glow to it: perhaps the cut end of a

>monofilament wire...

I see the dot but I don't see the glow. Perhaps the dot is a scratch or a speck of dust?

>You can also see some dark "flaring up structures" coming off  
>either side which also hints of a loop like attachment on either  
>side of the object. One might infer that the dot/ascending glow  
>is part of that very attachment means (knot?).

You have better eyes than I do.

>If one looks for a loop and not a straight line ascending from  
>the object, much more is understood. A wire can then be seen  
>going through that loop at a higher portion of the photo (not in  
>this blow up) coming from two different directions... Therefore,  
>a single wire doesn't apply to the Heflin case.

>You can actually see these structures without enhancements, but  
>the enhancement do help in pointing out where it is one should  
>be looking.

Quite a contraption our boy had. Wonder how long he was "off the job" while he did all of this.

>look at the blow up of Heflin #1 located near the bottom half  
>of the article... copy and paste the link below... etc. You can  
>then select a crop from Adobe Reader and dump it into any photo  
>enhancement Software you might wish... try embossing and  
>contrasting changes, etc... have fun. :) If more people see this  
>on their own it is much more impressive... there's a lot to be  
>said for self discovery.

I have looked but I'm not seeing these things. The problem, to my mind, is how much of this could be attributed to the passage of 42 years and accumulated scratches. Are there other scratches on these poloroids that can be used as a comparison?

>See the .pdf file:

><http://tinyurl.com/kmdvr>

I think you should find something else to compare this object to other than the model[HO?]train wheel. It's off for me. Not the angle "O" formed. That's not kosher for either the real thing or a model wheel. The flange is too wide/long on the object in the photo.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 20:13:07 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:17:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 20:58:43 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>By the way, Ann did confide in me recently that the JSE photos  
>are cropped and this was just one of my reasons for  
>underestimating the width of field below that calculated for the  
>FOV of the lens. Martin... Martin... Martin... get with the  
>program.

Recently? And "confided"? If this is true - if you knew (keeping  
the dark secret to yourself) that the JSE images were cropped  
before making that 30 degree estimate; if you therefore knew  
they were cropped before agreeing with me, off and on-List, that  
because proportions were preserved the best guess was that they  
were probably not cropped - then you were dishonest.

If it is not true - and if you did not know that they were  
cropped at this time but have latterly found out that this  
cropping fortuitously accounts for some or all of your earlier  
error - then you are dishonest now.

Whenever you got to know this significant fact, it seems to me  
you take pleasure in using it for gamesmanship purposes. I drew  
attention to some untruths and misrepresentations in your last  
List post, and could have said more. Don't be profligate with  
your integrity Viktor. You may need it.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## No US Official Has The Right To Lie

From: Larry W. Bryant <[overtci.nul](mailto:overtci.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 05:28:37 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:33:17 -0400  
Subject: No US Official Has The Right To Lie

No U. S. Official has a right to lie to the public in the performance of his/her official duty.

Excerpt from the United States Code Of Statutes:

-----

U.S.C. TITLE 18  
PART I  
CHAPTER 47  
Para. 1001

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully...

(1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact;

(2) makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or

(3) makes or USES any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to a party to a judicial proceeding, or that party's counsel, for statements, representations, writings or documents submitted by such party or counsel to a judge or magistrate in that proceeding.

(c) With respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of the legislative branch, subsection (a) shall apply only to...

(1) administrative matters, including a claim for payment, a matter related to the procurement of property or services, personnel or employment practices, or support services, or a document required by law, rule, or regulation to be submitted to the Congress or any office or officer within the legislative branch; or

(2) any investigation or review, conducted pursuant to the authority of any committee, subcommittee, commission or office of the Congress, consistent with applicable rules of the House or Senate.

-----

Beyond that statutory proscription, we have, for example, the content of this Aug. 12, 1990, editorial from the Chicago, Illinois, Sun Times:

-----

Military Has No Right to Lie

If the Middle East crisis goes on for a while, something needs to be cleared up at the outset so the U. S. military is more credible than it came to be during the Vietnam War.

We're referring to the misinformation given to the public by the Illinois National guard about the activation of its 126th Air Refueling Wing, based at O'Hare. When the unit's personnel and planes already were in Spain, a lower-ranking spokesman for the Guard was still telling the press that the unit hadn't been activated, that its planes were still at O'Hare.

Higher ranking officers later apologized for the misinformation, but when one commented that the incident now is "water over the dam," we had to wonder if he still didn't get the point.

The press understands that some information about troop movements and other military operations must be kept secret. So the press has always accepted a "no comment" or "we cannot confirm or deny that" statement from the military. But until this country turns into Iraq, outright and deliberate misinformation is unacceptable.

It is an important enough consideration in a democracy that it ought to be a part of the agenda of the highest-ranking officers.

-----

LWB Note: So long as Amerika has no "official secrets act" on the order of the one in Britain, the zero-tolerance principle re a federal employee's lying to the public should (and probably will) remain intact (despite any Bu\$ch junta's wishes to the contrary). Since we Amerikans happen to be the governors as well as the governed in this republic, any official lying subverts the nation's governmental security, credibility, and integrity - and hence must be avoided, rooted out, condemned, and punished.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## The Economic Alien

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:40:54 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:40:54 -0400  
Subject: The Economic Alien

Source: The Space Review - Rockville, Maryland, USA

<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/633/1/index.html>

Monday, June 5, 2006

The Economic Alien  
by Gregory Anderson

Speculating about what an alien race might believe, think, or do has a definite fascination. Of course, it is nearly pure speculation; we simply don't know enough about intelligence in the universe yet to reach even any tentative conclusions. It's also important to remember that speculation is human speculation, and may not, therefore, have anything at all to do with the thought patterns of an intelligent species that evolved along its own path.

With that disclaimer firmly in mind, let's look at the Park Hypothesis as put forth by Michael Huang in a recent TSR article. (See The Park hypothesis, The Space Review, May 30, 2006) Of course it's possible another race would choose not to develop spaceflight. Human spaceflight over the long term is not yet guaranteed. However, as Mr. Huang points out, those civilizations that limit themselves to one planet will not last indefinitely. We should also note that not every civilization will develop high technology. For those that do not, even though the species might have the necessary intelligence, the question of whether to develop spaceflight will never come up.

Much of the SETI community tend to assume the only reason any civilization would develop space technology is to do scientific research. At some point, however, a technological civilization confined to one planet will likely be driven to look into space for energy, resources, new manufacturing opportunities, and more.

In essence, then, The Park Hypothesis is only applicable to civilizations that have developed a technological base capable of supporting spaceflight. How likely is it that a civilization would go so far technologically, and decide to go no further? We don't know. Speculating, however, we can fairly surmise that a technological base able to throw robots into space, for example, will also have begun to transform society. Production of industry will have reached a formidable level. The material wealth of the society may have begun an historic boom. Science will have begun to ask more interesting, more profound questions than ever before. Advanced robotic probes imply powerful, tiny computers, which would open an array of possibilities. The quality of medical care might well be on the rise. Would a society in that situation decide to push no further?

There is also a more fundamental economic principle that would eventually exert itself. Mr. Park and much of the SETI community tend to assume the only reason any civilization would develop space technology is to do scientific research. At some point,

however, a technological civilization confined to one planet will likely be driven to look into space for energy, resources, new manufacturing opportunities in different gravity fields or in different physical environments, and more. Could off-planet economic development be accomplished using only robots in space? Perhaps. To be efficiently accomplished, however, those robots would need to be extraordinarily advanced from the start of space development activities. Otherwise, a motivated, educated member of that race would be able to do much more on site, much faster.

Once a race had routine access to an orbit of its home planet, it would also have easy access to the rest of its home solar system, at least in terms of energy requirements. A capability to visit sister worlds would evolve from the development of an ability to live in space for long periods for economic reasons. Would every race in that situation fly to other planets, and eventually to other stars? Who knows? Fermi's famous question might suggest other species have stayed home, but Fermi was a physicist, not an entrepreneur.

If economic realities would tend to drive a technological civilization into space and eventually to the stars, where are they? That answer has eluded us for fifty years, but fifty Earth years is no time at all in the history of the universe.

---

Gregory Anderson is a freelance writer and a graduate of Ball State University. He is a member of both The Planetary Society and the National Space Society.

[Thanks to Milos Krmelt 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Space.com Article Response - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <[macbot.nul](mailto:macbot.nul)>  
Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 17:41:48 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:48:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Space.com Article Response - Tonnies

>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 07:19:40 -0700  
>Subject: Re: Space.com Article Response

<snip>

>Forgive me for snipping everything that you wrote.

>I take exception to the "Top Ten Alien Encounters"

>[http://www.space.com/top10\\_alienencounters\\_debunked.html](http://www.space.com/top10_alienencounters_debunked.html)

>linked from that same article. The 10 encounters weren't  
>specific sightings as such, but general categories...

>It was a sad series starting with: "Space Aliens Engineered  
>Ancient Egyptian Pyramids", followed by Cattle Mutilations;  
>Area-51; Crop Circles; The FACE on MARS; The Alien Autopsy  
>Film(!);

Sad indeed. One problem I couldn't help but notice is that the bit about the Face on Mars contains some gross misrepresentations and makes the rather insulting mistake of assuming that those interested in the formation (whatever it is) are unanimous in their interpretation of it.

But coming from Space.Com, I expected no less.

Mac Tonnies <[macbot.nul](mailto:macbot.nul)>

Mac's website: <http://www.mactonnies.com>  
Mac blogs at: <http://posthumanblues.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Boone

From: Greg Boone <[Evolbaby.nul](mailto:Evolbaby.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 02:07:38 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:52:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Boone

Don't know if any of you has been keeping tabs on the latest stem cell research/application news but the more I read the more I recall the reported procedures done to people during abductions.

There isn't enough space to post each website news story as every day there are several new stem cell breakthrough stories.

With stem cells both embryonic and non embryonic we can grow new teeth, repair spinal cord damage, repair optical tissue and nerve damage, cardiac and cardiovascular damage, cure baldness, grow certain body parts, improve the condition of persons suffering from multiple sclerosis. Diabetes and full organ growth are just cures around the bend. There's so much news on a daily basis one person can't process it all.

What got to me were the regions of the body where the adult stem cells and embryonic stem cells are extracted. The nasal passage, womb and testicles.

Blood, bone marrow as well.

If anyone has been studying this and has published a paper please post.

Since there's no definitive proof our visitors are of extraterrestrial origin we do know they exist as real living creatures harvesting we humans and other animals for biological purposes.

I've always said that a civilizations first survival strategy is to stay alive as long as it can. Perhaps, yes I'll theorize, we're dealing with creatures of antiquity that reached that apex of biological progression where using stem cells they're able to replicate themselves into some long lasting or biological form of immortality.

An old saying states that time reveals all secrets may be appropriate here.

The data regarding stem cell discoveries and treatments are mind boggling to say the least. Of course our own Senate Majority Leader Sen. Frist has been stonewalling an entire year after a bill was passed to bring debate on stem cell research. Meanwhile, foreign countries are barreling ahead full steam with astounding stem cell applications and patents. We Americans are so far behind the pack that by the time the legislators and politicians and psychotic religious pundits have their say the foreign scientists will be regrowing new limbs and other miracles.

I've been fortunate to chat with the best foreign stem cell labs and researchers. Their results are undisputable as their patients are alive and well and going about their daily lives for the better after treatment.

Life on Earth is about to change drastically within the next few years. It's invigorating to see the doctors and nurses and medical staff full of bright ideas and hope. I just recently for

the first time in my life was hospitalized with a deadly illness. Fortunately after a week I was released okay. I got the chance to see what patients go through. Luckily the doctor who owned the hospital I was in is a stem cell genius and I'll be chatting with him as well.

Hold on to your hats folks, to me the most important job we can engage in is tending to one another. From the EMTs to the surgeons and nurses. We might be looking at a change in human history where tending to one another will be the rewarding endeavor instead of blowing each other up all the time.

I say we should have free medical training here in the U.S. and universal health care. I'd bet the average person would love to know the ropes on how to handle medical crisis.

So again, the abductors are after stem cells I'm certain.

Wasn't there a line in the scriptures, book of Genesis if memory serves that says something about a fear of us finding the tree of life and living forever?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 08:28:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:57:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

>Source: The Guardian - London, UK

><http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/story/0,,1804926,00.html>

>Saturday June 24, 2006

>Is It A Bird? Is It A Spaceship? No, It's A Secret US Spy Plane

>- Sightings of flying object over Britain worried MoD  
>- Questions threatened to strain relations with US

>James Randerson, science correspondent  
>The Guardian

>It is the stuff of internet conspiracy theorists' dreams. A top  
>secret, hypersonic, cold war spy plane that was allegedly flown  
>by the Americans in UK airspace without the government's  
>permission.

>Publicly, the UK government played down newspaper stories about  
>people who reported seeing UFO-like phenomena. But documents  
>released under the Freedom of Information Act suggest the  
>Ministry of Defence took the rumours much more seriously. Its  
>investigations even threatened to strain the special  
>relationship. "It does show that they were concerned that this  
>thing did exist and the Americans were flying it around willy-  
>nilly over the UK," said David Clarke, a social scientist at  
>Sheffield Hallam University, who obtained the documents. "It  
>certainly suggests that the British government suspected that  
>they were being kept in the dark."

>The United States has never confirmed the existence of the  
>mysterious aircraft, called Aurora, which was supposedly  
>designed to sneak at very high speed over the Soviet Union and  
>take covert snaps of what the enemy was up to. It was rumoured  
>to be capable of flying at up to mach 8 and so could reach  
>anywhere on the planet in less than three hours. In the early  
>1990s there were a string of supposed sightings and strange  
>sounds over Scotland which some bewildered locals attributed to  
>UFOs. Rumours in the press that Aurora was operating secretly  
>out of RAF Machrihanish on the tip of Kintyre prompted Scottish  
>MPs to ask questions in parliament.

<snip>

>"As you will have gathered, the whole affair is causing  
>considerable irritation within HQ [US Air Force], and any  
>helpful comments we can make to defuse the situation would be  
>appreciated."

>"The sort of prickly reaction to people not believing their  
>denials is pretty unusual," said Bill Sweetman, an expert on top  
>secret US black projects with Jane's Defence Review. "They  
>generally don't deny things actually because it generally  
>doesn't hurt them too much if somebody thinks they have a  
>capability they don't."

>A further batch of sightings on March 31 1993 over Devon,



>Cornwall, South Wales and Shropshire prompted another  
>investigation by the MoD. These turned out later to be a Russian  
>rocket re-entering the atmosphere, but the MoD investigators at  
>the time suspected Aurora. "There would seem to be some evidence  
>on this occasion that an unidentified object (or objects) of  
>unknown origin was operating over the UK... If there has been  
>some activity of US origins which is known to a limited circle  
>in MoD and is not being acknowledged it is difficult to  
>investigate further." Mr Sweetman suspects that by the end of  
>the decade the MoD knew about Aurora. Another document from 2000  
>on the MoD's investigations into UFO sightings - or unidentified  
>aerial phenomena as they prefer to call them - states that "some  
>UAP reports can be attributed to covert aircraft programmes".

>The section, which discusses other covert US aircraft such as  
>the SR-71 Blackbird, contains two paragraphs and two  
>illustrations which were censored before its freedom of  
>information release last month. Codes next to the removed  
>material indicate that it was excised in the interests of  
>international relations. "Certain viewing angles of these  
>vehicles may be described as saucer-like," the document says.

Uh oh.

The Condign Report is being treated seriously. But the Condign Report takes the witness testimony seriously.

As every good skeptic knows, the witnesses should only be taken seriously when they report explainable phenomena. Therefore one may assume that sightings attributed to the Aurora must be explainable, i.e., the Aurora must exist and must have been flown over Britain.....

Does this apply to the low flying, silent triangle sightings?

Hmmm...

But no one, including the British government seems to be able to prove that the Aurora exists or, if it does exist, that it has flown over Britain many times.

Hmmmmmm...

So what if there is no Aurora, or at least it was never over Britain? Could they still accept the witness testimony as describing something real? It would seem so.

Uh oh.

They have opened the door, ever so slightly, to the admission that witness testimony in UFO sighting cases can, at least sometimes, be accepted as real even when the sightings are unexplainable.

Uh oh.

They have opened the door to 'UFO reality'.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Bad UFO Photos & Video

From: **Greg Boone** <[Evolbaby.nul](mailto:Evolbaby.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:25:46 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 11:05:27 -0400  
Subject: Bad UFO Photos & Video

I've been reading the List discussions regarding UFO images.

Many years ago I looked into why so many UFO images and videos were so bad. Blurry, off-center, bad lighting, thumb in front of the lens, and every other bad-photography error.

Then one day while at my cousin's house I looked at his wedding photos. The photos were taken by family at a church they'd been attending for decades. Familiar folks, no surprises, typical wedding situations.

Nine out of ten of the photos was rotten. Thumbs in the way, cigarette smoke obscured, red eyes, blurry, you name it the bad photo monster showed up.

Again I looked at another, a friend's vids and photos of our regular events. Same thing. Bad lighting, thumbs in the way etc.

I even looked at my videos I took at UFO events. I should be ashamed because I know my equipment and faired much better but 10% were incompetent.

I grew up around top, award-winning photographers while working for the Gannett News Service, AP, Reuters and the rest. I got to see what makes a good photo. I'm talking back in the days when people actually developed film. Nowadays the cameras do everything but go fetch coffee and a kanish.

My point is that people can't take competent photos and videos of familiar events without goofing up, and we expect them to suddenly become master photographers and videographers when something like a UFO shows up. Even with auto-focus, auto-this and computerized-that, we still have that thumb in the way, that shakey camera and the rest.

Once in a while we're lucky and a UFO photo looks great. So when people ask why there aren't crystal clear photos of UFOs I say it's due to an unusual, unexpected event that consists of speed, short duration in most cases, and just plain nervousness.

There's a popular television show called America's Funniest Videos. Unexpected events caught on camera usually consisting of people falling down, or their pants falling off, of a pet's stunts or a child's disagreement with their food. Precious moments indeed but here we have familiar settings with unexpected actions. Some are captured well and others not.

With the spread of cameras in cell phones it's only a matter of time before someone gets pictures and video of things we'll all be studying.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 10:27:34 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 11:54:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 08:28:44 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

>>Source: The Guardian - London, UK

>><http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/story/0,,1804926,00.html>

>>Saturday June 24, 2006

>>Is It A Bird? Is It A Spaceship? No, It's A Secret US Spy Plane

>>- Sightings of flying object over Britain worried MoD  
>>- Questions threatened to strain relations with US

>>James Randerson, science correspondent  
>>The Guardian

>>It is the stuff of internet conspiracy theorists' dreams. A top  
>>secret, hypersonic, cold war spy plane that was allegedly flown  
>>by the Americans in UK airspace without the government's  
>>permission.

<snip>

>Uh oh.

>They have opened the door, ever so slightly, to the  
>admission that witness testimony in UFO sighting cases can,  
>at least sometimes, be accepted as real even when the sightings  
>are unexplainable.

>Uh oh.

>They have opened the door to 'UFO reality'.

Damned if they haven't! Cracked the door themselves! To be  
"hoisted by their own petard", in actuality! Like  
head-butting the ball into their own goal! A touch-back  
when they thought they had their touch-down assured. Pop the  
freakin' corn!

"Uh oh," indeed! Good eyes, Sir! That pitter-patter of feet we  
hear is the sound of us running in from the field for our turn  
at bat!

Can you feel it reader? Sea change! "The wind sets in the  
shoulder of our sail ant we are stayed for"! We must make them  
pay, and dearly, for their lack of consistency! No prisoners! <g>

[refraining from poetic explication that was there for the  
occasion, dammit!]

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://www.AlienView.net)

Re: Is It A Spaceship? No It's A Secret Spy Plane!

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Gammon

From: Jason Gammon <[BoyintheMachine.nul](mailto:BoyintheMachine.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 12:57:28 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 16:53:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Gammon

>From: Greg Boone <[Evolbaby.nul](mailto:Evolbaby.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 02:07:38 EDT  
>Subject: Stem Cells & Abductions

>Don't know if any of you has been keeping tabs on the latest  
>stem cell research/application news but the more I read the more  
>I recall the reported procedures done to people during  
>abductions.

<snip>

>So again, the abductors are after stem cells I'm certain.

>Wasn't there a line in the scriptures, book of Genesis if memory  
>serves that says something about a fear of us finding the  
>tree of life and living forever?

Greg,

Please don't be offended, but you are all over the place with this post. Yes, Stem Cell research is fascinating. Yes, Stem Cell research will no doubt revolutionize Human Medicine. However, there is no proof, nor is there any indication, that Aliens are harvesting such from people.

There is also no proof that Stem Cell research will lead to personal Immortality.

With regards to your "Tree of Life" comments, God placed the Angel with the flaming sword to guard the path. Assuming Stem Cells are in fact "The way", then I have yet to experience burning in my nostrils or crotch... wait, nevermind!

- Jason

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Conceptualizing UFOs - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 11:26:14 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 16:56:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Conceptualizing UFOs - Kasten

UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>posted:

>Source: The NICAP Website  
><http://www.nicap.org/concept.htm>  
>13 August 2003

>Conceptualizing UFOs  
>By Richard H. Hall

>People see things in the sky (and on the ground) that they  
>cannot explain and term them "UFOs".

>Although UFO has long since become a synonym for ET spaceship  
>in the popular mind, let us continue to think of it literally as  
>meaning an unexplained flying (sometimes landing) object or  
>phenomenon.

I agree. Over and over in the book I am writting, I try to point out that UFO means "neither you nor I know what we are looking at." There might be people who do know exactly what is flying in the skies, but we aren't a member of that group.

A couple more categories:

- 1) Don't have enough information to form an opinion.
- 2) Know that I don't have enough information to form an educated opinion.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Are We Missing Something?

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 20:13:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:23:14 -0400  
Subject: Are We Missing Something?

Hello List,

Can't help thinking we're like the youngster who's learned about 'the birds and the bees' - but finds the analogy can't cover all circumstances he might be interested in.

For instance - who's taken an electronics course starting with analogy of electrons as charged 'particles' but had to change to analogy of charged 'holes' when considering active solid-state theory? That should tell us something about both analogies. They don't fit the whole picture - so we're missing something.

Worse, the analogies used for light photons (actually all radiation) - i.e. as discrete particles or waves, are each clearly wrong when a case is tested - so we're missing something there also.

And, stepping up to our best theories, Relativity and QM, we find the mathematical analogies used for them also fail much of the time, giving us those 'infinities' which have to be discarded. But this time we can't swap analogies, for as yet we haven't got other mathematics that might fit completely.

Relativity and QM won't even fit together when we try to stretch them to cover the gaps. Relativity can't explain 'entanglement', the recent strange behavior of light (google - "Nimtz Wang"), or the distant too-old galaxies; while QM/QED, accurate as they are after those 'infinities' are discarded, can't "see" gravitational or nuclear forces at all.

And no-one has a cause for inertia or mass.

So we're missing many things.

Therefore, when we get reports hinting at manipulation of physics as yet impossible for us, how can we claim to rule them out?

If the craft/beings seem to obey 'our' physics - fine. But if they don't - what then?

It's fairly apparent, from govt's clamp-downs, hoaxes and cover-ups of bizarre cases, that they take these things seriously, despite media flimflam. So why don't we all?

By clinging to incomplete human physics - we're maybe missing something.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 17:40:57 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:25:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Stem Cells & Abductions - Maccabee

>From: Greg Boone <[Evolbaby.nul](mailto:Evolbaby.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 02:07:38 EDT  
>Subject: Stem Cells & Abductions

>Don't know if any of you has been keeping tabs on the latest  
>stem cell research/application news but the more I read the more  
>I recall the reported procedures done to people during  
>abductions.

>There isn't enough space to post each website news story as  
>every day there are several new stem cell breakthrough stories.

>With stem cells both embryonic and non embryonic we can grow new  
>teeth, repair spinal cord damage, repair optical tissue and  
>nerve damage, cardiac and cardiovascular damage, cure baldness,  
>grow certain body parts, improve the condition of persons  
>suffering from multiple sclerosis. Diabetes and full organ  
>growth are just cures around the bend. There's so much news on a  
>daily basis one person can't process it all.

<snip>

>Life on Earth is about to change drastically within the next few  
>years. It's invigorating to see the doctors and nurses and  
>medical staff full of bright ideas and hope. I just recently for  
>the first time in my life was hospitalized with a deadly  
>illness. Fortunately after a week I was released okay. I got the  
>chance to see what patients go through. Luckily the doctor who  
>owned the hospital I was in is a stem cell genius and I'll be  
>chatting with him as well.

>Hold on to your hats folks, to me the most important job we can  
>engage in is tending to one another. From the EMTs to the  
>surgeons and nurses. We might be looking at a change in human  
>history where tending to one another will be the rewarding  
>endeavor instead of blowing each other up all the time.

Nowadays the longer you live the longer you're likely to live.

What's coming?

The first person to live 200 years mght be alive today.

Read Fright Night: the Future under "FUTUREugh" at my  
web site:

[www.brumac.8k.com](http://www.brumac.8k.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 17:53:17 -0700  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:32:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake -

>From: Dirk Vander Ploeg <[publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 19:29:09 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Ex-Military Man Photographs UFO Over Lake

>>To aid in understanding this sighting better I have included  
>>links to the original larger photos that I received numbered  
>>exactly as shown:

><snip>

>Correct Links:

><http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland1.jpg>  
><http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland2.jpg>  
><http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland3.jpg>  
><http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland4.jpg>  
><http://www.ufodigest.com/Poland/Poland.doc>

Hello Dirk:

These images are much better, and I see you fixed the links.

Some questions, if you have access to the witness:

- 1) Which way is the camera facing in these photos? North? East? southwest?
- 2) What are those posts sticking up from the water offshore? Are those pilings from a collapsed pier, boat anchorage, tree stumps, or something else entirely?
- 3) Are those large birds perched on some of the pilings? They seem to change positions from one photo to the next. If birds, what kind are they?
- 4) If we assume the bottom of UFO is flat and circular or nearly so, it seems to be at a tilt of maybe 40 degrees from flat horizontal. Is there anything of interest in the direction of the flat bottom? Buildings, road, rail line, or just more fields and trees?

Thanks

- Larry

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Fate's David F. Godwin Has Heart Attack

From: Loren Coleman <[lcoleman.nul](mailto:lcoleman.nul)>  
Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 21:24:24 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:34:35 -0400  
Subject: Fate's David F. Godwin Has Heart Attack

Weird fiction aficionado and managing editor of FATE magazine,  
David F. Godwin, suffered a heart attack last Tuesday, June 20.

He was supposed to come home on Friday, June 23, 2006.

No other details are available yet.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: US Patent Application For Black Budget

From: Willian Sawers <[ufsyntax.nul](mailto:ufsyntax.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 16:54:47 +1000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:40:40 -0400  
Subject: Re: US Patent Application For Black Budget

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2006 10:33 PM  
>Subject: US Patent Application For Black Budget Aerospacecraft

>Source: Uncensored Magazine - Christchurch, New Zealand

><http://tinyurl.com/zfh69>

>20 Jun 06

>[Numbered items below, are linked to Patent Office info  
>from site above...]

>Patent Applications by Aerospace Manufacturers May Betray the  
>Existence of Black Budget Aerospacecraft and Explain Some UFO  
>Sightings.

>Lockheed patent for "Aircraft Thermal Protection System," a.k.a.  
>hexagonal, super alloy, honeycomb material, may reveal secret  
>"Aurora" hypersonic aircraft. Patent is #5,560,569, granted 1  
>October 1996.

Hi List

I found some of these patents extremely interesting, especially  
if some of them are flying. Some go back as far as the early  
'70s... including this:

"Teledyne Ryan submitted the following illustrations with a  
patent application for an "aircraft of low observability" on 21  
July 1975 and the application was granted on 26 April 1977. The  
illustrations show a pure delta-wing flying triangle. The full  
text of the application contains a rather candid discussion of  
the principles of radar cross-section reduction (stealth  
technology). At that early date such technology was not highly  
classified. Patent #4,019,699."

Some Patents talk of "pulse engines" and "refuelling  
chemtrails"?? I don't know much of these but I bet there have  
been improvements since '75 and Flying Triangles are sometimes  
mistaken for UFOs?

Regards

William

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 11:18:57 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:44:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning - Shough

>From: Cathy Reason <[CathyM.nul](mailto:CathyM.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 15:33:26 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 23:40:37 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: Reason's Reasoning

Hi Cathy

Sparing Listers too much anguish I've cut straight to what looks to be the zone of convergence (discussing other issues in a private mail).

>>Not all scientific theories are testable in all their forms all  
>>the time and in every part, but they don't necessarily become  
>>unscientific because of it.

>I think it's rather more accurate to say that no-one worries  
>overmuch whether they become unscientific or not - it just isn't  
>the sort of question which comes up.

Okay, I don't disagree with that way of putting it. In practice it is both much more difficult, and much less important, to draw clear formal distinctions. People don't bother because really it just isn't a practical necessity to be formally precise about it. From my point of view this is just as well because a requirement for such precision would exceed the natural limiting resolution of the process. Fantastically categorical demands would immobilise it.

>But I think you have a good  
>point here - there are potentially unscientific assumptions  
>right at the core of the scientific process. And I think you're  
>right. Which is precisely why I believe theory construction  
>should not be regarded as a scientific process. It makes us  
>too complacent about what theory really involves - and it also  
>provides an excuse for social scientists to pass off woolly  
>speculation and ad hoc rationalization as "scientific theory".

As I read you, you advocate denying theory construction its status as scientific activity even though you agree that it is part of the the scientific process, and you wish to do this from didactic or social motives, because you rightly say that theorism can be misunderstood and misrepresented. I don't think this is a very strong or necessarily a well-defined reason, but I understand it.

Now "Potentially unscientific assumptions at the core of the scientific process"

So we can agree that there is a scientific process at least, and that it cannot exist without what you wish to call unscientific assumptions (which I take to mean ideas not immediately, individually and directly testable against the "real world")?

Perhaps to shift this semantic logjam what we need is a semantic

shake-up. We need to either find some whole new vocabulary for all that stuff which theorists think they're doing most of the time, and stop calling them scientists at all except for certain clearly defined purposes, thus reserving the adjective "scientific" to describe only those activities and ideas very directly associated with the business of experimental testing; or else we need to find a term to differentiate the activity of testing from the rest of what we continue to call the scientific process.

A traditional way of respecting the distinction would be to as theorism and experimentalism but maybe that isn't sharp enough

>>Science isn't constructed just from experimental facts (it never >>was; nature had to invent ideas before she could invent the >>concept of knowledge). It's constructed from complexes of >>densely theory-related observations and principles that are >>granted the status of facts in science. These meta-facts are >>what mostly constitute the "body of knowledge", not the >>botanical lists of pressure differentials and acceleration rates >>or whatever that end up in the tables in the back of reference >>books.

>Yes, this is why I pointed out to Richard Hall that a corpus of >research findings is not the same thing as a corpus of >knowledge.

Okay, agreed.

>>Theories are tested for consistency against these meta->>facts and through them make indirect contact with nature before >>ever being tested in direct physical experiment, and this is >>part of how successful new theories can emerge, in competition >>largely with one another.

>>Junk this very refined socio-historical process, and you are >>reduced to randomly sticking a pin in your list of theories - >>oh, except that you don't have any theories to list in the first >>place. :-)

>I don't think the process is all that refined, Martin. In my >experience it can be extremely hit-and-miss. As you've indicated >yourself, theoreticians are not just inferencing machines; in >fact, many of us are pretty near barking, to be quite frank >about it. A lot of stuff happens to do with incomprehensible >diagrams scribbled on bits of paper in coffee-bars, and that >sort of thing. (A thought - do we include espresso as part of >the scientific method?)

Well this describes a lot of human behaviour obviously. But to say that the process looks messy is not the same as saying that it is not refined. We're pretty clueless about how any single mind works, never mind the networking of Nobel prizewinners. I'm sure Mahler is just a lot of noise to a parakeet (the late lamented Ligetti was noise to a lot of people). It might be possible to read (say) Schweber's classic book 'QED and the Men Who Made It', and see the generative complexity of theory construction as no more than random Brownian motion, but either we just have no clue what's going on or it takes an extraordinary effort of imagination.

The picture you appear (to me) to have in your mind is of a sort of pinball machine where the phase point representing progress is a blind ball bounced randomly from test to test as from pin to pin, each move disconnected from the relationships of past tests (the body of knowledge) and from the objective of future testing, but when it happens by chance to roll over the location of a hidden pin then that pin pops up. As the density of the pins increases so the constraints on the random walk of the ball get tighter and it follows more closely the underlying pattern. This is a literally aimless process but does by chance get somewhere.

My pinball machine would be similar but less mechanistic in that it contains a smart cursor instead of an inert one. The ball in my machine is capable of learning. It does not start out smart, but it has a lot of internal degrees of freedom. It has an internal register or history of moves, and it is capable of predictive responses to the evolving pattern of pins. In short by trying out theory-like strategies it acquires some active control over the game, develops a degree of self-organisation,

actively seeks out new pins to facilitate new connections, drives down the randomness in the process, and so gets somewhere faster.

And I wonder if this gets us to the real root of your distrust of theorism? Is it perhaps only partly your radical positivism, more largely a (related) radical reductionism and epiphenomenalism? You see 'higher-level' functions as being explained away by their description at smaller spacetime scales, and your instinct is to try to represent the scientific process as driven by deterministic interactions among particles of fact? I mention this because I don't share this view, and if basic metaphysical differences are at least partly the issue then there is probably little chance of resolution.

Martin

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## UFOs Brought Down To Earth

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:55:09 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:55:09 -0400  
Subject: UFOs Brought Down To Earth

Source: Stuff Co - Wellington, New Zealand

<http://stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3711570a11,00.html>

25 June 2006

UFOs Brought Down To Earth  
By Donna Chisholm

Sorry Kaikoura, your UFOs haven't convinced Dr Jill Tarter. Nor, in fact, have any other alien sightings. Ever.

Astronomer and engineering physicist Tarter, co-founder of the California-based Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Institute, has been ET-hunting for more than 25 years, and is credited with moving the search from the lunatic fringe to the mainstream.

Tarter, due in Dunedin this week as a keynote speaker at the New Zealand International Science Festival, was named by Time magazine in 2004 as one of the 100 most influential people of the 20th century. Jodie Foster's character in the movie Contact is said to be largely based on Tarter.

As a member of the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal, Tarter regularly studies so-called UFO sightings, and says she's not yet seen credible evidence of alien life.

Kaikoura's "balls of light" sighted in 1978 created worldwide attention - but were later attributed to Japanese squid boats.

Tarter will tell New Zealand audiences about her institute's new and future use of sensitive radio and optical telescopes to scan the universe for ET transmissions.

So how do we know our technology is going to be on the same wavelength?

"A very good question. But if the appropriate technology is something we haven't yet invented we can't exactly use it."

The best we have are radio waves which can travel across the galaxy without being absorbed by the dust between the stars. Any communication, of course, will be a one-way street - given that any message takes 100,000 years to cross the galaxy.

"It's probably not going to be a snappy conversation," she agrees.

Any information encoded in a signal will be "probably repetitive" and thought out by civilisations who have made contact among themselves long before we came into the picture.

Tarter has no notion about what ETs might look like, other than that they won't be microscopic. "Metres are a good scale -you

have to be able to build the equipment and transmit. But beyond that, all bets are off. I don't know whether we're talking about big blue women or little green men or purple octopuses. Anything is possible."

The common depiction of aliens as green and antennaed probably "goes back into the old part of the brain which feared snakes and reptiles", she says.

During our conversation, Tarter's cellphone cuts out three times. Technology may have to improve significantly to get across the galaxy if it can't get across the world.

"Maybe cellphones aren't going to be what we need, that's for sure," she says.

[www.scifest.org.nz](http://www.scifest.org.nz)

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## This Column Is Out Of This World

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:01:16 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:01:16 -0400  
Subject: This Column Is Out Of This World

Source: The Coshocton Tribune - Ohio, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/kuy7n>

June 25, 2006

This Column Is Out Of This World  
By Len Lacara  
Managing Editor

If you would have asked me last week to suggest a column topic, flying saucers would have been last on the list.

Yet here I am, trying to determine if we're living in East Roswell instead of Coshocton.

(Roswell, of course, is the New Mexico town where aliens supposedly landed a half-century ago.) The Internet is the home of all sorts of crazy stories, including some about our area.

A group that researches UFO sightings has a description of something that supposedly happened at Dillon Dam in May 1999.

According to the narrative, which appeared on the Internet last week, two brothers and their father were fishing at the dam about 10 p.m.

"Suddenly, right in front of us, it sounded as if something 'huge' was coming out of the water," one of the eyewitnesses wrote. "Later when we talked about it, my brother mentioned something as big as a house, but that was just because that was the biggest thing he could think of. It sounded as if an aircraft carrier was emerging from the water. You could sense it rising up out of the water, but we could not see it. You could also hear the water falling back down off of the object, back to the lake."

Is this common knowledge, and I'm just the last guy at the party? Or is a major investigative project in order?

Those who are old enough might remember a more famous UFO investigation. On Nov. 13, 1966, Zanesville barber and amateur astronomer Ralph Ditter took two photographs that clearly show a UFO hovering in the sky. People were excited and amazed; the Rand Corp. was not. The think tank's researchers proved the photos were a hoax.

Mr. Ditter wasn't trying to fool anyone at first; he was just trying to fulfill a promise to his daughter to take a picture of an alien spaceship.

Not to be outdone, Coshocton has its own UFO tales. According to a blog called "Coshocton Then, Coshocton Now," residents swore they saw a flying saucer hover over town for several hours back in June 1954.

In October 1973, United Press International said citizens and

police officers reported dozens of orange-colored UFOs in central Ohio, "including a woman who said three UFOs forced her car off a roadway."

Personally, I've never seen a UFO. I do believe we are not alone in the universe, though, and always wondered how I would react to a bona fide alien encounter. Would they be logical, like the Vulcans of "Star Trek," all-powerful like Superman or murderous like the aliens of "Independence Day"?

Or are there already aliens in our midst? Guess it's off the supermarket tabloid section to find out.

Len LaCara is managing editor of the Coshocton Tribune and Zanesville Times Recorder. You can call him at (740) 295-3420 or e-mail him at [llacara.nul](mailto:llacara.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:08:08 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:08:08 -0400  
Subject: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

Source: FreeRepublic.Com - Fresno, California, USA

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-chat/1655089/posts>

06/24/2006

Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

with David Sereda

by Diane M. Cooper

How do alien spacecraft get into our Solar System from those galaxies far, far away?

David Sereda thinks he has found the answer to this question.

In this technically satisfying but extremely readable interview, Sereda describes some of the experiences with alternative energy that eventually led to his "revelation" about the way alien spacecraft maneuver. And he explains to us just exactly how they may be able to move at the speed of light.

-----

Diane: David, how did you get involved in the study of UFOs?

David: Initially I got involved in UFOs because I saw one in Berkeley, California, in 1968 on my way home from elementary school. It was a clear day in California, and my friend Tommy and I noticed a large crowd of people pointing at the sky. There was a clear metallic disc hovering there for a good twenty minutes. After we watched it for a while it just blinked out.

I had some interesting dreams after that =97 dreams of one set of colored lights spinning one way and another set of colored lights spinning the other way on the same axis =97 and I never knew exactly what those dreams meant until much later in my life.

But I never forgot it. And that's how my interest began.

Diane: I understand you have an extensive scientific background =97 that you have been exposed to some of the most brilliant scientists in the United States =97 and that you have been involved in research around a new form of energy. Could you tell us a little about that project and how it ultimately influenced your involvement in the NASA UFOs. We'd like to know about this because it provides a lot of credibility to your personal research.

David: I worked on environmental issues most of my life. And at one point I worked for a group of physicists who were involved with non-radioactive, helium-free fusion. A scientist from MIT named Dr. Bogdan Maglich had invented a new type of nuclear energy fusion reactor that could produce in one square meter a



gigawatt =97 a jillion watts =97 of energy. That is the amount of energy put out by a full-scale nuclear reactor!

Maglich spent 27 million dollars on three or four prototypes, and he got to the point in the late 1980s where he was one experiment away from actually proving a working power-plant model. At that point, the U.S. Air Force, at the request of Major G. Lamberson at Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque, NM, spent almost three million dollars doing computer feasibility studies on the prototypes. And the results were astounding, ground-breaking work on fusion power. A lot of the research was "classified," but it basically proved that the next model would succeed. There was no reason for failure.

The head of NASA at the time was Gene Fletcher, and he put a request before Congress that they fund the next phase, because it would provide NASA with the ultimate space-based power system. Congress turned Fletcher down, and continued to turn his down for three years in a row.

I actually got to speak to Congress on this issue in 1993. I spoke with a panel of brilliant physicists about the debate concerning Tokamak Fusion[1], which is basically the main thrust of fusion research in this country. Most of the government funding is monopolized for Tokamak Fusion, with most of the work and experiments being done at Princeton University.

Two fuels are fused =97 deuterium, which is the isotope of hydrogen sometimes called "heavy hydrogen," and tritium, which is radioactive hydrogen. Ninety percent of all the energy that comes out of that reaction is pure radioactivity, so it is not an environmental option whatsoever. But the public has been led to believe that this type of fusion will supply them with a safe environmental energy source.

We were fighting for a different kind of fusion =97 one that had met most of its criteria in its experimental models for a fraction of the cost, and was literally the cleanest, most environmentally friendly form of fusion =97 that is, Deuterium and Helium Free Fusion. According to the National Resource Defense Council studies on nuclear fuel cycles, Helium Free is the cleanest of all nuclear fuels.

So we had scores of Nobel Laureate prize winners supporting it, including Murray Gell-Mann (Nobel Prize, Physics, 1969), and Glen Seaborg, who chaired the Atomic Energy Commission under Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. The list of supporters went on and on. Yet despite that, no one in Congress would fund it. So I formed a company in 1992 with a wealthy Saudi individual, and we went out and had meetings with the richest people in the United States, Saudi Arabia, and Europe, and tried to get them to fund it. And no one would do it.

Diane: So you were looking for funding for alternative forms of nuclear fusion?

David: Yes, fuels that are far more advanced than gasoline and hydrogen or any of the fuels we use today.

For instance, nine grams of Helium3 can produce the same amount of energy as a thousand barrels of crude oil. But you have to know how to extract it. That's the trick.

If we would have put the money into this ten years ago =97 back in 1989 =97 we'd have these types of power plants in all our major cities, and we'd all have the cheapest form of electricity.

So my background comes from being around physicists and learning physics from a business perspective, and for public relations and communications. To do this, I had to learn a lot about science, and I was around many of the biggest names in this field.

Around 1994 or 1995, I was introduced to Martin Stubbs, who was a program manager of a cable TV station and had archived hundreds of hours of space shuttle missions. He had studied the tapes and found there were UFOs appearing during several missions. A professional photographer friend, Michael Boyle, phoned me and suggested I take a look at these films.

Diane: So what did you begin to see?

David: There is one piece of footage in which two astronauts are repairing the Hubble space telescope, and we hear them referring to an object which is out in front of them. You then hear all these interjections from Houston Control or Alabama, telling the astronauts not to worry about it =97 to keep focusing on the mission.

On the film you can see this light going behind them, and later we hear some comment about a camera filter coming off.

It's so typical in these transmissions that you get ridiculous statements coming from NASA that don't make any sense at all and are just thrown out there to confuse the issue. Camera filters are one of the hardest items to unscrew by accident =97 it doesn't happen. I've used cameras semiprofessionally for over twenty years, and it just never happens.

And further, if an astronaut had seen it, he would have identified it, and once a camera filter gets too far away you wouldn't see it anymore.

The image you see is a big bright flashing blob that's going behind them in the far background. The cameras are nowhere near, and are all on board the shuttle, so the comment about its being a camera lens just doesn't make any sense. You get these nonsensical comments like that all the time.

On one film, I saw an object zipping around the curvature of the Earth and disappearing on the other side while moving over earth space at a distance I calculated at just under a thousand miles, at just under four seconds.

Diane: Is it possible that the astronauts can't see these objects, perhaps?

David: The cameras are shooting in black and white. These are cameras that are sensitive to looking at light in the infrared that is invisible to the human eye. The visible wavelengths go from the color red to the color violet. I also have confirmed that these cameras can see into the near ultraviolet, which is almost a whole bandwidth higher than the human eye can see.

So, yes, it's possible that what I was seeing on film were objects that were invisible to the eyes of the astronauts on the Columbia.

Diane: In your lecture, I saw a piece of fascinating film concerning a satellite and a tether. Would you talk about that please?

David: There was a satellite that came untethered and was drifting away from the shuttle. In this footage the satellite, with a 12-mile-long tether, is approximately 77 miles away, and drifting to 100 miles away, from the shuttle. In the film footage, you can see swarms of these balls of light moving around, flying by at different velocities, some very slow and some very fast. They are pulsing, and actually look as though they are spinning.

When the camera zooms in on them, we can clearly see that they are disc-shaped objects passing behind the tether. And it is so important to understand what this means when we see they are going behind the tether.

You see, we know where the satellite is in relationship to the shuttle, and that is drifting 100 miles away from the camera, so we know the objects we are looking at cannot be any closer to the shuttle than that. And because we know the distances, we can measure some of the minimum diameters of those objects.

If they are right up behind the tether (which it is doubtful) they would measure between two and three miles in diameter. But if they are further behind the tether, then they are way bigger than that. There is just no end to how much bigger they could be, because we don't know exactly how far back they are. All we know is that these clearly disc-shaped objects pulsing with amazing energy waves are passing behind the tether.

Literally they are massive things. If they became visible down on Earth, they'd block out the entire sky. But if they are only

detectable in the infrared or ultraviolet ranges, than no one on Earth would even know they were there.

Diane: Which would explain why no one sees them.

David: Just like the UFO I saw that disappeared right in front of my eyes and the eyes of a hundred spectators. Where did it go? We know where it went =97 it went to another dimension of the electromagnetic spectrum.

Diane: I saw the film of the NASA UFOs when you lectured here in Sedona, and had some very interesting sensations and dreams that occurred within twenty-four hours of watching those films. It reminded me of watching blood cells under a microscope. It has left me with a very odd, familiar feeling.[2]

Could you talk more about the shape and what you discovered about it?

David: Essentially, we can start with aircraft and aviation and spacecraft today. We're used to seeing physical objects move with certain characteristics because we live in the physical dimension.

Einstein's law prohibited mass, or "solid objects," from attaining the speed of light because as you move mass faster and faster in the physical, you encounter resistance. When you move a boat through water, the water impedes the boat. The faster you go, the harder it becomes to move, because the water's resistance increases. It becomes more and more difficult to push the boat through the water.

When you move an aircraft through air mass, the same thing happens. Our speed limit in air is much higher than it is with water, but air mass impedes an aircraft in the same way that water impedes a boat.

It was extremely difficult to break the sound barrier, which is 660 miles per hour. When we try to get space craft to go anywhere near the speed of light, it just gets extremely difficult. You can actually get close to it, but it will cost you an enormous amount of energy.

In 1989, I had a conversation with Dr. Earl VanLandingham of NASA. He's now retired, but at that time he was the head of Propulsion Power and Energy, and went on to become head of Space Access and Technology for all of NASA.

When I asked VanLandingham about the ET question, he said that when you consider the amount of energy it takes for a spacecraft to arrive at Earth from another star system, the energy system emitting from the craft would be so massive we would detect the signal well in advance of the spacecraft's arrival.

Our nearest stars are Alpha Centauri A and B. They are 4.2 and 4.3 light years from earth. That means that even if you could do the speed of light, it would take you 4.3 years to get there, and that would be if you were in a constant mode of space travel just doing the speed of light.

Particle Accelerators accelerate subatomic particles to faster and faster velocities and basically slam them into each other. In experimentation, scientists basically accelerate protons, which are the main portion of the atom, and get them up to 99 percent of the speed of light. But it costs a trillion electron-volts of energy to get them there.

How much energy is a trillion electron volts? It is five thousand times more energy than is released in a nuclear explosion. Nuclear explosions release 200 million volts of energy, which is staggering as far as we are concerned.

So to produce a trillion electron volts =97 and we can only produce that much for about a second =97 costs an enormous amount of energy. If a space ship were using this type of technology to get close to the speed of light and visit us from another star system, they would have an energy signal of over a trillion electron-volts pulsating from their craft in a continuous stream of energy. And that is something that every amateur radio astronomer and every radio oscilloscope would pick up well in advance of the arrival of a spacecraft.

That's exactly what Dr. VanLandingham said, and we've never seen anything like that.

So what I propose is a new theory in the field of physics, and the UFO field, in particular. I propose that somehow these craft are able to convert their mass into light. Essentially, once you can make a spacecraft into a photon =97 a particle of light =97 then according to Einstein's theory they weigh in at zero mass.

If something weighs in at zero mass, getting it to do the speed of light in Einstein's formula costs next to no energy =97 maybe a couple of volts.

So my concept is that what these ETs are doing is taking steel or metallic spacecraft and basically reducing their mass down to zero before they even try to move them around. And once they reduce their mass to zero, then they can go at lightspeed on a very small amount of energy.

What that tells us, if that is what they are doing, is that they can convert their mass into light. They also can disappear into different parts of the electromagnetic spectrum, just as I witnessed in Berkeley, California, on that day in 1968.

Further, the pilots or occupants would not experience any G forces. G force is the gravity force you get when you're going at a high velocity and you start turning. You can experience that even in your car when you try to make a turn doing seventy miles an hour. Your body will be pushing off to one side. In an aircraft you go much faster, and when you try to turn, the forces of gravity cause you to experience this force =97 which is very physical.

If you were a spacecraft doing three thousand miles an hour and you did a sudden turn, if you had mass, your spacecraft would explode. The atoms would simply implode on each other and you would have a nuclear fission and fusion explosion as a result of the turn.

So I propose that if the spacecraft has reduced its mass to zero and become pure light energy, and if it can make a 90-degree turn and experience no G force, it must be able to go right through solid objects. It can disappear =97 be invisible =97 and it can attain light speed on a small amount of energy.

If a craft were visiting us from another star system and had the kind of properties I'm talking about, it would not be detectable in the energy sense that Einstein equates to  $E=3Dmc=B2$  =97 i.e., that energy is equal to mass times the speed of light squared. When you run a zero-mass spacecraft through this formula, of course, your energy comes out as zero.

When I considered the amount of energy you need in a physical model to move a spacecraft at the speed of light, I can't even accept that that type of energy is even attainable for more than a couple of seconds.

Wormholes are another very exotic form of space travel proposed by modern physicists, but that would cost you the energy that a hundred billion suns put out for an entire year. Our galaxy has a hundred billion suns in it, so they are saying that to produce a worm hole you need all that energy for an entire year of every star in our galaxy. The numbers are so ridiculous and impossible that I cannot accept that that is how these UFOs are doing it.

The reason NASA cannot accept the UFO phenomenon is because they are stuck in Einsteinian physics. They cannot see another way out of this. So when they look at the UFO phenomenon, they say it can't be real because Einstein's law says if they are moving at that speed we should be seeing this huge energy signal, and we're not. So that's one of the main reasons the presence of UFOs is negated and mainstream physicists don't take this seriously.

However, if you look at what I'm proposing =97 that mass can turn into light and be reduced to zero =97 then you have a whole new set of possibilities.

Diane: Isn't that essentially what is proposed by the idea ascension?

David: It is. There are stories of masters and yogis who have been able to do exactly this with their own bodies. Christ in his resurrected body can literally appear anywhere on the planet in a blink of an eye because that body is made of pure light and can move around. It is free of the laws of physical matter.

In the Autobiography of a Yogi by Paramahansa Yogananda[3] there are many stories of yogis who could do the same thing.

So where does this go next? How do you convert mass into light? This is where I've had a major revelation in physics. It's going to be hard to do in an interview, but I'm going to try.

Everything in front of you right now =97 everything that you see that appears physical =97 is just waves when you look at it at a micro-atomic level.

When we look into any substance we see atoms. Initially, we saw that the atoms were made of protons, neutrons, and electrons. The proton is a positively charged nucleus that has an electron spinning around it at an incredible speed, like a little planet, in an essentially wave-particle relationship.

All of those waves have frequencies.

Our planet Earth is a giant particle moving through a wave relationship. The wave is actually the energy sphere that the planet is moving through =97 a path, if you will.

This relationship shows up everywhere you look. The brain is like a particle of mass and actually produces a wave. The Galaxy itself is the ultimate wave-particle relationship. We see all these planets and stars and gases spinning around, getting closer and closer to a black hole.

When physicists look at even smaller particles, they aren't even particles any more =97 they are waves. That's known as the particle-wave duality.

So the question is: If ultimately everything is just waves, what is the difference between the one thing we know that can attain the speed of light, which is a photon, and ordinary matter?

The answer is really quite amazing.

Scientists have found out that solid mass is actually in a near-zero state of frequency. In other words, its electromagnetic frequency is at or near zero.

Light, however, is high in frequency.

So, in theory, you could change the frequency of mass, turn it into a high frequency state, and it would take on the properties of photons.

The only thing we can see on this planet that escapes Earth's gravity are photons. Photons are light particle waves that are bouncing off of the Earth and going out into space and not being pulled back by the Earth's gravity. They levitate. They bounce off walls and go shooting back into space, possibly giving someone out there a picture of what the Earth looks like.

So there has to be something about these little guys that contains the answer, not only to light-speed travel but to levitation and many other phenomenal things.

In 2000 I invented a model =97 what I call the Galaxy Clock =97 that allows us to look at the wave-particle relationship in 3D. Today, we use what is called an oscilloscope, which allows us to look at waves, and we measure the number of peaks per second in that wave relationship. That gives us our frequency. Frequency means how frequently a wave oscillates per second (the Galaxy Clock may be viewed at UFONasa.com).

When I decided actually to look at the wave in the UFOs =97 we're talking about two months after I made this invention =97 I was in Maui studying with a zero-point energy scientist named Steve Okerlund. He purchased a huge TV and a thousand-dollar VCR, because we wanted to have the best freeze-frame possibilities.

We looked at the very largest UFO that was pulsating and moving all across the top of the tether on Mission SGS-75, and when we freeze-framed the waves, I was so astounded =97 I knew exactly what I was looking at! We had three waves that kept repeating themselves over and over, and they told me everything that was happening with the craft. It was the answer to the propulsion system and how we could reverse-engineer this sort of thing ourselves.

What we saw, basically, was a series of waves that were going from a low-frequency state to a medium-high-frequency state and then to an ultra-high-frequency state =97 which is exactly what is needed to transform mass, which is very low in frequency, to light, which is very high in frequency.

That was the revelation. I saw a clear signature of a series of transitional waves moving from low to ultra-high. The Golden Phi spiral that we see when we run the image through a wave clock is a wave in transition going from low to ultra-high.

These craft are not using rocket engines, they are pulsating the steel or metallic structure of their craft with a series of waves that, I propose, transform its mass into light.

The next thing I did was to find a scientist, John Hutchinson, the inventor of the Hutchinson effect. He's used Tesla coils, Vandegraff generators, and Tesla radio coils to pulsate objects. In one case, which is recorded on film, he pulsates a 75-pound steel cannonball with very low frequency Vandegraff waves and then medium-high-frequency radio waves and ultra-high radio waves =97 and the cannon ball levitates! This huge piece of steel hovers above a wooden table.

And we can clearly see the revelation. We can see how these very large UFOs are silently witnessed hovering above cities, houses, and farmers' fields. There's no rocket or thrust.

So we have the first part of the answer.

Now, if you can make a space shuttle or any spacecraft levitate by raising its frequency, we would see the same relationship between mass and photons. All objects with mass fall into the Earth's gravity except for photons, and we know that photons are in a higher frequency state than mass.

The exciting thing is, once you can convert mass into light, it can levitate but it also can disappear. Once you're there, you can maintain a state of zero mass with a small amount of energy. And further, you can attain the speed of light on very small amounts of Einsteinian, or physical, energy. This is how I believe the UFOs are doing it.

Diane: I am aware that you researched back in history to see where these disc-shaped objects appeared previously.

David: Yes. What we wondered next is where these visitors came from. I was working on a FOX TV special, on a show called "UFOs: The Best Evidence Caught on Tape - II," which aired in April 2000. They created a segment on me and the NASA UFO material. In the middle of the research, one of the researchers came up and showed me a picture of an ancient artifact with a physical identical match to the NASA UFOs. That was another astounding find.

When we look at the NASA images, we see a large, round, translucent disc of light with a black hole in the center and a rectangular notch cut out of the side. When we freeze-framed that, we saw a spiraling wave radiating off the center of the black hole.

The picture of the ancient artifact that was brought to my attention is something called a Dropa stone.[4] Several of these were found in a series of caves on the Chinese Tibetan border in 1936 by a professor of archeology at the University of Beijing.

A burial site was found, with skeletal remains of tiny people with large, bulbous heads. Initially, they thought they were apes, but apes don't bury one another. Then they discovered, in interlocking caves, these Dropa stone discs that were round with a hole in the middle, and some had a rectangular notch cut out of the side and some had a spiraling groove of closely-written

characters not unlike hieroglyphics inside of the spiral. So we had a perfect match. It was really incredible.

It took many years to translate the characters in the spiral. Someone had to study the local language and actually determine what was written on the discs. In 1947, an English scientist named Dr. Karyl Robbin-Evans went to study the Dropa stones, and, later the people from the area. He learned that these ancient artifacts were artistic impressions of a giant spacecraft that crash-landed in their mountains twelve thousand years ago, whose inhabitants came from the star system Sirius.

In 1996, in England, we had a crop circle with the exact same markings =97 the same degree of spiral, right down to the black hole in the middle, all identical to the Dropa stone and the NASA UFOs.

Because we make this connection to Sirius, I ended up reading Robert Temple's book *The Sirius Mystery*[5], which tells us the earliest gods and goddesses that educated humankind were from the star system Sirius and were the builders of the Great Pyramid. The Goddess Isis and her husband, Osiris, are said to be from the star system Sirius, as well.

Then I looked at the Dogon Tribe of Mali in northwest Africa, who actually migrated from pre-dynastic Egypt because they wanted to keep safe the knowledge that came from the original builders of the pyramid and the original gods of the star system Sirius.

They actually prophesized the return of the Syrian gods and goddesses. And Lo and behold! the space shuttle during the tether/satellite incident was actually flying over the motherland where the Syrian gods and goddesses are said to be from. We can hear this from NASA's commentary on the film.

As a further "coincidence," I took some research from Richard Hoagland. Three years after the tether incident, he announced that space mission STS-96 was being launched at the precise time when the star system Sirius was 33.33 degrees from Cape Canaveral. Well, the founding fathers who wrote the United States Constitution were all highest-degree Masons, and the number 33.33 is the highest symbol of enlightenment in Masonic wisdom. So I do not believe this timing could have been a coincidence. I believe NASA was using this type of communication literally to tell the star system Sirius that we understand who they are.

Diane: There is such an incredible amount of evidence showing the existence of other beings? Why, then, do you suppose there is so much denial about it?

David: Well, there's a lot of fear. There's also the control issue. The people who have direct experiences with extraterrestrials or interdimensional beings don't seem to be working for universities or for NASA.

The way our societal structure is set up, people think the folks at the top should be notified first =97 everyone wants the UFO to land on the White House lawn, because to us that is the top of the hierarchy. But from the ET point of view, that's obviously not true. They don't seem to be interested in those people very much. They perhaps want to communicate a message to those people, but obviously the ones they really are interested in are individuals selected for their level of awareness.

So until this contact happens to the most important people in our society, they probably won't acknowledge it's happening to anyone.

Meanwhile, it is happening. Many people have had encounters.

Diane: Well, there is some talk that contact actually has happened to our world leaders.

David: And also to astronauts, and that there's a cover-up.

I don't know about contact on an individual basis, but Jimmy Carter has said he has seen a UFO, and astronaut Gordon Cooper has actually stated in the Disclosure Project that he saw a UFO land at the end of the runway at Edwards Air Force Base when he

was a pilot training to be an astronaut. It's enough to know that something is going on there.

Diane: Would you entertain the possibility that some of these vehicles are created by humans?

David: I think that's the case with some of the sightings =97 but definitely not all of them. I don't believe that we have the capacity to make UFOs as big as some of the ones that are appearing on the NASA transmissions =97 the ones that I propose are massive, two or three miles in diameter.

We might have antigravity technology =97 but if we do have it and it's successful, you'd wonder why we're not using it in our military. It is also possible that there is an alternative space program, and some of the speculation says that we have bases on the Moon and Mars already, and that NASA is just a cover for the public.

But, that's all just theory. And when you have a theory, you have to set out to prove it. It's as good as any theory out there, but proving it is pretty tough work.

David Sereda was born in 1961 in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. In 1964, he and his family became permanent residents of the United States. He grew up in California, and his first aspiration in life was to become an astronaut.

David's interest in space, religion, philosophy, astronomy, and science led him on his career in related fields. He has worked deeply in high technology, on environmental and humanitarian issues, and also as a professional photographer. Sereda has personally planted over a million trees in the forests of the Pacific Northwest, and is an environmental scientist of world repute.

David's discoveries and revelations have made him the subject of efforts to silence him =97 so far, to no avail.

To read more about David Sereda and his discoveries and view the NASA UFO footage, please visit his website at [UFONASA.com](http://UFONASA.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 12:56:48 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:05:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 10:22:06 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:38:15 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 15:12:50 +0100  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>>BTW - Please let it be known that I have two cameras and had  
>>>>already offered one of them to both David and Martin early on.

>>>>I beg your pardon? I genuinely squirm to have to do this Viktor,  
>>>>but you should be much more careful of what you say. I hunted  
>>>>back through saved mails to locate this mysterious "offer". I  
>>>>finally found it in an email on June 05. Here is the relevant  
>>>>paragraph:

>>>>"I like our sometimes heated exchanges. I don't take it  
>>>>personally. But I love to argue... Italian/Croatian  
>>>>background... what can I say. I'll probably have an extra  
>>>>camera. I won two on ebay. Perhaps David might like one. I'm  
>>>>sure we can lick this thing together."

>This is getting so silly, as to be ridiculous, contrived on both  
>your parts, Martin/David, your trying to make a genuine offer  
>appear in the worst possible light, that has been my growing  
>concern with both your styles. You manipulate and sculpt such  
>harmlessness into something unrealistic. I've been pointing out  
>the need for using a real camera, from the beginning, so, no  
>harm in that?

Sculpt? Quote. Anyone can see, Viktor, that you mentioning in  
passing that you might give a camera to David (which apparently  
you did not) is very far from your claim - plainly designed to  
wound - that you had made David and Martin offers of free  
cameras with the implication that these offers were turned down.  
All the manipulation here is yours. Why would I even read into  
your reference to David that you wanted give me a camera on  
the strength of a couple of emails? I'm thousands of miles away

>Argue doesn't mean with vehemence, argue means with sincere  
>interest and exchange of ideas. I can't help it if you don't  
>want to hear about the film being over saturated. I just brought  
>that up as a point worth considering when doing experiments with  
>digital cameras. This is ASA 3200 speed, 40 times greater than  
>ASA 80. Therefore, I thought the real camera would be of  
>interest. I thought you both might want to discuss who gets the

>extra camera, Is this so argumentative, so uncooperative  
>sounding, please! Since I was in contact with Martin, I thought  
>he might want firsts, if he didn't bring it up, well, I guess a  
>real camera wasn't a real commodity back then... which makes  
>my point, it had no value?

I'm sorry? So it's my fault because I didn't inform David that  
you said you wanted to offer him a camera? This is baroque. As a  
matter of fact David and I have not been corresponding about  
this case. It would never occur to me to do that.

>Martin, I can't help it if you hadn't extended the offer. I did  
>make the offer, I work long hours. I can't send e-mails to  
>everyone. I presumed this would be a nice offer worth repeating  
>to someone your working with. If you hadn't extended the offer  
>then my evaluation of your propensities is once again confirmed  
>(Martin)

I'm willing to believe you're very busy, but with respect  
neither that fact nor your wish to offer a camera to David had,  
or have, anything to do with me.

>>>However, by Viktor incorrectly stating "I have two cameras and  
>>>had already offered one of them to both David and Martin early  
>>>on," he again makes it sound as if he is the only one who values  
>>>experimentation while we somehow don't or are dodging it.

>Martin, this is you putting words in my mouth and manipluating  
>events to sound how you want them to appear. This is exactly  
>my problem with you!

Viktor, this is not even me speaking, and the fact that such  
rash accusation comes all too easy to you is my problem.

>My point has always been using the camera. This is nothing new.  
>That was my first issue with both your approaches, sorry! I just  
>brought them up,I can't help it if someone new is on the line  
>pointing out what you may have otherwise gotten little feedback  
>on in the past, not be toatally accustomed to, some counter  
>approaches worth considering.

>My point then was that you can't use strings on telephone poles  
>in a different focus zone when comparing strings that may not be  
>in focus close to the lens... sorry to spoil your fun, but this  
>needed to be brought up, this was obvious oversight.

This is just incoherent. When you're in a hole, stop digging.

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](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - Kaeser

From: Steven Kaeser <[steve.nul](mailto:steve.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:59:29 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:08:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - Kaeser

>From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 20:13:43 +0100  
>Subject: Are We Missing Something?

>Can't help thinking we're like the youngster who's learned about 'the  
>birds and the bees' - but finds the analogy can't cover all  
>circumstances he might be interested in.

>For instance - who's taken an electronics course starting with analogy  
>of electrons as charged 'particles' but had to change to analogy of  
>charged 'holes' when considering active solid-state theory? That should  
>tell us something about both analogies. They don't fit the whole  
>picture - so we're missing something.

>Worse, the analogies used for light photons (actually all  
>radiation) - i.e. as discrete particles or waves, are each clearly  
>wrong when a case is tested - so we're missing something there also.

>And, stepping up to our best theories, Relativity and QM, we find the  
>mathematical analogies used for them also fail much of the time, giving  
>us those 'infinities' which have to be discarded. But this time we  
>can't swap analogies, for as yet we haven't got other mathematics that  
>might fit completely.

>Relativity and QM won't even fit together when we try to stretch them  
>to cover the gaps. Relativity can't explain 'entanglement', the recent  
>strange behavior of light (google - "Nimtz Wang"), or the distant too-  
>old galaxies; while QM/QED, accurate as they are after those  
>'infinities' are discarded, can't "see"  
>gravitational or nuclear forces at all.

>And no-one has a cause for inertia or mass.

>So we're missing many things.

>Therefore, when we get reports hinting at manipulation of physics as  
>yet impossible for us, how can we claim to rule them out?

>If the craft/beings seem to obey 'our' physics - fine. But if they  
>don't - what then?

>It's fairly apparent, from govt's clamp-downs, hoaxes and cover-ups of  
>bizarre cases, that they take these things seriously, despite media  
>flimflam. So why don't we all?

>By clinging to incomplete human physics - we're maybe missing  
>something.

Hi Ray,

What you've stated here is certainly accurate, but since science is really a "process" and not a "thing" I think this has to be taken in context. The theories of the day, as flawed as they may be, are built on the theories of others that have thus far remained supportable. However, as we've seen with some of Einstein's theories, there are modifications and alterations yet to take place as new theories emerge. Given the inability to find most of the "matter" that was believed to have been

generated by the "Big Bang", and extreme theories that involve multiple parallel universes, I suspect there's a lot we have to learn about the reality around us.

While you've seemed to focus on how little we've learned, I look around at the changed world around me and wonder where the hell it all came from and where it's going.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:22:09 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:09:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - Shell

>From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 20:13:43 +0100  
>Subject: Are We Missing Something?

>By clinging to incomplete human physics - we're maybe missing  
>something.

Why equivocate with "maybe", Ray? Until we have a unified theory that incorporates and explains everything we observe, we're obviously missing something. Most likely many somethings. We need scientists who are not afraid to go out on a limb and come up with new theories. Today those scientists who venture out to the far reaches of theoretical physics face not the wrath of the Church, as Galileo did, but the wrath of the new religion called Science. Coming up with "far out" theories is not a way to secure your next funding grant.

Every generation of scientists has lives in the smug knowledge that they pretty much understand how things work. Every generation of scientists has been wrong about some of the fundamentals. We look back at scientists of 100 years ago, smile to ourselves, and say "what idiots they were to believe....."

I'm reminded of the French academy of science that discounted meteors on the grounds that stones could not possibly fall from the sky because there were no stones in the sky. Today we accept meteors without a blink, but aren't willing to admit that "red rain", giant blocks of ice, etc., fall from the sky because it is manifestly obvious that there are no such things in the sky. How much progress have we really made?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Shell

From: **Bob Shell** <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:43:49 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:17:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Shell

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:08:08 -0400  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

>Source: FreeRepublic.Com - Fresno, California, USA

><http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-chat/1655089/posts>

>06/24/2006

Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

with David Sereda

by Diane M. Cooper

<snip>

>David: There is one piece of footage in which two astronauts are  
>repairing the Hubble space telescope, and we hear them referring  
>to an object which is out in front of them. You then hear all  
>these interjections from Houston Control or Alabama, telling the  
>astronauts not to worry about it =97 to keep focusing on the  
>mission.

>On the film you can see this light going behind them, and later  
>we hear some comment about a camera filter coming off.

>It's so typical in these transmissions that you get ridiculous  
>statements coming from NASA that don't make any sense at all and  
>are just thrown out there to confuse the issue. Camera filters  
>are one of the hardest items to unscrew by accident =97 it doesn't  
>happen. I've used cameras semiprofessionally for over twenty  
>years, and it just never happens.

This is just plain BS. I've been a professional photographer since 1971, and have had filters come unscrewed and fall off a number of times. Photographer friends have had the same experience. Now I don't know what's in that video, since it isn't clear enough to really tell, but it could be a filter spinning as it moves through space, alternating reflective surfaces toward the sun. But to say it can't be a filter because they never come off is just idiotic.

>David: There was a satellite that came untethered and was  
>drifting away from the shuttle. In this footage the satellite,  
>with a 12-mile-long tether, is approximately 77 miles away, and  
>drifting to 100 miles away, from the shuttle. In the film  
>footage, you can see swarms of these balls of light moving  
>around, flying by at different velocities, some very slow and  
>some very fast. They are pulsing, and actually look as though  
>they are spinning.

>When the camera zooms in on them, we can clearly see that they  
>are disc-shaped objects passing behind the tether. And it is so  
>important to understand what this means when we see they are

>going behind the tether.

I've seen this video and the so-called "disc-shaped objects" are quite clearly lens flare caused by bright, point source lights in the distance. They appear to be disc-shaped because that is the shape of the camera's diaphragm. Notice the "notch" cut out of the lower edge of the "discs". That's a video camera artifact.

I am constantly amazed by what is supposed to be photographic evidence. People claim to be experts, when they don't even know the basics of photographic optics.

Bob Shell  
(sighing in disgust)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:45:06 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:19:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 13:44:13 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 12:38:15 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

><snip>

>>I have had conversations with Viktor on other things and like  
>>him. He was also very generous with his time and providing me  
>>with materials. But he is beginning to get under my skin with  
>>his repeated grandstanding on this Heflin redux investigation. I  
>>want to work with him, not against him, but he needs to tone  
>>down his "Italian/Croatian" style a couple notches.

>I feel like I'm a visitor on a Green Acres Episode? Does might  
>make right too? These are obvious ploys to the audience. So, at  
>least I have an honest assessment - a full awareness of the  
>tactics being used.

>If you guys spent a little less time patting yourselves on the  
>back and trying to put yourselves always in the best light for  
>those who don't have time to read all the posts, I think I could  
>take all this with a little more seriousness rather than with a  
>good hearty laugh.

<snip>

>I like you guys too, but please a little less ganging up.

Viktor,

David and I have never exchanged e-mail about this case or  
discussed it in any other way other than on-List, where what we  
have done - for anyone to see - is discuss disagreements and try  
to resolve them. What you call 'ganging up' is two people  
separately and freely finding fault with a third party. This is  
called independent corroboration. A little less paranoia please.

>By the way, some of your responses in some of your other post  
>were being addressed to comments I hadn't made, so be careful of  
>all the cleverly crafted slice and dice on your film's editing  
>floor. Maybe those thrown away pieces speak a better truth, make  
>a more honest film, the kind I'd like to watch or sing to. The  
>music in this drama is definitely off key.....

>I didn't write this comment (See below) yet you respond to it  
>like it was from me to make a false impression... this is what  
>I'm talking about! It was your first response right off the bat,  
>a cleverly placed artifact. Use names if you're addressing two  
>different individuals, please.

>>>>I can't see the comparison matching the Heflin photos matching a  
>>>>model train wheel. The flange on the model is shorter than that  
>>>>in evidence in the photos.



Yet again, hasty misjudgment and paranoia. Obviously this was Don's comment, and David strongly endorsed it. How anyone in his right mind could conceive that David was hoping to misrepresent Don so as to be able to put you down by pretending to agree with you (huh?) is beyond me! This implies an insult not only to David's intelligence (that he would think of such a blatant and futile misrepresentation) but also indirectly (via the implication that he would not notice such abuse) to Don's.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:36:58 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:41:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shell

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:19:45 -0300  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>I think you should find something else to compare this object to  
>other than the model[HO?]train wheel. It's off for me. Not the  
>angle "O" formed. That's not kosher for either the real thing or  
>a model wheel. The flange is too wide/long on the object in the  
>photo.

As for it being a model train wheel, if we just go by the images themselves, then the thing is way too asymmetrical to be a wheel of any kind. There's a tendency to fill in and round out what we think we see rather than what may actually be in the photos. Giving them a general overview, here's what I think I see (please excuse my crummy sketch work):

<http://img76.imageshack.us/img76/7386/comp28ea.jpg>

The thing seems to have a kind of "prow," which looks like a tapering but may not be. The base appears to be circular, but that just might be my brain trying to make it circular. The bottom shot shows that there could be a kind of indentation on the "stern" that could be something related to propulsion. Or maybe just a bumper! The base itself is not uniformly wide. It actually looks like it might have a kind of lifting body curve to it. I see dark bands on the top part that don't seem to be reflection effects, but something else. Windows? Exhaust panels? And I think I see a flattened dome on the very top that is set back a bit from the prow.

All-in-all, what I see is a surprisingly asymmetrical thing, with some interesting aerodynamic-looking features, that actually more resembles a fedora than a train wheel. To me, anyway.

<http://img352.imageshack.us/img352/6964/fed2ft.jpg>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Frank Edwards' Publisher Lyle Stuart Dies June

From: Loren Coleman <[lcoleman.nul](mailto:lcoleman.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 16:11:36 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:43:04 -0400  
Subject: Frank Edwards' Publisher Lyle Stuart Dies June

Lyle Stuart, Frank Edwards' Publisher, Dies on June 24th

This intriguing date has claimed another. Here's a celebration of a publisher linked to our world of wonders.

Read Full Post...

<http://www.cryptomundo.com/cryptozoo-news/stuartobitx/>

Posted by Loren Coleman on June 26, 2006

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 17:44:54 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:44:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - Balaskas

>From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Sun, 25 Jun 2006 20:13:43 +0100  
>Subject: Are We Missing Something?

<snip>

>Therefore, when we get reports hinting at manipulation of  
>physics as yet impossible for us, how can we claim to rule them  
>out?

Hi Ray!

We continue to hear expressions from practioners, followers or believers of Science such as "according to the laws of physics, this is not possible" or "science has proven that the cosmology found in Genesis is wrong". Such absolute statements actually hinder the growth of knowledge and understanding and prevent us from coming close to the truth. They're also silly and illogical since Science is not "absolute" but is a methodology; a vast collection of facts and a way of interpreting these facts that is always changing and evolving.

In our current state, we humans are prisoners of a 3 dimensional reality which is further limited by our five senses. Unless we can observe something, measure or weigh it and describe its motion or other properties, then it does not exist. We are smart enough though to deduce from the many puzzling things, such as entanglement as you mentioned, which cannot be explained by our 3-D physics that the real universe must consist of higher dimensions. String theory hints at 10 or 11 and the Bible and "The Boys Topside" suggest that it is 12.

Time is also a dimension but unlike the 3 dimensions of space (length, width, height) which can have negative and postive directions (according to our present mathematics), we think of time as something moving forward and at a constant rate. This is wrong too. It is an established fact that the flow of time cannot be the same everywhere in the universe since it depends on other quantities such as mass, gravity and velocity. Particle physicists have also noted that the motions of anti-particles can be described as regular particles travelling in negative time (making time travel a possiblity too!)...

>If the craft/beings seem to obey 'our' physics - fine. But if  
>they don't - what then?

The oral traditions and written texts of our ancestors from all over the world contain numerous accounts of strange objects performing impossible things and advanced human or no-human beings doing miraculous acts. Some of these impossible things or miraculous acts (such as the flying vimanas of India or the transmutation of elements) are now possible. Since this vain generation thinks is much smarter than previous ones, even ones which claimed direct revelations from ETs or the gods, the accepted practice to dismiss this vast body of ancient history as "mythology" and ignore it completely. New facts that conflict with the present scientific beliefs and popular world views are also ignored but for less valid reasons. After all, scientists

are human too and science is not always what scientists do...

>It's fairly apparent, from govt's clamp-downs, hoaxes and cover-  
>ups of bizarre cases, that they take these things seriously,  
>despite media flimflam. So why don't we all?

I suspect it is the same reason alien abductions happen and our freedoms and rights can be taken away by Earthly governments. It is a question of control. If we were to realise who we truly are and know of our special relationship to the supreme power in the universe (eg. the first two words of the Lord's Prayer that is now banned in schools so not to offend others but in reality to allow a few to enslave us), we would be in control. This is also why aliens only respond and all abductions are thwarted whenever we identify ourselves as children of God or that supreme ET in the sky! Regarding the government cover-ups, Stan Friedman has stated on a number of times that "no country wants its citizens to owe their allegiance to the planet instead of to that government". I would replace "planet" with "supreme God".

>By clinging to incomplete human physics - we're maybe missing  
>something.

We certainly are. That something is our special place as unique beings in the universe - everything that was created by the supreme intelligence or God. This was something our parents and past civilizations took for granted except for the present secular/humanist "scientific" generation that believes it knows better.

Just some of my thoughts on this very important subject...

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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Donna T. Hare & NASA UFOs Revisited

From: Don Ecker <[decker0726.nul](mailto:decker0726.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 20:56:42 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 07:59:29 -0400  
Subject: Donna T. Hare & NASA UFOs Revisited

It was a sweltering hot night in Southern California in July 1995 when I had Ms. Donna Tietze Hare on my program, UFOs Tonite!. Dwight Schultz was co-hosting with me and Donna, at the time, was going by the name Donna Tietze only. She appeared on UFOs Tonite! to talk about here time as a NASA contract employee where she witnessed what she described as NASA "routinely airbrushed UFOs out of NASA photos before being sold" to the public.

At this time, the FOX Television special of the Alien Autopsy had not yet aired, but was the other hot topic being discussed throughout the UFO arena. However, the Alien Autopsy story did not overshadow what Ms. Donna Tietze Hare had to say.

Some of the items she discussed included but were not limited to airbrushing UFO photos, what astronauts had to say while in quarantine after returning from the Moon, what she believed to be the definitive Federal Agency that was in charge of the secrecy and it was not CIA! This was a classic in the annals of UFO broadcasting.

Please drop by the Dark Matters site where you can either download the show into your ipod or listen with streaming technology.

New shows are currently in the pipeline so stay tuned.

Regards;

Don Ecker  
<http://www.darkmattersradio.com>

Don Eckers exciting supernatural thriller!  
<http://www.PastSins.Net>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## SETI & CSICOP

From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:51:23 +1000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 08:19:02 -0400  
Subject: SETI & CSICOP

Hi all,

Thought I would forward on my most recent column for our free online magazine Sub Rosa

<http://subrosa.dailygrail.com>

as I believe it may be of interest to some members.

Kind regards,

Greg

-----

SETI and CSICOP - Strange Bedfellows?

Over recent months, it has become plain that an odd alliance has been created between the ultra-skeptical organisation CSICOP (the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal) and the leaders in SETI (the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence). The SETI Institute's weekly radio program, Are We Alone, is now heavily flavoured toward skeptical subjects and guests (even to the point of having a 'Skeptical Sunday' feature), and their website proclaims outright that the show is produced in partnership with CSICOP and other skeptical organisations such as CFI (the Center For Inquiry). This has even led to some of the subject matter discussed not even being related to the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (such as investigation of psychics).

Conversely, regular CSICOP commentators such as James Randi (no longer affiliated with the organisation, for reasons too detailed to explain here) have long advocated SETI and participation in the distributed computing effort [SETI.nul](mailto:SETI.nul). 'Bad Astronomy' critic Phil Plait has a regular spot with SETI radio. Skeptical Inquirer has recently featured a critical article by Peter Schenkel regarding the search, which allowed no less than three responses to the critique by individuals such as SETI luminary Jill Tarter and astrobiologist David Darling. While the balance of articles suggests that there is some tension within CSICOP as to the validity of SETI, it also is astounding in comparison to the one-sided attacks (with no responses) on other topics that are usually seen in the magazine.

Why does James Randi not offer a million dollar prize for SETI to prove that there is truly an alien intelligence out there, with criticism of the funding that has been provided to them? Simply because he thinks it likely that there is 'someone' out there. Parapsychology research has provided far more positive results than SETI (see the Dean Radin interview in this issue), with as huge implications for our paradigm, but he regularly savages anyone who dares to ask the question of whether psi effects exist, and finds the idea of funding such studies outrageous.

CSICOP's collaboration with SETI, and accompanying lack of

criticism (apart from Schenkel's article), stands in contrast to other critical views gaining momentum. Historian George Basalla, in his book *Civilized Life in the Universe*, takes SETI to task for 'fifty years of failure'. In his view, SETI is popular because of its quasi-religious features; perhaps there are benevolent 'beings' out there, more advanced than us, who have wondrous things to show us - it's interesting to note the lack of concern in SETI circles about the dangers posed by contacting an alien civilisation. He also notes the cultural assumptions we have made at various points throughout history about possible alien races, and uses this as a mirror to point out the ethnocentric blindness through which today's SETI scientists "believe that extraterrestrial civilizations construct radio telescopes."

Basalla's point has been well made previously by Terence McKenna, who noted that "to search expectantly for a radio signal from an extraterrestrial source is probably as culture bound a presumption as to search the galaxy for a good Italian restaurant." SETI's Seth Shostak has made the highly positive analogy that in the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, we are like Columbus sailing into uncharted waters. Perhaps, considering current search strategies, we are more akin to Columbus standing on the coast of Europe throwing pebbles into the ocean, waiting for Native Americans to see the ripples and answer back via the same method.

In ABC's 2005 feature, Peter Jennings Reporting: UFOs - Seeing is Believing, both Jill Tarter and Seth Shostak provided a skeptical counterpoint to ufology - Tarter is a CSICOP fellow. "If we claim something, there will be data to back it up," Tarter says in the program. Ironically, Tarter - the current director of the Center for SETI Research at the SETI Institute, and one of the pioneers of research in the area - was the 'model' for the character of astronomer Ellie Arroway in Carl Sagan's *Contact* (and played in the movie version by Jodie Foster). Those familiar with the story will remember that it ends with a twist, in which the rationalist atheist character of Arroway is placed in the position of believing in something for which she has no empirical evidence -- alien contact -- based solely on her own totally convincing experience.

This is a worthwhile sidenote to keep in mind. Turning once again to Terence McKenna, we should remember to avoid anthropocentric thinking, and keep our minds open - while obviously thinking critically - to other methods of contact from 'intelligences'. SETI, says McKenna, has been "chosen as the avenue by which it is assumed contact is likely to occur. Meanwhile, there are people all over the world - psychics, shamans, mystics, schizophrenics - whose heads are filled with information, but it has been ruled a priori irrelevant, incoherent, or mad. Only that which is validated through consensus via certain sanctioned instrumentalities will be accepted as a signal."

So should we abolish SETI? I don't think so; actually I'm actually a fan. It's ideal is a worthwhile one, reaching out beyond our isolation to communicate with anyone else who might be out there. Remembering what the acronym actually stands for, my only suggestion would be that SETI stop lying down with close-minded inquisitors, and start broadening their horizons by entering into a dialogue with scientists out there who share SETI's ethos, but are willing to look outside the paradigm for answers.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06

From: **Stephen G. Bassett** <[ParadigmRG.nul](mailto:ParadigmRG.nul)>  
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 06:40:59 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 08:57:30 -0400  
Subject: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06

PRG/X-PPAC  
Paradigm Research Group  
Extraterrestrial Phenomena Political Action Committee

Update - June 26, 2006

Exopolitics World Hub  
[www.exopoliticsworld.net](http://www.exopoliticsworld.net)

PRG has formally set up a new website, Exopolitics World Hub. The ambitious goal of this project is to link together one website from each of 32 key countries - all with the same URL formats, i.e., [www.exopoliticsunitedstates.us](http://www.exopoliticsunitedstates.us), [www.exopoliticscanada.ca](http://www.exopoliticscanada.ca), [www.exopoliticsfrance.fr](http://www.exopoliticsfrance.fr), etc. Each site would provide links and information regarding exopolitical developments within that country. Ideally all sites would be published in the principal language of the country and in English. Sites for the United States (by PRG) and Italy have been published. Canada and Turkey are pending. Each country may design their site as they wish, but all are welcome to draw upon the design format for [www.exopolitidsunitedstates.us](http://www.exopolitidsunitedstates.us). The consistency in URL and design formats will enhance the perception of an organized network.

It is expected that once these sites are operational and receiving traffic, they will quickly rise to the top listings on Google and other search engines creating a powerful sense of a global exopolitical movement.

Anyone who believes they are positioned to create and maintain a participating site for one of these countries, please contact PRG at your earliest convenience. Individuals living in the respective country are much preferred.

X-Conference #3  
[www.x-conference.com](http://www.x-conference.com)

The new target date for the 3rd X-Conference is now April 2007 in the Washington, DC area. Let's face it, 2006 is proving to be an awful year, another annus horribilis, best forgotten. After December 31 let's not speak of it again. PRG will have to raise \$50,000 to rectify the event franchise and commit to the third conference. The effort continues.

X-PPAC Congressional Alert  
[www.x-ppac.org/Alerts.html#6-26-06](http://www.x-ppac.org/Alerts.html#6-26-06)

Few things are more disconcerting in these troubling times than for a politically minded and observant person to watch the Congress of the United States of America stumbling around in the hallowed halls and chambers of the Capitol Building looking for a spine. While the hunt proceeds X-PPAC will continue to point out the obvious to the esteemed Members: 1) there is an extraterrestrial presence engaging the human race, 2) many people in the government and the military are well aware of this, 3) many of same have begun to speak out publicly, 4) nevertheless, the United States Government continues to maintain

a truth embargo and deny the issue, 5) this truth embargo is no longer acceptable and must be resolved in favor of the public's right to know, and most importantly 6) extraordinary technology which could save countless lives and solve major problem faced by all nations remains hostage to this truth embargo and to those leaders who do not trust their own citizens and place the development of weaponry above all else.

This most recent Congressional Alert brings to the attention of Congress the availability of a new book, *Majic Eyes Only: Earth's Encounters with Extraterrestrial Technology* by Ryan S. Wood and a new project by PRG (see below).

PRG Quotes Page

[www.paradigmclock.com/QuotesPage.html](http://www.paradigmclock.com/QuotesPage.html)

PRG has assembled from multiple sources a powerful compilation of selected written and spoken quotes from persons of rank and accomplishment. The near term goal is to expand this section to 100 listings. Quotes were selected on the basis of an unambiguous relationship to the validity of an extraterrestrial presence and the history of government posture toward this presence. Such a compilation can be very useful to advocacy, but its usefulness is directly dependent upon full sourcing: date, event, location, book, interview, etc.

Please email PRG if you can provide information pertaining to: 1) the validity of a quote, 2) the accuracy of a quote, 3) the provenance of a quote, or 4) have a suggested quote for inclusion in the PRG Quotes Page. Thanks.

---

Paradigm Research Group  
E-mail: [ParadigmRG.nul](mailto:ParadigmRG.nul)  
URL: [www.paradigmclock.com](http://www.paradigmclock.com)  
Cell: 202-215-8344  
4938 Hampden Lane, #161  
Bethesda, MD 20814

---

3rd Exopolitics Expo - The X-Conference  
TBA 2007  
[www.x-conference.com](http://www.x-conference.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 10:09:08 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 09:28:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Friedman

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:43:49 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:08:08 -0400  
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

>>Source: FreeRepublic.Com - Fresno, California, USA

>><http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-chat/1655089/posts>

>>06/24/2006

>>Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

>>with David Sereda

>>by Diane M. Cooper

<snip>

>>David: There was a satellite that came untethered and was  
>>drifting away from the shuttle. In this footage the satellite,  
>>with a 12-mile-long tether, is approximately 77 miles away, and  
>>drifting to 100 miles away, from the shuttle. In the film  
>>footage, you can see swarms of these balls of light moving  
>>around, flying by at different velocities, some very slow and  
>>some very fast. They are pulsing, and actually look as though  
>>they are spinning.

>>When the camera zooms in on them, we can clearly see that they  
>>are disc-shaped objects passing behind the tether. And it is so  
>>important to understand what this means when we see they are  
>>going behind the tether.

>>I've seen this video and the so-called "disc-shaped objects" are  
>>quite clearly lens flare caused by bright, point source lights  
>>in the distance. They appear to be disc-shaped because that is  
>>the shape of the camera's diaphragm. Notice the "notch" cut out  
>>of the lower edge of the "discs". That's a video camera  
>>artifact.

>>I am constantly amazed by what is supposed to be photographic  
>>evidence. People claim to be experts, when they don't even know  
>>the basics of photographic optics.

I join Bob in sighing. Sereda is a wannabe name-dropper who has no scientific background, but slings around terminology without knowing what he is talking about. He gets things wrong very often as in another piece claiming that a nuclear explosion produces 200 Million electron volts. That is the energy produced in one single fission event. Only off by a million billion billion or so for a bomb.

It is a shame Dan Akroyd has worked with him... I heard his MUFON talk and have watched a video. Just what we don't need.

Stan Friedman

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:18:36 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 09:33:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:36:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:19:45 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>I think you should find something else to compare this object to  
>>other than the model[H0?]train wheel. It's off for me. Not the  
>>angle "O" formed. That's not kosher for either the real thing or  
>>a model wheel. The flange is too wide/long on the object in the  
>>photo.

>As for it being a model train wheel, if we just go by the images  
>themselves, then the thing is way too asymmetrical to be a wheel  
>of any kind. There's a tendency to fill in and round out what we  
>think we see rather than what may actually be in the photos.  
>Giving them a general overview, here's what I think I see  
>(please excuse my crummy sketch work):

><http://img76.imageshack.us/img76/7386/comp28ea.jpg>

>The thing seems to have a kind of "prow," which looks like a  
>tapering but may not be. The base appears to be circular, but  
>that just might be my brain trying to make it circular. The  
>bottom shot shows that there could be a kind of indentation on  
>the "stern" that could be something related to propulsion. Or  
>maybe just a bumper! The base itself is not uniformly wide. It  
>actually looks like it might have a kind of lifting body curve  
>to it. I see dark bands on the top part that don't seem to be  
>reflection effects, but something else. Windows? Exhaust panels?  
>And I think I see a flattened dome on the very top that is set  
>back a bit from the prow.

>All-in-all, what I see is a surprisingly asymmetrical thing,  
>with some interesting aerodynamic-looking features, that  
>actually more resembles a fedora than a train wheel. To me,  
>anyway.

><http://img352.imageshack.us/img352/6964/fed2ft.jpg>

I agree mostly with these impressions, except that a) your sketchwork is not at all crummy, b) I see a projection on the "stern" rather than an indentation and c) some of the apparent skewed geometry, particularly the tapering flange, may be due to motion blur (rapid oscillation).

I'd like to stress again that I think there are some interesting similarities with unexplained features of the Trindade and Puerto Rico photo cases - skewing, oblique streaking, "smoke" etc.

Now we wait, until some anonymous informant reveals that Heflin had a great hat collection <g>.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

From: Michael Salla <[exopolitics.nul](mailto:exopolitics.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 03:52:33 -1000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:01:22 -0400  
Subject: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

Aloha all, I'm very pleased to announce the succesful completion of the first Extraterrestrial Civillzations and World Peace conference in Hawaii. We had a number of prominent individuals travel to address the conference including the Hon Paul Hellyer and Ambassador John McDonald. Both of whom thrilled the audience with their insights into government policy built up over decades of senior level experience and how these related to the Extraterrestrial hypothesis. Fourteen other presenters many of whom have decades of experience on the extraterrestrial hypothesis also discussed their research and how this related to world peace. You can find a detailed conference report at:

<http://www.exopoliticsinstitute.org/Conference-Report.htm>

Some video exercepts of the conference are available at:

<http://www.jerryippin.com/Hawaii%20ETCWP%20Conference.htm>

Personally, the most satisfying part of the conference was the process by which both speakers and participants reached consensus on a conference Declaration promoting peaceful relations with extraterrestrial civilizations. The Declaration has so far been translated into German, Italian and French and an English version is available on the conference website or in petition form at:

<http://www.petitiononline.com/ETPeace/petition.html> .

More information about the conference in terms of media coverage, available DVDs and photos are all available on the conference website: <http://www.etworldpeace.com>

I thank all those who supported the conference, especially those who made the effort to travel to Hawaii to better understand the nexus between extraterrestrial civilizations and world peace. We are already planning the second Extraterrestrial Civilizations and World Peace conference and look forward to bringing again to Hawaii a combination of senior level government policy officials and researchers/experiencers of the UFO/exopolitical phenomenon.

In peace

Michael Salla

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <[steve.nul](mailto:steve.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 09:55:23 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:22:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Kaeser

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 10:09:08 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

<snip>

>I join Bob in sighing. Sereda is a wannabe name-dropper who has  
>no scientific background, but slings around terminology without  
>knowing what he is talking about. He gets things wrong very  
>often as in another piece claiming that a nuclear explosion  
>produces 200 Million electron volts. That is the energy produced  
>in one single fission event. Only off by a million billion  
>billion or so for a bomb.

>It is a shame Dan Akroyd has worked with him... I heard his  
>MUFON talk and have watched a video. Just what we don't need.

Which is why MUFON (IMO) is becoming less relevant in the  
scientific analysis of ufology.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06 - Allan

From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:56:42 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:26:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06 - Allan

>From: Stephen G. Bassett <[ParadigmRG.nul](mailto:ParadigmRG.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 06:40:59 EDT  
>Subject: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06

>PRG/X-PPAC  
>Paradigm Research Group  
>Extraterrestrial Phenomena Political Action Committee

>Update - June 26, 2006

<snip>

Since everyone on earth now knows the truth about extraterrestrial presence on our planet I suggest you dismantle your organisation forthwith. There is simply no need, none whatever, for the US (or any other) Government to inform the public of this fact. We have been told the truth so many times by you and your predecessors that it has finally sunk in and is now abundantly obvious to all people on this planet.

Your Paradigm Research Group is therefore redundant.

The Extraterrestrial Phenomena Political Action Committee (phew!) is also redundant. Your proposed April 2007 conference is thus totally unnecessary. You can now retire, and live happily ever after.

CDA

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: SETI & CSICOP - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 09:07:39 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:30:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP - Lehmberg

>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:51:23 +1000  
>Subject: SETI & CSICOP

>Thought I would forward on my most recent column for our free  
>online magazine Sub Rosa

><http://subrosa.dailygrail.com>

>as I believe it may be of interest to some members.

>---

>SETI and CSICOP - Strange Bedfellows?

>Over recent months, it has become plain that an odd alliance has  
>been created between the ultra-skeptical organisation CSICOP  
>(the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the  
>Paranormal) and the leaders in SETI (the Search for  
>Extraterrestrial Intelligence). The SETI Institute's weekly  
>radio program, Are We Alone, is now heavily flavoured toward  
>skeptical subjects and guests (even to the point of having a  
>'Skeptical Sunday' feature), and their website proclaims  
>outright that the show is produced in partnership with CSICOP  
>and other skeptical organisations such as CFI (the Center For  
>Inquiry). This has even led to some of the subject matter  
>discussed not even being related to the search for  
>extraterrestrial intelligence (such as investigation of  
>psychics).

<snip>

>So should we abolish SETI? I don't think so; actually I'm  
>actually a fan. It's ideal is a worthwhile one, reaching out  
>beyond our isolation to communicate with anyone else who might  
>be out there. Remembering what the acronym actually stands for,  
>my only suggestion would be that SETI stop lying down with  
>close-minded inquisitors, and start broadening their horizons by  
>entering into a dialogue with scientists out there who share  
>SETI's ethos, but are willing to look outside the paradigm for  
>answers.

Har! I'm glad someone has pointed this out.

Forgetting I'd be the first to welcome SETI back into the outre-  
investigative fold... given they stopped acting like they  
possessed the only legitimacy grudgingly bestowed by an  
inconstant scientific (sic) pontificate... the conflicted  
imperative and obdurate agenda of a suspiciously canted  
Mainstream Science prosecutes its clue-lessness by apparent  
design!

It is not Ufology that needs to make itself worthy of science.  
It is science that needs to make itself worthy of UFOs.

I stand on the shoulders of giants, reader, to say that the  
study of the 'other' presupposes a necessity to investigate  
same; that it is the truth able to withstand - and having

withstood for decades - the errant slings and invalid arrows of its corporately biased opposition.

Science FAILS us in an execution of its charter... because it does not execute its charter... in a deliberate sense, in an ethical sense, in an efficacious sense, in a data following sense, or in a sense free of ego. Vallee and McKenna et sig al have pointed out that it almost seems this imposition of an 'other' is invented by the 'other' as a mechanism to discredit, or otherwise point up the short-comings of that same science refusing to investigate in a forthcoming manner that which is obviously there for millions... if not billions... of individual persons!

Science fails UFOs, not the inverse. Science fails me, not the inverse! Don't tell me what I'm seeing is not there... that I'm Misleading, Misled, or Mentally ill... You only discredit yourself and set me against you.

The attitude of SETI and its unsavory bedfellows -I hope somebody's wearing a diaphragm or a condom ...forgetting STDs, the thought of an issue from that sticky union is too appalling to consider - then, is the intimation by SETI that it is not a serious investigation of the other... just an uncomfortable dodge to hold the intellectually inconvenient at arm's length.

Still, I would welcome them back into respectful arms if for no other reason than money spent on them is still better than throwing that money entirely away on another no-bid Halliburton contract.

If Science wants to do something credible in the investigation of UFOs it can actually investigate what it now only pronouncing upon. Research by proclamation is the mechanism of dark age churches and not the domain of 21st Century science. One would think.

Finally, in the measures and graphs of this same science are cited lines beginning to accelerate straight up! These across-the-board asymptotic graph lines indicate a flavor to a near term civilization and culture that will be so bizarre that we can't extrapolate from the present to it. Completely unpredictable, reader! Not only stranger than we imagine but stranger than we can imagine, eh?

By 2015? We're moving at hyperspeed... or we'll be extinct. It's my suspicion CSICOPia is the necropolis and it would have once been attended by a too willing handmaiden, SETIcia.

[alienview.nul](http://alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:35:32 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:35:32 -0400  
Subject: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS

Source: The Khaleej Times - Dubai, UAE

<http://tinyurl.com/z3d78>

27 June 2006

Unidentified Floating Object Near International Space Station  
(DPA)

MOSCOW - An unknown floating object close to the International Space Station ISS has concerned ground control, according to reports from the US Space Agency NASA on Tuesday.

The object is approximately 2.8 kilometres away from the International Space Station, said the Russian flight control centre in Moscow, citing a NASA source.

The situation is quite serious, but does not yet require a dodge manoeuvre, said Russian flight trajectory expert Alexander Kireyev.

"The object has no number in the list of space debris," Kireyev said, according to reports from the Russian Itar-Tass agency.

"It is however probably an old piece of space exploration equipment."

If the object gets any closer to the ISS, astronauts Jeff Williams and Pavel Vinogradov would have to take the precaution of moving to the rescue space shuttle Soyuz TM.

A dodge manoeuvre could cause difficulties for the docking of the US space ship "Discovery", due to be launched on July 1.

[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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06 - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 10:46:57 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 12:36:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06 - Lehmborg

>From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:56:42 +0100  
>Subject: Re: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06

>>From: Stephen G. Bassett <[ParadigmRG.nul](mailto:ParadigmRG.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 06:40:59 EDT  
>>Subject: X-PPAC/PRG Update - 06-26-06

>>PRG/X-PPAC  
>>Paradigm Research Group  
>>Extraterrestrial Phenomena Political Action Committee

>>Update - June 26, 2006

><snip>

>Since everyone on earth now knows the truth about  
>extraterrestrial presence on our planet I suggest you dismantle  
>your organisation forthwith. There is simply no need, none  
>whatever, for the US (or any other) Government to inform the  
>public of this fact. We have been told the truth so many times  
>by you and your predecessors that it has finally sunk in and is  
>now abundantly obvious to all people on this planet.

>Your Paradigm Research Group is therefore redundant.

>The Extraterrestrial Phenomena Political Action Committee  
>(pew!) is also redundant. Your proposed April 2007 conference  
>is thus totally unnecessary. You can now retire, and live  
>happily ever after.

<Applause>

Yes... this was helpful... where it wasn't obtuse, where it  
didn't lack imagination, where it wasn't dismissive and  
insulting, where it wasn't fraught with intellectual cowardice  
and philosophical colorlessness... where it wasn't decidedly  
unhelpful. Such ufological ineptitude should not go  
unrewarded.

<Applause>

Truly, those yet to contribute anything must counterfeit same  
by sniping at those who aspire to make same...

<Applause>

[alienview.nul](mailto:alienview.nul)  
[www.AlienView.net](http://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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Feel smart? Thank Your Lucky Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:37:58 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:37:58 -0400  
Subject: Feel smart? Thank Your Lucky Aliens

Source: The Bay Of Plenty Times - Wellington, New Zealand

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/1jmi>

27.06.2006

Feel smart? Thank Your Lucky Aliens  
By Anna Bowden

Ever thought that each generation is becoming physically, emotionally, intellectually and spiritually smarter than before?

Here's why: We are being genetically upgraded by aliens.

That's the opinion of international speaker and hypnotherapist Mary Rodwell, who recently won a forum debate on the topic at the prestigious Oxford University. She is due to speak in Tauranga tonight.

In basic terms, she says aliens have intervened with thousands of people around the world - including hundreds in the Western Bay - and are in the process of upgrading humankind to a level where we can become part of a galactic community.

She says new generations are "hybrid species" and are the key to humankind's future.

Mrs Rodwell, principal of the Australian Close Encounter Resource Network with 1200 clients from all over the world, said people are beginning to open their eyes to not only the possibility but the probability of extra-terrestrial intervention.

Tauranga "experiencer" Suzanne Hansen is hosting the Australian therapist whom she met through her own research. The Pahoia woman has launched her own national network, Ufocus NZ.

The organisation provides support, resources and contacts for experiencers, and will launch an inaugural conference next year.

Mrs Hansen said the Tauranga area is particularly strong for sightings, especially between Motiti and Mayor Islands and the Matata hills.

Since forming her organisation, Mrs Hansen has supported hundreds of people who are often ridiculed for their experiences.

"I'm being approached by a lot of elderly people now, these are just ordinary Kiwis who have got children and grandchildren and they've decided before they die, they want to talk and understand what happened to them," she said.

Both women said experiences often involved entire families and children had especially heightened senses and sometimes healing powers.

According to Mrs Rodwell the question is no longer do aliens exist but what their plan for humankind is. This is where the "star kids" concept comes in.

She says humans use about 3 per cent of their DNA - "it's like when you start a new programme on a computer you need an access code, I think what the star kids are doing is bringing in a new programme."

She says aliens are preparing humans by inserting new genomes - 233 of them are not biologically linked to us - but until we can make peace on our own planet, we will not be complete.

So who are the star kids?

They are children who experience alien intervention - wake up with marks on their bodies, have missing time, natural healing powers - typically they refrain from squashing bugs and spiders, want to be vegetarian, are passionate about the planet and their environment, and have higher senses in communication.

One of Tauranga's brightest youngsters, Nick Newman, competed in a television competition earlier this year which had children face off to find the country's brainiest kid.

The 12-year-old is in a class two years ahead of his age level at Otumoetai College and found the suggesting of alien intervention "very interesting" - his father Mike said it "explained a lot" about his quirky son.

Nick said, "I would like to hope that there is something else out there, some extra-terrestrial being but I would think we would see other signs."

\* Mary Rodwell will speak at the Bay of Plenty Polytechnic Bongard Centre at 7.30pm tonight.

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 21:25:13 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 21:25:13 -0400  
Subject: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere

Source: The Mail & Guardian - Hatfield, South Africa

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/2mwn>

26 June 2006

The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere

Reesha Chibba  
Johannesburg, South Africa

South Africa's Unidentified Flying Objects Resource (Saufor) will host its second annual Unbind Your Mind UFO conference in celebration of World UFO Day on July 1 in Cape Town.

The conference will reveal a timeline of UFO (unidentified flying object) events in South Africa and topics will include, amongst others: identified flying objects; how to report a UFO; UFO witnesses and hallucinations; UFOs as a gateway to a higher knowledge; and important current international developments.

Cristo Louw, founder of Saufor, said in a statement on Monday: "The time is ripe for the South African public to be informed about the true nature of the UFO issue."

Saufor's mission, he said, is to bring South Africa out of the "Ufological" Dark Age.

Saufor said in the statement: "The whole UFO debacle and the related conspiracies of government cover-ups, extraterrestrial visitations and an international, underground secret-government cabal pulling... strings from behind the scenes is probably the most-important issue facing humanity at this point in our global evolution.

"According to international researchers, it all boils down to keeping the status quo, because when the public finds out that alternative methods for generating free energy, derived from advanced extraterrestrial technologies, are revealed as not only possible, but have been in use for many years, the oil industry and all parts of world economy dependent on it will have to be seriously revised.

"And no more power outages in South Africa!"

The conference will be held at the University of Cape Town's middle campus and starts at 10.30am. The cost per person is R75.

On the net  
A full programme with speakers is available at:

[www.saufor.com](http://www.saufor.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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Clash Of Events Has UFO Festival Upset

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:08:10 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:08:10 -0400  
Subject: Clash Of Events Has UFO Festival Upset

Source: The Roswell Daily Record - New Mexico, USA

<http://www.roswell-record.com/archives/062506/news05.html>

25 June 2006

Clash Of Events Has UFO Festival Organizer Upset

Erin Green  
Record Staff Writer

Organizers scheduled an event to honor Roswell's military veterans for Saturday to avoid conflict with the city's Independence Day events.

But they created fireworks of another kind because of a scheduling conflict with of the 12th annual Roswell UFO Festival and its use of military helicopters in a flyover.

The event to honor veterans, called One Nation Under God, is sponsored by Church on the Move and has been scheduled for the final hours of the three-day UFO Festival. The church plans to ends its event with fireworks display, which will coincide with the UFO Festival parade and a flyover by the helicopters.

Church on the Move Pastor Troy Smothermon said he wanted to organize an event to honor God, the country and the veterans. He said he did not want to create any controversy with regard to the UFO Festival.

"I'm not against the UFO Festival, but I am for honoring God and our veterans and teaching our children the real meaning of July Fourth," Smothermon said. "Part of our event is geared to take back Independence Day. I'm not against (the UFO festival), but it won't stop us."

The church event will take place at Cielo Grande Park from 3 p.m. to 9 p.m. Saturday with games, food, patriotic music, speakers and professionally choreographed fireworks, Smothermon said.

Smothermon also requested use of the helicopters, according to the UFO Festival's lead organizer, who said she holds the permits from the Department of Defense for the Apache and Blackhawk helicopters.

Julie Shuster, director of the Roswell International UFO Museum and Research Center, said she will not allow the church events to use the helicopters because the aircraft are her and the museum's responsibility under terms of the government's permit.

"All permits and requests are for the festival," she said. "I am not taking on that kind of liability."

Shuster also expressed concern about the planned fireworks display by Church on the Move, which Smothermon said will

contain 3,200 shells including 600 for the 30-second grand finale at 9 p.m.

That is the same time as the UFO Festival's Lights in the Night parade on Main Street downtown and the Alien Invasion flyover by the helicopters. Shuster said she is concerned about the safety of the flyover because the helicopters' route would be over the area fireworks display at Cielo Grande.

"We're a tinderbox right now," Shuster said, referring to the drought. She acknowledged city fire personnel will be on the scene to keep the situation under control at both events but said the city's manpower would be stretched thin in case anything happens.

"If there's any trouble with the fireworks, if there's any wind at all, what will happen to those embers," Shuster said.

A city official tried to allay those concerns, saying each and every fireworks displays inside the city limits must have the proper permits and insurance.

"For that reason, professionally done shows are probably safer than the ones where people are just shooting off shells in their backyard," said Kim Elliott, director of the city Parks and Recreation Department.

He said the fireworks will shoot to a maximum 8,000 feet. The helicopters will come in at 10,000 feet.

Nor do city officials view the events as conflicting.

They are for different audiences and in different parts of the city, said Renee Roach, city public relations officer.

"They've never been determined as being conflicting or as having conflicting permits," Roach said.

But Shuster does see the One Nation Under God event as conflicting because its fireworks display is being billed as the largest Roswell has ever seen and because the event has many similarities to other events taking place July Fourth including a steak dinner for veterans and family members.

Smothermon said he wanted to have the event Saturday to avoid conflicting with the city's July Fourth celebration Tuesday.

"We didn't want to compete with the city over their July Fourth events," he said. "We appreciate them for doing it."

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Sleuthing Out Truth On UFOs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:23:47 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:23:47 -0400  
Subject: Sleuthing Out Truth On UFOs

Source: The Register-Guard, Eugene, Oregon, USA

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/ku42>

Monday, June 26, 2006

Sleuthing Out Truth On UFOs  
By Winston Ross  
The Register-Guard

FLORENCE - Mike Johnson and his daughter Brenna were driving home to Woahink Lake from town that spring night in 1995 when Brenna turned around in her seat and saw a strange light hovering above the water.

The Johnsons knew exactly whom to call: Greg Barnes, regional UFO investigator - a self-taught expert in the field of "ufology".

Barnes began with his typical first question: "What do you see right now?" Then, "How do you feel about it?" The latter query is nearly as important as the first, he said. It tells him whether the caller is panicked or calm, fearful or skeptical. That state of mind could affect a person's ability to report information accurately.

"A person who's awestruck responds differently than a person who's petrified," Barnes said. "The person who's afraid isn't so much interested in details; they just want the thing away from them."

Ultimately, Barnes drove to the Johnson house, not far from his own Woahink getaway. He missed seeing the lights himself, but wound up interviewing 11 people who claimed that they'd seen either the lights or the floating, silent object that carried them, before the object veered west and glided out towards the ocean, reportedly disrupting cable television signals throughout Florence in its wake.

Barnes knows his hobby and his business card adorned with a flying saucer place him squarely on the fringe. "You're easily branded a nut," he said. "I have to accept that, with this topic. What we have here is ordinary people seeing extraordinary things. A whole lot of what people see are obviously misidentifications; fishing boats, that kind of thing. People tell us 'Oh, that's just something that Lockheed made.' But I doubt very seriously the government would test their latest, greatest underwater machines in Florence."

Mike Johnson, for one, isn't sure if what he saw was of this planet. But he's willing to accept it might not have been.

"I think it would be extremely egotistical not to think there's other intelligent life out there, being that there are probably 100 billion stars in our own Milky Way galaxy and there have got

to be hundreds of galaxies," Johnson said.

Skepticism doesn't bother 54-year-old Barnes, a Navy veteran, former Indianapolis 500 racecar mechanic, excavator and Florence auxiliary police officer. People need someone to talk to about the strange lights they see, or the flying saucer they believe they just spotted.

He is happy to hear their stories; scour nearby hillsides for clipped treetops or the ground for impressions; take readings with his Geiger counter - or the "Cutie Pie" that measures alpha, beta and gamma rays - and pass his reports on to national UFO experts.

"Usually it's anomalous lights in the sky," Barnes said of the calls he gets from people who know his reputation. "If it's in the middle of the night, I say 'You just woke me up. This better be a good story.' Generally people thank me before they even say anything: 'I'm so glad I have someone to talk to that thinks I'm not nuts.' I say 'Well, I haven't determined that you're not nuts.'"

Often he reports findings to Peter Davenport, who runs the national UFO Center based in Seattle. Davenport says what sets Barnes apart from the hundreds of other "regional investigators" he hears from is his common-sense approach.

"He's very objective," Davenport said. "He recognizes that most of the data, most of the reports in the media or in mainstream ufology probably can be explained by terrestrial events. You have to winnow out the schlock to get to the real material."

Barnes is still working with a distraught, elderly Florence woman who claims she saw a light outside her window one night. Soon she was overtaken by paralysis and two small creatures appeared before her, she said. She felt nauseous, she said, and then found herself floating out her bedroom window, towards some kind of disc-shaped light.

The woman doesn't remember what happened next, Barnes said. But when she returned, her bedclothes were buttoned incorrectly, she said.

Barnes also has seen his own blend of UFOs, he said. In September 1993, he was standing at the boat ramp at Westlake when he spotted a light out of the corner of his eye.

Barnes marked the spot with cedar cones and ran for his wife Wendy, a friend and a pair of binoculars.

Ten or 15 minutes later, Barnes said, a smaller white light dropped from the bottom of the big light, circled around the top and flew off. Under normal circumstances, he said, he would have been compelled to remain, maybe even paddle out into the lake for a closer look. But the trio immediately and all at once lost interest, he said, as if something had convinced them it was time to leave.

Wendy, an escrow officer in Florence, has known her husband since they were children living across the street from each other in Torrance, Calif. She can't remember when he first started talking about UFOs, but it's never bothered her.

"I never had the feeling to be so arrogant that we're the only thing to exist in this universe," she said. "And he has a very healthy attitude about it. If somebody doesn't believe it, thinks you're nuts, he says, 'That's fine, that's your deal.' He doesn't feel like he has to try to convert them."

Florence's Regional UFO Investigator

Name: Greg Barnes

Age: 54

Equipment: Camera, binoculars, spotting scope, Geiger counter and the "Cutie Pie," which measures alpha, beta and gamma rays.

Web site: [www.oregonuforeview.com](http://www.oregonuforeview.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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## UFOs And A Half-Naked Man

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:35:30 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:35:30 -0400  
Subject: UFOs And A Half-Naked Man

Source: Steve Olafson's The Brazosport News blog -Texas, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/lcfv2>

Monday, June 26, 2006

My Back Pages: UFOs And A Half-Naked Man In A Small Town In Brazoria County

I was Googling myself the other day when I happened upon a newspaper story I wrote more than 9 years ago.

(Here's the story, posted for posterity on the "World of the Strange" Website, if you'd like to read it.):

-----

<http://tinyurl.com/pxrr2>

West Columbia Library, Doctor Have Their Own 'X files'

By Steve Olafson  
Copyright 1997 Houston Chronicle

WEST COLUMBIA -- The search for extraterrestrial intelligence probably goes on in important, top-secret places, but in this small town 50 miles south of Houston, look no further than the public library.

In West Columbia, population 4,372, the library is UFO Central.

It not only keeps a healthy sampling of reading material on unidentified flying objects; it also plays host to occasional meetings of sky watchers who swap UFO stories and view videotapes of blinking lights they believe to be alien spacecraft.

As a result, people with UFO tales tend to confide in the town librarian, Sally Taylor, a good-natured woman who listens patiently and keeps an open mind.

"It's very prevalent in this area," advises Taylor. "There are so many people that come in and say something's happened to them. I just give them Doc's number."

"Doc" is what everybody calls M.D. Wagner, who is not a doctor but is the unofficial leader and father confessor of UFO watchers in Brazoria County.

A soft-spoken man of 60 who lives in a log cabin west of town near the San Bernard River, Wagner, a Dow Chemical Co. retiree, has been organizing UFO meetings open to the public since 1992. He admits his wife, Rose, "thought I flipped" when he told her of his plans to hold his first UFO talk at the American Legion Hall in Brazoria about five years ago.

Since then, the Wagners have remained married, and he's still holding meetings, the last one convening on a recent rainy night.

He warmed up the crowd by saying: "Brazoria County is a real hot spot -- has been for a long time. UFOs are real. Where they're from, I don't know."

A group of 17 spectators listened patiently before speaking up.

A nurse told of seeing three aircraft emerge from a larger object in the night sky. "They circled the mother ship three times," she said.

A middle-aged man in a gimme cap said alien visitors are interested in mining sulphur from the Damon area.

"They're watching us. They're studying us," he said, adding that he has suffered "missing time." In UFO parlance, that means he has been abducted but cannot recall what occurred because the aliens wiped his memory clean.

A woman seated next to him said she has been having flashbacks of being interrogated by men dressed in white smocks.

No one batted an eye at the stories, which went on for about two hours, except for an elderly woman who occasionally cast glances to either side and muttered, "My God."

These UFO believers are not alone. A poll conducted in 1995 by the Scripps Howard News Service and Ohio University in Athens found half of all Americans believe flying saucers could be real and the federal government is covering up what it knows about extraterrestrial beings.

In 1990, a Gallup Poll found 47 percent of Americans believe UFOs are real.

Brazoria County UFO watchers don't need opinion polls to assure them in their beliefs, however. Still, the UFO meetings seem to serve a purpose similar to group therapy: It gets people together and lets them talk about subjects they might not feel comfortable discussing elsewhere.

The nurse who spoke of three aircraft emerging from the "mothership," for instance, admitted she had not told anyone about what she saw for two years until she attended the UFO meeting.

"I didn't realize there was this much of it going on," she said, sounding relieved that other people have seen things similar to what she described.

Indeed, Bill Bertram, a 65-year-old Navy veteran and former West Columbia city councilman, says the UFO meetings have given many Brazoria County residents the courage to come forward.

"They've been keeping it to themselves all this time, thinking, 'Who's gonna believe me?' They're starting to come out of the woodwork now," said Bertram, who says he spotted his first UFO five years ago.

Of course, there are plenty of people who wouldn't dream of going to one of the UFO get-togethers at the library -- including some people who have seen startling, unexplained things in the sky.

Nancy Markham's husband, for example, was driving home on Texas 36 the night of Feb. 5 when he saw a formation of blinking red lights bigger than a football field pass overhead.

"It shook him up," she said. "He doesn't believe in this UFO stuff, but he almost went off the road and the guy behind him did run off the road. He really thought he was gonna see it on the 6 o'clock news."

Markham, a 52-year-old retired hairdresser, asked that her husband's name not be disclosed. She couldn't convince him to come to the library and talk about what he saw.

"He says that's just for people with nothing better to do than

sit around and gossip," she said.

Maybe so, but plenty of people think otherwise.

"I could easily go into denial and become a total skeptic," declares Pat Parrinello, 48, a West Columbia computer programmer who helps Wagner organize the UFO meetings. "But I want to know where the suckers are coming from."

If enough other people do, the UFO meetings may become regular monthly affairs.

-----

Now, as Paul Harvey says on the radio, is the rest of the story.

The article, as you may have deduced if you read the link, was written after the reporter (me) paid a visit to the regularly scheduled meeting of a group of Brazoria County Unidentified Flying Objects enthusiasts/believers/alleged abduction victims.

The meeting took place at the West Columbia, TX branch of the county library system.

In addition, I did separate one-on-one interviews with some of the more active participants of the UFO group.

The story was published in The Houston Chronicle and was then picked up by the wire services, which led to its publication in other periodicals around the country (and maybe overseas, for all I know.)

A day or so later, I get a call from one of the UFO believers.

You see, in the story, I referred to the local library in West Columbia, TX., as "UFO Central."

The UFO people didn't call it that. I called it that. It seemed like an apt description. After all, it was where the UFO group held held its meetings, or discussions, if you prefer.

The "UFO Central" verbiage applied to the small-town library, apparently, gave the curious, as well as the mischievous, something to hang their hat, so to speak.

And the library, as well as the library's dowdy overseers, were getting telephone calls from all over the place. People were asking, "Is this UFO Central?" and such as that.

The West Columbia librarian I had interviewed, a real nice lady, apparently was catching heck for the newspaper story, because the Brazoria County library system was being held up as a laughingstock, or perhaps just a kooky gathering place for UFO nuts, rather than the sort of quiet, august edifice that library professionals want the public to imagine their institutions to symbolize.

A place of serious learning and contemplation, in other words, not a place where wacky tall tales are told.

The UFO believer who called to tell me all this seemed sort of amused by the fallout, but, if I remember correctly, the extraterrestrial discussion group wasn't going to be able to continue their meetings on Brazoria County taxpayer-funded property, even though, as a nonbiased outside observer, I found the meeting to be informative and entertaining; plus, it really "made you think" about whether we're all alone in the universe or if there are weird-looking creatures with oversized heads living on other planets (or even among us Earthlings!)

I'm not sure where the UFO people ended up taking their discussion group.

The other odd thing that happened in gathering information for the story still befuddles me.

I was sitting in this guy's living room talking to him about his belief that he had been abducted by aliens. His wife was the kitchen, tending to chores, being quite pleasant about the visit by the Big City reporter, when all of a sudden this guy decides to change into a different pair of pants.

So right there, in his living room, he takes off his jeans, and it becomes apparent that he is WEARING NO UNDERPANTS. No boxers, no tiny whities, nothing.

He's got a shirt with a tail on it, which is affording a semblance of modesty, but not much of a semblance.

Then he proceeds to put on his other pair of pants.

I'm not sure why he decided to change pants then and there in his living room, rather than go into another room to do it. I don't think he was making a pass at me. I sure hope not. He didn't act like it, and, after all, his wife was right there in the kitchen. Swingers? No way. Still and all, without announcement, he did remove his dungarees right in the middle of an interview with a reporter employed by one of the biggest newspapers in the country!

I'd like to go back in time and see what kind of expression I had on my face.

I know I didn't say anything like, "Good God, man, I don't want to see your genitals!" or "Sir, have you sense no decency," but I'm fairly certain I was thinking thoughts roughly akin to those words.

Instead, I tried to act like everything was fine and normal. I didn't cover my eyes with my hands and I didn't avert my gaze, as if I had just spotted something very interesting out the window and across the street. By the same token, I didn't stare with mouth agape. At least I don't think I did. That's why I'd like to go back in time, just to see for myself.

Anyway, after the guy put on his other pair of pants, the interview proceeded as any other interview would, except I'm pretty sure I cut the question-and-answer session a little shorter than usual. Then I got the heck out of there.

And that, as Paul Harvey says, is the rest of the story.

[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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

From: Christopher Allan <[cda.nul](mailto:cda.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 17:14:49 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:39:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

>From: Michael Salla <[exopolitics.nul](mailto:exopolitics.nul)>  
>To: <[Ufoupdates.nul](mailto:Ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 03:52:33 -1000  
>Subject: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

<snip>

>Personally, the most satisfying part of the conference was the  
>process by which both speakers and participants reached  
>consensus on a conference Declaration promoting peaceful  
>relations with extraterrestrial civilizations. The Declaration  
>has so far been translated into German, Italian and French and  
>an English version is available on the conference website or in  
>petition form at:

<snip>

See my reply to Stephen Bassett. My remarks equally apply to you  
and your organisation.

In view of the established presence of extraterrestrials here on  
earth the next step is clearly interplanetary peace (even  
interstellar peace) instead of purely world peace. But we need,  
above all, to establish that our visitors are friendly and  
peaceful. Once that is done, you too can retire and live happily  
ever after.

CDA

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:20:44 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:42:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Tim

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:18:36 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:36:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:19:45 -0300  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>I think you should find something else to compare this object to  
>>>other than the model[HO?]train wheel. It's off for me. Not the  
>>>angle "O" formed. That's not kosher for either the real thing or  
>>>a model wheel. The flange is too wide/long on the object in the  
>>>photo.

>>As for it being a model train wheel, if we just go by the images  
>>themselves, then the thing is way too asymmetrical to be a wheel  
>>of any kind. There's a tendency to fill in and round out what we  
>>think we see rather than what may actually be in the photos.  
>>Giving them a general overview, here's what I think I see  
>>(please excuse my crummy sketch work):

>><http://img76.imageshack.us/img76/7386/comp28ea.jpg>

>>The thing seems to have a kind of "prow," which looks like a  
>>tapering but may not be. The base appears to be circular, but  
>>that just might be my brain trying to make it circular. The  
>>bottom shot shows that there could be a kind of indentation on  
>>the "stern" that could be something related to propulsion. Or  
>>maybe just a bumper! The base itself is not uniformly wide. It  
>>actually looks like it might have a kind of lifting body curve  
>>to it. I see dark bands on the top part that don't seem to be  
>>reflection effects, but something else. Windows? Exhaust panels?  
>>And I think I see a flattened dome on the very top that is set  
>>back a bit from the prow.

>>All-in-all, what I see is a surprisingly asymmetrical thing,  
>>with some interesting aerodynamic-looking features, that  
>>actually more resembles a fedora than a train wheel. To me,  
>>anyway.

>><http://img352.imageshack.us/img352/6964/fed2ft.jpg>

>>I agree mostly with these impressions, except that a) your  
>>sketchwork is not at all crummy, b) I see a projection on the  
>>"stern" rather than an indentation and c) some of the apparent  
>>skewed geometry, particularly the tapering flange, may be due to  
>>motion blur (rapid oscillation).

I was thinking of that, also. So I tried to make all three  
sketches conform to characteristics I thought I saw in at least  
two of the three angles. That way, I figured if there was motion  
blur, it would have to be duplicated a couple of times at

different angles, which could be possible, but unlikely. The angular skew of the top part is one of those features.

I know I'm missing some details, and there are some things I think I see that aren't really there (elephants in the clouds).

>Now we wait, until some anonymous informant reveals that Heflin >had a great hat collection <g>.

Secrets, secrets. Everybody has their little golden UFO Element-115 nugget stashed away they think is the absolute proof, one way or the other, and they use that nugget to judge everything else.

I suppose rampant paranoia is an unavoidable aspect of UFO research, but sometimes I wonder about the things people have tucked away in their little personal collections that never see the light of day.

Who had the original Heflin photos squirreled away for 30 years?

Was Mr. Anonymous right about there being another set of photos floating around out there that are fake? Or "real"?

I hear a lot of people complain about the state of UFO research, but sometimes I wonder if there might be a little more progress made if people would come forward with some of the stuff they have hidden in their safes, away from the MIB.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: SETI & CSICOP - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:42:10 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:44:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP - Tim

>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:51:23 +1000  
>Subject: SETI & CSICOP

>Hi all,

>Thought I would forward on my most recent column for our free  
>online magazine Sub Rosa

><http://subrosa.dailygrail.com>

<snip>

>In his view, SETI is popular  
>because of its quasi-religious features; perhaps there are  
>benevolent 'beings' out there, more advanced than us, who have  
>>wondrous things to show us - it's interesting to note the lack of  
>concern in SETI circles about the dangers posed by contacting an  
>alien civilisation.

Just a quick two cents about this notion. If you ignore the UFO and channeling evidence, and go along with the "Fermi Paradox" assumption that we have not had contact with ET civilizations, perhaps the most compelling reason why that's happened is that all the civilizations that managed to survive were smart enough to shut up and not make their presence known until they knew what, if anything, was out there.

If Nature as we know it extends past our planetary boundaries, who knows what kind of vicious and nasty predatory species are out there, equally stealthy, waiting for a telltale radio signal like a bobber on the end of a fishing line?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 15:01:28 -0300  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:46:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS - Ledger

UFO UpDates - Toronto wrote:

>Source: The Khaleej Times - Dubai, UAE

><http://tinyurl.com/z3d78>

>27 June 2006

>Unidentified Floating Object Near International Space Station (DPA)

<snip>

I get NASA News everyday, as many as 4-6 daily, and this hasn't shown up on their horizon.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - Tim

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 13:41:45 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:50:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - Tim

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:22:09 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something?

<snip>

>How much progress have we really made?

I think we've gotten better at measuring things, and we're better at refining things like semi-conductors so we can make stuff smaller and purer. But every once in a while I like to get out a couple of strong magnets and just play with them.

What's going on there? Nobody can tell me. Something happening in a dimension I can't grasp?

Simple, stupid, obvious little thing like a magnet.

Still a puzzler.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

From: Dirk Vander Ploeg <[publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:56:00 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:56:09 -0400  
Subject: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

Source: UFO Digest.Com - Hamilkton, Ontario, Canada

<http://www.ufodigest.com/beeston.html>

27 June 2006

[Images at site]

Another UFO Caught Accidentally by Digital Camera

Date: May 1, 2006  
Location: Beeston, Nottingham, England.  
Witness Account: Adrian P.

Received an email from Adrian P. on June 26, 2006. He was walking his dog along with his girl friend in Beeston, which is South-East of Nottingham, England.

They had decided to take her new digital camera and try it out. The actual photo was taken on Monday May 1, 2006.

The photo is quite striking. The object to the right of the church spire is very prominent and one wonders how the object was not seen when first shot. One possible explanation is that the craft was moving so quickly the human eye could not perceive it. Another more easily acceptable reason is that the particular view finder on the camera simple didn't show the entire panormal of the scene. That is it only showed the center object in the view finder.

Robert Morningstar, as usual, did a great job enlarging and enhancing the above photo.

NB: This is a preliminary report. More details have been requested from Adrian and will be posted when received.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 13:06:42 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:57:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:36:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:19:45 -0300  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>I think you should find something else to compare this object to  
>>other than the model[H0?]train wheel. It's off for me. Not the  
>>angle "O" formed. That's not kosher for either the real thing or  
>>a model wheel. The flange is too wide/long on the object in the  
>>photo.

>As for it being a model train wheel, if we just go by the images  
>themselves, then the thing is way too asymmetrical to be a wheel  
>of any kind. There's a tendency to fill in and round out what we  
>think we see rather than what may actually be in the photos.  
>Giving them a general overview, here's what I think I see  
>(please excuse my crummy sketch work):

><http://img76.imageshack.us/img76/7386/comp28ea.jpg>

>The thing seems to have a kind of "prow," which looks like a  
>tapering but may not be. The base appears to be circular, but  
>that just might be my brain trying to make it circular. The  
>bottom shot shows that there could be a kind of indentation on  
>the "stern" that could be something related to propulsion. Or  
>maybe just a bumper! The base itself is not uniformly wide. It  
>actually looks like it might have a kind of lifting body curve  
>to it. I see dark bands on the top part that don't seem to be  
>reflection effects, but something else. Windows? Exhaust panels?  
>And I think I see a flattened dome on the very top that is set  
>back a bit from the prow.

>All-in-all, what I see is a surprisingly asymmetrical thing,  
>with some interesting aerodynamic-looking features, that  
>actually more resembles a fedora than a train wheel. To me,  
>anyway.

I've been creating a ray-tracing model, trying to reproduce key features in the scene. One preliminary result is that the object has a shiny or specular surface, most evident in Heflin's photo 1, where the object is picking up bright glare from the overhead sun. Other peculiar shading of the object can only be reproduced if the surface has some mirror-like quality to it. Thus, if it's a fedora, it's a metallic, glass, or smooth plastic one. It's probably also dark in shade, otherwise the specular object would appear lighter than it does.

There is indeed some banding, which I now believe is the result of the mirror-like surface reflecting features in the surrounding 180 degrees, like a pantoscopic cylindrical fun-house mirror. This may provide critical "fingerprints" of just where the object is, near (hoax) or far (genuine). This is something I am working on now.

One problem is trying to reproduce the shape of the object reasonably accurately because the reflections are critically dependent on the shape. E.g., very slight changes in the slope of the top dome can determine whether it reflects sky or countryside towards the camera. Is there a small "dome" on top, or can top reflections be reasonable accurately recreated with a bevel on the top (current model)? Possibly the "dome" that seems to be there in photo 1 is an artifact of bright sun glare off the top bevel.

One nice feature about ray tracing is that it permits one to do any number of "what-if?" scenarios very easily. E.g., if I want to see what surrounding features are reflected where in the object, I can eliminate them one by one and watch how the reflections change on the various object surfaces in the different photos.

Photo 2 I find most interesting in this regard. If it's a near model, then it turns out the underside is reflecting the bushes next to the van by the side of the road. If it's a distant object, then it is reflecting the field that the object is flying over. Right now I would lean to the former. The underside looks like it is reflecting the darker nearby brush, rather than the lighter distant field, but there are uncertainties in the lightness of these features.

There is also some interesting banding in photo 2 that might also suggest nearness. E.g., some darker regions on the left of the close-up object of photo 2 could correspond to a reflection of the power pole about 20 feet in front of and to the right of the van, which show up in the ray-traced reproduction. Another could correspond to a hypothetical suspension pole on the van holding up a model outside the window. There are no corresponding bands in a ray-tracing saucer off in the distance over the field.

However, before screaming "hoax," I should also point out that the reflected power pole and suspension rod also show up in the ray-traced model object of photo #3, yet I don't see equivalent bands in the real blow-up of the object in photo 3. Lack of clarity or "graininess" in the photos is frustrating. Possibly high quality enhancements of the originals would bring out such details, or perhaps not.

We would also still have to account for the "smoke trail" seen in enhancements of the photo 3 object. Heflin would have to conceal something like a smoking cigarette stub on the back of a hoax model to maybe recreate this feature plus a suggestion of rising smoke in photo 2, then mention nothing about it later, such as dropping hints like, "I am quite sure I saw smoke coming off the object when I shot photos 2 & 3.

My mind continues to go back and forth as to whether this is a hoax or not. I'll let the group know if I find something more conclusive.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac.nul](mailto:brumac.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 16:24:06 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:59:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier - Maccabee

>From: Bob Shell <[bob.nul](mailto:bob.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:43:49 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 08:08:08 -0400  
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

>>Source: FreeRepublic.Com - Fresno, California, USA

>><http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-chat/1655089/posts>

>>06/24/2006

>>Breaking The Light Speed Barrier

>>with David Sereda

>>by Diane M. Cooper

<snip>

>>It's so typical in these transmissions that you get ridiculous  
>>statements coming from NASA that don't make any sense at all and  
>>are just thrown out there to confuse the issue. Camera filters  
>>are one of the hardest items to unscrew by accident it doesn't  
>>happen. I've used cameras semiprofessionally for over twenty  
>>years, and it just never happens.

>This is just plain BS. I've been a professional photographer  
>since 1971, and have had filters come unscrewed and fall off a  
>number of times. Photographer friends have had the same  
>experience. Now I don't know what's in that video, since it  
>isn't clear enough to really tell, but it could be a filter >  
>spinning as it moves through space, alternating reflective  
>surfaces toward the sun. But to say it can't be a filter because  
>they never come off is just idiotic.

>>David: There was a satellite that came untethered and was  
>>drifting away from the shuttle. In this footage the satellite,  
>>with a 12-mile-long tether, is approximately 77 miles away, and  
>>drifting to 100 miles away, from the shuttle. In the film  
>>footage, you can see swarms of these balls of light moving  
>>around, flying by at different velocities, some very slow and  
>>some very fast. They are pulsing, and actually look as though  
>>they are spinning.

>>When the camera zooms in on them, we can clearly see that they  
>>are disc-shaped objects passing behind the tether. And it is so  
>>important to understand what this means when we see they are  
>>going behind the tether.

>I've seen this video and the so-called "disc-shaped objects" are  
>quite clearly lens flare caused by bright, point source lights  
>in the distance. They appear to be disc-shaped because that is  
>the shape of the camera's diaphragm. Notice the "notch" cut out  
>of the lower edge of the "discs". That's a video camera

>artifact.

I agree with Bob on this.

Furthermore, the object that appeared to go behind the tether satellite (at distance greater than 77 mi) may have gone in front of it. One couldn't tell without analyzing the original video in order to determine whether the brightness of the tether satellite image changes at all or not (it shouldn't change if the object went behind it). These images, as recall from seeing a copy, are at the saturation level of the camera. If a full saturation level then slight changes in brightness of the objects will not produce a change in brightness of the image. If not at full saturation level, then a tiny nearby object passing between the tether satellite and the camera could increase the brightness of the tether satellite image by a small amount.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS - Sawyer

From: Steve Sawyer <[stevesaw.nul](mailto:stevesaw.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 13:46:01 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:09:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS - Sawyer

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Tuesday, June 27, 2006 8:35 AM  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS

<snip>

Source: The Khaleej Times - Dubai, UAE

<http://tinyurl.com/z3d78>

27 June 2006

Space Debris To Pass Metres From ISS

MOSCOW (AFP) - A piece of space debris left by the United States could pass within 240 metres (800 feet) of the International Space Station (ISS) but does not pose a serious threat, Russia's space flight control centre said on Tuesday.

"The object, which could pass 240 metres above the station, is a piece of abandoned American cargo launched in 1963" and weighing 79 kilogrammes (175 pounds), said a spokesman for the centre, Vsevolod Latychev.

"But following our calculations, the chance of a collision is practically zero..... There is therefore no need to change the flight path of the ISS," he told Latychev.

Officials at the centre had earlier indicated that the debris might pose a threat to the ISS and that its inhabitants, Russian cosmonaut Pavel Vinogradov and US astronaut Jeffrey Williams, might have to move into an escape vessel as a precaution.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Looking For Signs Of Alien Life In NZ

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:13:36 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:13:36 -0400  
Subject: Looking For Signs Of Alien Life In NZ

Source: Stuff.Com - Wellington, New Zealand

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3715018a10,00.html>

28 June 2006

Looking For Signs Of Alien Life In NZ

By Matthew Torbit

Is the truth out here? One of the United States' top hunters of aliens is coming to New Zealand to find out.

Jill Tarter, who heads an American institute investigating proof of extra terrestrials, will attend a week-long New Zealand International Science Festival from next Saturday.

She is the director of California's Search for Extra Terrestrial Intelligence (Seti) Institute, established in 1960 to monitor and detect radio frequencies in deep space that may be of intelligent alien origin.

"What we do is look for evidence of technology from someone else's civilisation and to do that we use telescopes that work at radio frequency and other telescopes that use optical frequencies," Dr Tarter said.

The institute was looking for deliberately sent "hello" or "leakage" alien frequencies.

"Considering the vastness of space, we operate on the theory that another developed and intelligent civilisation may exist somewhere out there."

Seti employs 120 staff and uses some of the most sophisticated and largest telescopic monitoring equipment on Earth.

It maintains links with several United States universities and attracts a lot of private funding. In the past, funding has also come from space agency Nasa.

So far Seti had not come up with any evidence of alien life, despite a few "false alarms".

Dr Tarter said members of the public had distorted views on what the non-profit Seti

institute did =96 mostly thanks to Hollywood.

"It's very frustrating for us because we try very hard to distinguish between the rigorous scientific exploration that we carry out and the pseudoscience and the alien tabloid (newspapers)."

The festival is being held in Dunedin and features exhibits and guest speakers from New Zealand and overseas.

In New Zealand, Dr Tarter will give talks in a number of cities and visit several space observatories.

[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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 16:52:42 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:16:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

>From: Michael Salla <[exopolitics.nul](mailto:exopolitics.nul)>  
>To: <[Ufoupdates.nul](mailto:Ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 03:52:33 -1000  
>Subject: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

<snip>

>Personally, the most satisfying part of the conference was the  
>process by which both speakers and participants reached  
>consensus on a conference Declaration promoting peaceful  
>relations with extraterrestrial civilizations.

<snip>

>In peace

>Michael Salla

Intending no disrespect, but how are proponents of exopolitics  
different from the "space brothers" believers of the past?

I admit I am uninformed, though not intentionally. But I am not  
seeing a valid reason for the exopolitics movement. I understand  
current ET motivation as malevolent and self-serving at best,  
violently abusing all humanity at most.

In my uninformed estimation, diplomacy only works with parties  
who mutually respect each other. Theodore Roosevelt spoke softly  
with those who respected big sticks. Current ET activity shows  
no respect for any human powers.

Please correct my ignorance, Michael.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## UK Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:20:12 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:20:12 -0400  
Subject: UK Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive'

Source: The Independant - London, UK

<http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/legal/article1115911.ece>

28 June 2006

Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive'

By Robert Verkaik  
Legal Affairs Correspondent

A secretive Whitehall department set up by the Government to handle sensitive and difficult requests under the new Freedom of Information Act is itself in breach of the new legislation, a parliamentary committee says.

The so-called "clearing house" brought in by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer of Thoroton, shortly before the new laws took force in January 2004 has refused to release information about its activities.

Today, MPs on the Constitutional Affairs Committee, which has been reviewing the first year of the FoI Act, told the Government that it must comply with the "letter and spirit" of the law.

The clearing house was asked by an academic interested in the workings of the legislation to release information about the number of cases it had dealt with. But he was told that such information was exempt under the Act because it could "prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs".

The MPs said: "This is an unacceptable position for the government department in charge of promoting FoI compliance. The clearing house must comply fully with the letter and the spirit of the FoI Act, be openly accountable for its work and respond to any individual requests for information which it receives in full accordance with the Act."

Government plans to introduce more fees for using the legislation were also criticised in the report. "We see no need to change the fees regulations. There appears to be a lack of clarity and some under-use of existing provisions," said the MPs.

The report also found that Britain's new freedom of information laws were being undermined by a culture of delay, with some public requests for information being postponed indefinitely. The committee says it regarded this as contrary to the spirit of the Act but welcomed a commitment from the information commissioner to adopt a firmer approach to enforcement, and put pressure on public authorities to deal with requests more quickly.

A further finding was that the complaints resolution provided by the information commissioner's office (ICO) was unsatisfactory,

with many requesters and public authorities having to wait months for the commissioner to begin investigating their complaints. The quality of some investigations was also inadequate.

"The committee is surprised it took so long for the backlog of complaints to be addressed and is not convinced that enough resources have yet been allocated to clear this problem. The commissioner is expected to publish a progress report in September of this year which the committee will use to assess the success of the ICO's recovery action plan," said the MPs. They also had reservations about the relationship between DCA and the ICO and questioned whether it was working effectively. The committee recommended that the Government consider making the information commissioner directly accountable to, and funded by, Parliament.

Alan Beith MP, chairman of the committee, said: "Freedom of information is clearly working, although there is room for improvement. We welcome the way that information is being released and used, but our FoI legislation can only be as good as the quality of the records management it gives us access to, and only if people can get access to the information in a timely way. Long delays in accessing information or having complaints resolved go against the spirit and letter of the Act, and must be resolved."

A secretive Whitehall department set up by the Government to handle sensitive and difficult requests under the new Freedom of Information Act is itself in breach of the new legislation, a parliamentary committee says.

The so-called "clearing house" brought in by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer of Thoroton, shortly before the new laws took force in January 2004 has refused to release information about its activities.

Today, MPs on the Constitutional Affairs Committee, which has been reviewing the first year of the FoI Act, told the Government that it must comply with the "letter and spirit" of the law.

The clearing house was asked by an academic interested in the workings of the legislation to release information about the number of cases it had dealt with. But he was told that such information was exempt under the Act because it could "prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs".

The MPs said: "This is an unacceptable position for the government department in charge of promoting FoI compliance. The clearing house must comply fully with the letter and the spirit of the FoI Act, be openly accountable for its work and respond to any individual requests for information which it receives in full accordance with the Act."

Government plans to introduce more fees for using the legislation were also criticised in the report. "We see no need to change the fees regulations. There appears to be a lack of clarity and some under-use of existing provisions," said the MPs.

The report also found that Britain's new freedom of information laws were being undermined by a culture of delay, with some public requests for information being postponed indefinitely. The committee says it regarded this as contrary to the spirit of the Act but welcomed a commitment from the information commissioner to adopt a firmer approach to enforcement, and put pressure on public authorities to deal with requests more quickly.

A further finding was that the complaints resolution provided by the information commissioner's office (ICO) was unsatisfactory, with many requesters and public authorities having to wait months for the commissioner to begin investigating their complaints. The quality of some investigations was also inadequate.

"The committee is surprised it took so long for the backlog of complaints to be addressed and is not convinced that enough resources have yet been allocated to clear this problem. The commissioner is expected to publish a progress report in

September of this year which the committee will use to assess the success of the ICO's recovery action plan," said the MPs. They also had reservations about the relationship between DCA and the ICO and questioned whether it was working effectively. The committee recommended that the Government consider making the information commissioner directly accountable to, and funded by, Parliament.

Alan Beith MP, chairman of the committee, said: "Freedom of information is clearly working, although there is room for improvement. We welcome the way that information is being released and used, but our FoI legislation can only be as good as the quality of the records management it gives us access to, and only if people can get access to the information in a timely way. Long delays in accessing information or having complaints resolved go against the spirit and letter of the Act, and must be resolved."

[Thanks to Larry W. Bryant 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Gates

From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 01:01:29 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:22:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Gates

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:18:36 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>Now we wait, until some anonymous informant reveals that Heflin  
>had a great hat collection <g>.

>Martin Shough

Listers, Martin

Hats won't be it at all. Somebody will claim that they new a friend of a friend who thought that another friend had showed them pie pans and how easy it was to throw them in the air and create hoax photo. Naturally after all these years they can't pinpoint the date, but they are certain that is was around the time of Heflin..... :)

Better yet, besides model trains, friends of friends, who knew somebody that lived in Orange County in 1965 are absolutly sure that another Heflin hobby was welding, so naturally what was in the picture was a pie pan that had been reshaped and re welded by Heflin.... :)

Naturally, keeping in skeptibunker fashion, the above would be seized upon as a total and complete explanation, case closed...never mind any problems.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:39:06 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:25:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - Dickenson

Hello List,

Thanks to Steven, Bob and Nick for back-up.

Do you think we might go further with what we have now?

To start with - Planck said (paraphrased) "We can't see reality by using our bodily senses"

<http://tinyurl.com/fkpgqr>

Why? Because our senses work by receiving impulses from 'photons' - which are generated by electron - proton movements. In other words, we can only see or feel energy transfers from other protonic matter like ourselves. But most of the universe is made of different stuff and doesn't generate photons. So to us it's invisible. And all our work and movements depend on inertia and mass - which are unknowns.

Einstein later confessed his great fear for the protonic universe - "I consider it quite possible that physics cannot be based on the field concept, i.e., on continuous structures."

<http://tinyurl.com/rx7c3>

Obviously Einstein was being forced to the conclusion that the cause of inertia and mass wasn't a steady field but, as indicated by Planck's quanta, an intermittent (though regular and very high-speed) force. In other words he was saying that we - and the visible protonic universe - are 'non-constant structures'; that we flicker in and out of existence, like frames on fast forward.

So how do we see the world and each other as solid? The answer might be simple - the whole protonic universe is subject to that inertia-causing force, therefore it's all in synch (so far as we know).

Anyway, the human brain can blur "now" for up to a second or so without us noticing, except during very fast action and then it gets confused. E.g. - when you first switch on a device it's not unusual to see the indicator light up just before you've pressed the switch - but only the first time. The thoughtful slow part of your brain (cerebrum) was pressing the switch while the primitive fast part (cerebellum) was seeing the light. That's why learner drivers seem so slow to us cerebellum-using hotshots.

Does it help to know about inertia? Well, let's say we find a proximate cause of inertia. Not the ultimate cause, just one step up.

We could maybe manipulate that proximate cause. Civilization, buildings, energy-sources and transport could be transformed beyond recognition. Also, with some control of inertia there's no need for rockets, because 'escape velocity' doesn't matter. You simply ascend at 1g (most of you'll know that a steady acceleration of 1g could get you near relativistic speed in quite a short time).

Even better, manipulating the inertia-causing field will need sensors, inertia-field radar, inertia-field cameras. We might then find that other folk are already doing it - and quite close to us. No need for SETI.

The scenario follows logically from the conclusions of Planck, then Einstein.

So - why hasn't it been tested in the last fifty years?

BTW - example of limitations of 'scientific common sense' in a well-educated, well-informed chap.

<http://tinyurl.com/f4r7s> - edit/find for: Etesian Winds

It shouldn't embarrass modern scientists - he's been safely gone for 2,400 years or so.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 11:13:06 +0000  
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 08:30:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere - Hall

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 21:25:13 -0400  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere

>Source: The Mail & Guardian - Hatfield, South Africa

><http://tinyurl.co.uk/2mwn>

>26 June 2006

>The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere

>Reesha Chibba  
>Johannesburg, South Africa

>South Africa's Unidentified Flying Objects Resource (Saufor)  
>will host its second annual Unbind Your Mind UFO conference in  
>celebration of World UFO Day on July 1 in Cape Town.

<snip>

>Cristo Louw, founder of Saufor, said in a statement on Monday:  
>"The time is ripe for the South African public to be informed  
>about the true nature of the UFO issue."

>Saufor's mission, he said, is to bring South Africa out of the  
>"Ufological" Dark Age.

>Saufor said in the statement: "The whole UFO debacle and the  
>related conspiracies of government cover-ups, extraterrestrial  
>visitations and an international, underground secret-government  
>cabal pulling... strings from behind the scenes is probably the  
>most-important issue facing humanity at this point in our global  
>evolution.

Woo, woo, woo! Nuttiness knows no boundaries.

>"According to international researchers, it all boils down to  
>keeping the status quo, because when the public finds out that  
>alternative methods for generating free energy, derived from  
>advanced extraterrestrial technologies, are revealed as not only  
>possible, but have been in use for many years, the oil industry  
>and all parts of world economy dependent on it will have to be  
>seriously revised.

Those 'international researchers' must be part of an underground  
secret government cabal to spread manure over the landscape.....

God help us from their evil schemes.

- 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Blinded By The Lights?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:18:14 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:18:14 -0400  
Subject: Blinded By The Lights?

Source: The Charlotte Observer - North Carolina, USA

<http://www.charlotte.com/mld/observer/news/opinion/14917496.htm>

June 28, 2006

Blinded By The Lights?

Paranormal claims should be subjected to scientific investigation

Daniel B. Caton  
Special to the Observer

I crept down the stone stairs to the pulpit of the paranormal. The rock ledges at Wisemans View overlook the Linville Gorge and provide a breathtaking view of Table Rock and Hawksbill. And, supposedly, of the Brown Mountain Lights, mysterious moving balls of light.

This viewing session was on the occasion of the first Brown Mountain Lights Festival, a weekend gathering of those interested in the lights - their science, pseudoscience and folklore.

From hope to skepticism

Would we see the lights? I was still the world's greatest expert on the lights who had not actually seen them. My interest goes back many years, when a student of mine fanned the flame of interest. I had hoped there would be some interesting science behind the lights. As the trips to try so see the lights came and went without any sightings, my hopes turned to skepticism. After trip 15, it turned to cynicism. How can some people claim to see them every time they try, yet I had never caught sight of anything truly odd? Something was clearly wrong. The first clue came when my colleague, Lee Hawkins, and I tried remaining silent as others came to look. We found they got excited about what were obviously camper lights. Similar to UFO sightings, about 95 percent of the sightings are of such familiar things as camper fires, flashlights, vehicle lights, planes taking off from the Morganton-Lenoir airport, and, yes, even the stationary street lights of distant Lenoir.

The remaining 5 percent are interesting but not necessarily paranormal - they are just not yet unexplained. If doctors could diagnose correctly 95 percent of the time, they would be quite happy.

What about that 5 percent? A clue came after I was interviewed by an Associated Press reporter a year ago. The story went out nationwide, and I got many e-mails about sightings of "Earth lights," here and elsewhere. Some were probably bogus, but others stood out as remarkable.

These might be called "close encounters of the third kind," sightings made from only a few feet away. The reports are all

similar - soccer-ball-size glowing spheres of light. This sounded exactly like an enigmatic phenomenon called "ball lightning."

Now I completed the loop from cynicism back to curiosity.

Ball lightning is basically not understood - we cannot make it in the lab with any repeatability and we cannot even say how it can theoretically exist. How do you make a moving, self-confined ball of glowing gas?

More importantly, how does Mother Nature manage to do it repeatedly in the Gorge area as well as in many other special locations around the planet?

Finally, something scary

The only paranormal effects during our weekend at the festival were actually more frightening than any myths of the lights. I speak of the haunting specter of "Quantum-Touch".

Long hours of staring into the dark encourages a lot of storytelling. One of the attendees, from Charlotte, told us that one of her jobs is as a "Quantum-Touch" practitioner. She shows the technique, passing her hands close to our bodies, asking if we feel any effects.

Well, no, you're not touching us.

She bubbles forth about energy fields and other things not in the domain of real science. She gets paid to do this for people, and even can do it remotely, from hundreds or thousands of miles away. It cures cancer, re-forms bones and spruces up roses, too - check their Web site.

Right.

This would only have been an amusing side note, a meeting of science and pseudoscience at the Gorge, if it were not for what she claimed: Nurses can get continuing education credit for this "training."

Yikes! What did your nurse not take, instead getting this voodoo training?

Science's responsibility

Science has a responsibility to investigate claims of the paranormal, like the Brown Mountain Lights. The point? Not to spoil it by explaining it - the rainbow is just as beautiful after you know its physics, perhaps even more so. But rather to see what clues about our universe lie in new phenomena.

We also need to debunk pseudoscience that has not been subjected to double-blind clinical trials. Validation comes through publication in peer-reviewed journals, not book reviews in The New York Times.

I hope I'll soon finally see the lights. And, I hope that those who were headed to experience some voodoo treatment or training will also see the light.

Daniel B. Caton

Observer community columnist Daniel B. Caton is observatory director and astronomy professor at Appalachian State University. Write him at the Department of Physics and Astronomy, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608, or by e-mail at [catondb.nul](mailto:catondb.nul)

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://www.uforeview.net> for the lead]

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [ufoupdateslist.com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## How Many Computers To Make Contact With ETs?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:23:34 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:23:34 -0400  
Subject: How Many Computers To Make Contact With ETs?

Source: The Wall Street Journal, New York, USA

<http://tinyurl.co.uk/4pph>

June 28, 2006

How Many Computers Does It Take To Make Contact With E.T.s?

By Lee Gomes

Maybe the easiest thing would be to blame the Germans.

Without their dedication to science, Chris Benoit would never have started SETI.USA. And absent that, one of the computer world's least-known but most powerful monopolies might not still exist. Yes, it's true that even without the SETI.nul crowd bigfooting the world of distributed computing, we probably still would have incurable diseases and dangerous climate change. But we'd be a lot closer to solutions than we are now, don't you think?

We should back up in our story a bit.

In the late 1990s, David P. Anderson, a University of California, Berkeley, computer scientist, realized that with the global Internet connecting millions of often-idle computers, the time had come for "distributed computing". This takes one big scientific computer problem and breaks it into little pieces, to be farmed out to many machines.

After Dr. Anderson wrote his software, he needed a problem for the machines to tackle. He chose SETI, the "search for extra-terrestrial intelligence". His SETI.nul would pore through the data from the Arecibo radio telescope looking for blips that might indicate intelligent life.

To make things interesting, there was added a scoring system, which awarded points to users for the computer time they donated, and allowed them to compete to see who could rack up the most. The credits are good only for bragging rights but would become a potent motivator. In fact, with finding E.T. such a long shot, the competition for points quickly became a main reason for taking part.

Dr. Anderson's real interest was distributed computing; the extraterrestrial angle was something of an attention-getting gimmick. But it was a spectacular success. Nearly a million downloaded the software that enabled their computers to analyze the Arecibo data. And it worked brilliantly.

And so other researchers - biologists looking into proteins implicated in Alzheimer's, say, or physicists exploring fine points in relativity - all began lining up at Dr. Anderson's Web site, [boinc.berkeley.edu](http://boinc.berkeley.edu), seeking help for their own projects.



There was a problem, though: SETI.nul didn't want to switch their allegiance. Hundreds of thousands keep running the SETI software - far more than any other distributed-computing project. What was supposed to be a test case became a powerful entrenched interest. Today, SETI.nul is to distributed computing what AARP is to social-security reform.

A big reason for the inertia turned out to be the points, which users had spent years accumulating. As with frequent-flier miles, they didn't want to lose them by switching.

This is where the Germans come in. Early on, they had formed a team, SETI.Germany, which dominated the results, even though more Americans participated. That rankled Chris Benoit, a Chicago health-care worker. "Hey, we're America, and we've always accomplished great things," he recalls thinking.

Thus was born SETI.USA, which quickly began outpacing the Germans. But a consequence is that now, with national rivalries mixed in, there was even less chance of anyone doing anything besides [SETI.nul](#)

SETI.USA members take this competition very seriously, so much so that they will buy more computers in search of points. Daniel T. Schaalma, of Fond du Lac, Wis., a former machinist, has 23 in his house, mostly scattered across banquet tables in his basement. "I've probably spent in excess of \$20,000 on them over the years," he says. "It's basically a hobby for me. Yeah, it's expensive, but golf can get pretty expensive, too".

Team.USA members say it's all friendly competition and good, clean, scientific fun - Mr. Benoit was even once named "Member of the Month" of the German team.

Maybe, but there have been wars started over soccer.

This continued fascination with living-room SETI comes as professional setiologists concede that early assumptions about the search for intelligent life - notably those popularized by astronomer Carl Sagan - have proven naively optimistic.

For instance, it's now conceded there is little chance of detecting the "leaking" transmissions of another planet - its version of "I Love Lucy" broadcasts. Those signals are too weak to stand out from the universe's background noise.

Dr. Anderson says he himself doesn't run SETI any more. Instead, he donates his spare computer power to a global warming project. But he doesn't presume to tell others what they ought to be doing with their CPU cycles.

Scientists, including those who would benefit from the freed-up computers, are similarly tolerant. "It's hard for me to criticize their choice," said one.

This columnist, though, knows no such compulsion. I asked Mr. Benoit: With polar ice caps melting, doesn't someone who continues to use their computer for manifestly less timely problems surely have water on their hands?

He replied, "You're really putting me in a corner, aren't you?"

Write to Lee Gomes at [lee.gomes.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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## The Ultimate Lifeboat

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:28:03 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:28:03 -0400  
Subject: The Ultimate Lifeboat

Source: TCS Daily - Washington, DC, USA

<http://www.tcsdaily.com/article.aspx?id=062706D>

27 Jun 2006

The Ultimate Lifeboat  
By James Pinkerton

If one were looking for a non-metaphysical description of human life here on earth, it would be hard to do better than Edmund Burke's statesmanlike definition of society: "a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born."

Burke's vision of society as an intergenerational partnership was expressed in his 1790 work, the elegiac *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. In that famous book, reacting to the tumultuous political changes just across the channel, Burke sought to defend England's traditions against French radicalism. More generally, he vindicated Western Christian civilization in its struggle with atheism, relativism, and nihilism. Yet for all its brilliance, *Reflections* carries an unmistakably melancholy tone, as when Burke sighed, "The age of chivalry is gone; that of sophisters, economists, and calculators has succeeded, and the glory of Europe is extinguished forever." In other words, the onslaught of modern things -- dangerous modern things, in his view -- would overwhelm the stable conservative order that he treasured. Looking around today, even fans of progress would have to concede that Burke was correct when he predicted that rapid change would fracture the familiar face of Europe.

Now, two centuries later, political ideas are as important as ever, and as radicalizing as ever, but in addition, technology has added a new and deadly backdrop to the human drama: Humanity has developed the capacity to destroy itself. Society now can be undone, not only by a malignant majoritarian mob, but also by a techno-malcontented few.

So recently another well-credentialed Briton with a philosophical mind, the physicist Stephen Hawking, has offered us a challenging prophecy, which amounts to a techno-tragic updating of Burke. In Hawking's telling, more than custom and tradition will be fractured -- the planet itself will be fractured. As he said recently in Hong Kong, we are at risk of being "wiped out" from a wide variety of possible dangers, including nuclear war, genetically engineered viruses, catastrophic global warming, and "other dangers we have not yet thought of."

Hawking believes that human destructiveness, combined with bad luck, could destroy not only any Burkean intergenerational partnership among humans, but the entire ecosystem. And of course, he spoke before the latest nuclear scare out of North Korea, which should serve to remind us that the minute-hand of

the Doomsday Clock is never far from midnight.

If Hawking is right about this impending risk, then we have a duty to listen, and to act -- even if that means going where no man has gone before. That's how we can keep the partnership between the generations in force; we don't have to keep faith with the past and the future only from the platform of this planet. Admittedly, that's not an idea that Burke entertained in his 18th century life, but as he also famously declared, the challenge to leaders in any era is to sluice the tides of change through the canals of custom -- that is, to deal appropriately with change by harnessing it to traditional goals. So Burke would likely approve of new methods, so long as they were aimed at keeping the sacred generational continuity.

If anyone today is well-positioned to speak wisely about the earth and the cosmos, it's Hawking, who holds the academic chair once held by Isaac Newton. His research and ruminations on black holes and other spacey phenomena have earned him a place in the physics pantheon, as well as a best-selling book and a guest gig in a "Star Trek" movie. Now at age 64, suffering from advanced Lou Gehrig's Disease, Hawking has only a little bit of time left to him. So if he worries about the fate of the earth in the future, it's for our sake, not his. And as he said in Hong Kong, "It is important for the human race to spread out into space for the survival of the species."

So in the name of Hawking, and in the spirit of Burke, we might think about a plan for making sure that the human partnership survives. And while we're at it, why not preserve the plant and animal partnership, too? The challenge of human destructiveness -- combined, it is worth emphasizing, with the naturally occurring malevolence of Mother Nature -- could affect more than just homo sapiens; it could affect all the flora and fauna of the world, too, from the tiniest microbe to the biggest whale. Indeed, in the last half-billion years or so, on at least five occasions, huge extinctions have taken place. In other words, if humanity doesn't destroy us all, the almighty forces of the universe might just finish us off. So with a nod to Noah, a far-seeing fellow if there ever was one, why not build an Ark? The idea of a "space ark," of course, is nothing new, as fans of such movies/TV shows as "When Worlds Collide" to "Battlestar Galactica" to "Titan A.E." can attest.

For a while in this century, it seemed as if politicians were inexorably leading us into space, thus fulfilling, in effect, the space-ark mission. In 1962, John F. Kennedy declared that the US would become "the world's leading spacefaring nation." And in keeping with his own idealism about space, JFK further avowed, "We set sail on this new sea because there is new knowledge to be gained and new rights to be won and they must be won and used for the progress of all people."

Even after Kennedy's assassination, the space vision continued; we would be running around the solar system soon enough. Remember the movie "2001"? Made in 1968, it took it as a given that travel to and from the Moon would be routine -- and that travel to Jupiter wouldn't be much of a leap.

Well, it didn't happen, for three reasons.

First, the end of the space race. Encrypted in all of Kennedy's proclamations was the logic of Cold War rivalry and American supremacy. Good for us: We won. But after we won, there wasn't much to do. Much of the strategic imperative of the space program collapsed along with the Soviet Union. The Chinese have lately shown interest in space; if their program takes off, for either civilian or military purposes, Uncle Sam will likely rouse himself from his present space-torpor, but that hasn't happened yet.

Second, and more broadly, came the erosion of faith in the future. Starting in the late 60s, a combination of factors -- the Vietnam War, the gloomy-and-doomy excesses of an often Luddite environmental movement, worldwide economic slowdown, plus a general realization that Big Government didn't work very well -- all united to undercut the idea that governments could do much of anything, including run a space program. People still had ambitions, of course; so even if they were skeptical of collective action, individual entrepreneurs and their corporations still undertook bold missions. But alas, none of

those undertakings included space travel that was anything more than a joyride. Capitalism is great, but it does not provide insulation against "market failure" in certain sectors -- in this instance, sustained space exploration. There are some things, it appears, that only governments can or will do.

Third, and perhaps even more profoundly, the realization that there is no other intelligent life in our solar system, indeed no life, period. Yes, we might yet find some fossil algae under an extraterrestrial icecap somewhere, but by now it's gallingly evident that we are alone in our corner of the universe -- and maybe even alone in the universe as a whole. And the effect of that understanding has been to diminish enthusiasm for space travel: If there are no Martians, or ETs, or Klingons, or whatever to meet -- or to fight, guard against, or trade with, or have sex with -- then the whole space trip just isn't as interesting to people.

OK, so that's why we're here, stuck on this mortal coil. As Los Angeles lawyer-inventor-video-maker Greg Piccionelli has illustrated through his "Doomsday Curve," our present situation is imminently mortal and lethal; his video shows the rising destructive capacity of technology, wielded by either individuals or nations -- he even put it to music!

Of course, many people raise objections to Hawking's space-ark plan. For example, Alan Guth, a physics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was quoted in the same round of news stories, reacting to Hawking: "I don't see the likely possibility within the next 50 years of science technology making it easier to survive on Mars and on the moon than it would be to survive on earth." Guth added, "I would still think that an underground base, for example in Antarctica, would be easier to build than building on the moon."

And some are doing just that. In the face of gathering dangers, some farsighted folks, lacking the capacity for spacefaring, are creating their own non-space arks. Survivalists aside, a benevolent bunch looking out for all of us, are the 100 nations that have banded together to establish and endow the Global Crop Diversity Trust, a warehouse for all the world's seed, operated by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute. The Crop Trust is building a climate-controlled facility on the Norwegian island of Svalbard, far north of the Arctic Circle, which is known informally as "the doomsday vault." In the words of The Washington Post's Rick Weiss, it is to be "the ultimate backup in the event of a global catastrophe -- the go-to place after an asteroid hit or nuclear or biowarfare holocaust so that, difficult as those times would be, humankind would not have to start again from scratch."

Maybe this is the best we can do: figure out how to save plants, at least, in the event of any catastrophe short of the planet being exploded or incinerated out of existence. The Svalbard facility offers a near-perpetual hope of re-greening the planet, if need be -- assuming, of course, that the survivors know about it.

OK, that's good news for seeds, but what about human beings? A few outfits, such as the aptly named Lifeboat Foundation (of which I am a supporter) call for "self-sustaining space colonies," but such voices are distressingly scarce in the public square. And so we sit, vulnerable.

Yet interestingly, even Guth thinks that Hawking is probably right over the longer term: "If he's talking about the next 100 years and beyond, it does make sense to think about space as the ultimate lifeboat."

So that's our two-fold challenge:

First, to survive the next few decades, even as we share this "pale blue dot" with the likes of Kim Jong Il and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Those madmen can't wipe out the whole planet, to be sure, but a loose nuke or two could set off a chain reaction, and we know how chain reactions can end. And eventually, Murphy's Law will get the best of us, no matter what we do -- that's Hawking's point.

So, second, to develop a robust spacefaring capacity. It's

likely that the Pentagon will be moving forward with its own plans for "milspace," but if we are thinking about preserving civilization, and not just a few colonels, we will have to do more. Let's have a political debate, let's argue, let's logroll -- but let's get it done.

Above all, we must resist the temptation to hide from the problem -- or attempt to hide from the problem. It's no coincidence that back in the 60s, as support for the space program was falling, the desire to get high was, well, rising. That is, as technological forms of tripping faded away, trips of the pharmaceutical kind took off. And in the wake of psychedelic drugs came the efflorescence of New Age religion and, yes, one must also say, the explosion of the Internet. To put it another way, stargazing gave way to acid-dropping, and then to navel-gazing, and then to web-surfing. What a long strange trip it's been, indeed.

For sure, a lot of this inner-space tripping has been fun, and some of it has been wildly profitable. And there's more to come, as "virtual reality" takes off.

But there's one huge problem: No matter how far we go, virtually, we haven't actually gone anywhere, physically. Our corporeal selves are still here on earth, still vulnerable to whatever fate befalls the earth. All those cyber-savvy yuppies in the World Trade Center had their cell phones and Blackberries with them on 9-11, and those machines worked fine, even unto the end. But the vaunted products of the Digital Revolution couldn't save those poor high-techsters from the grim-reaping reality of the massed kinetics of fiery fuel.

And that's the point about the earth, too. If it goes, we go. And so we should go elsewhere, so that when the earth goes, we have another place to go. And while we're at it, we should take our pets and plants, too. We wouldn't want to be without them, just as they wouldn't want to be without us -- even if they don't know it. It's our job to know things, and to act accordingly. And if we fail at that mission, then we really will have failed in upholding our end of the Burkean bargain -- that is, partnering not only with the living and the dead, but with those who are yet to be born.

James Pinkerton is TCS Daily's media critic.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere - Hall

From: Richard Hall <[hallrichard99.nul](mailto:hallrichard99.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 11:13:06 +0000  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:29:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere - Hall

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <[UFO-UpDates.nul](mailto:UFO-UpDates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 21:25:13 -0400  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere

>Source: The Mail & Guardian - Hatfield, South Africa

><http://tinyurl.co.uk/2mwn>

>26 June 2006

>The Truth Is Out There... Somewhere

>Reesha Chibba  
>Johannesburg, South Africa

>South Africa's Unidentified Flying Objects Resource (Saufor)  
>will host its second annual Unbind Your Mind UFO conference in  
>celebration of World UFO Day on July 1 in Cape Town.

<snip>

>Cristo Louw, founder of Saufor, said in a statement on Monday:  
>"The time is ripe for the South African public to be informed  
>about the true nature of the UFO issue."

>Saufor's mission, he said, is to bring South Africa out of the  
>"Ufological" Dark Age.

>Saufor said in the statement: "The whole UFO debacle and the  
>related conspiracies of government cover-ups, extraterrestrial  
>visitations and an international, underground secret-government  
>cabal pulling... strings from behind the scenes is probably the  
>most-important issue facing humanity at this point in our global  
>evolution.

Woo, woo, woo! Nuttiness knows no boundaries.

>"According to international researchers, it all boils down to  
>keeping the status quo, because when the public finds out that  
>alternative methods for generating free energy, derived from  
>advanced extraterrestrial technologies, are revealed as not only  
>possible, but have been in use for many years, the oil industry  
>and all parts of world economy dependent on it will have to be  
>seriously revised.

Those `international researchers' must be part of an underground  
secret government cabal to spread manure over the landscape..  
God help us from their evil schemes.

- 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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: SETI & CSICOP - Friedman

From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 10:05:48 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:32:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP - Friedman

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:42:10 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP

>>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:51:23 +1000  
>>Subject: SETI & CSICOP

>>Hi all,

>>Thought I would forward on my most recent column for our free  
>>online magazine Sub Rosa

>><http://subrosa.dailygrail.com>

>><snip>

>>In his view, SETI is popular  
>>because of its quasi-religious features; perhaps there are  
>>benevolent 'beings' out there, more advanced than us, who have  
>>>wondrous things to show us - it's interesting to note the lack of  
>>concern in SETI circles about the dangers posed by contacting an  
>>alien civilisation.

>Just a quick two cents about this notion. If you ignore the UFO  
>and channeling evidence, and go along with the "Fermi Paradox"  
>assumption that we have not had contact with ET civilizations,  
>perhaps the most compelling reason why that's happened is that  
>all the civilizations that managed to survive were smart enough  
>to shut up and not make their presence known until they knew  
>what, if anything, was out there.

>If Nature as we know it extends past our planetary boundaries,  
>who knows what kind of vicious and nasty predatory species are  
>out there, equally stealthy, waiting for a telltale radio signal  
>like a bobber on the end of a fishing line?

Enrico Fermi did not say nobody was visiting.

After a discussion at lunch in which it was agreed that it  
wouldn't take too many million years for the whole galaxy to be  
colonized, he asked the sensible question "So where is  
everybody?".

Obviously there are many possible answers.

Fermi was well know for asking questions as an important part of  
teaching.

One answer is that they are all over the place and the  
government knows they are, and doesn't want to let anybody know  
because it would mean a loss of power and others might find out  
about their technology.

Another answer is that they have bases on asteroids or the back  
side of the moon or on other satellites.

Another is they are quarantining us to make sure we don't escape to attack out there; or There are rules about colonizing planets on which there is already a civilization, primitive though it may be, etc., etc., etc.

Stan Friedman

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

From: Kelly Freeman <[Khfflsciufu.nul](mailto:Khfflsciufu.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 10:37:53 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:42:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 01:01:29 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>Better yet, besides model trains, friends of friends, who knew  
>somebody that lived in Orange County in 1965 are absolutly sure  
>that another Heflin hobby was welding, so naturally what was in  
>the picture was a pie pan that had been reshaped and re welded  
>by Heflin... :)

>Naturally, keeping in skeptibunker fashion, the above would be  
>seized upon as a total and complete explanation, case  
>closed...never mind any problems.

Hello Robert, EBK and List,

I have only been following this thread intermittently, but I am curious as to whether or not anybody has taken the time to try and simulate the Heflin event.

Has anybody actually gone to the location of the sighting and tried to hoax the same UFO using theories proposed in this thread? Would it, in fact, be possible at all?

A scientific approach would be to observe, theorize and test that theory/theories under the same or similar conditions of the event. I am not aware of it being done in this case.

If it has been done, what were the results? Any discussion as to whether the photos are genuine or not, IMHO, should be based on those results.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 16:04:49 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:44:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:20:44 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:18:36 +0100  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:36:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>All-in-all, what I see is a surprisingly aysmmetrical thing,  
>>>with some interesting aerodynamic-looking features, that  
>>>actually more resembles a fedora than a train wheel. To me,  
>>>anyway.

>>><http://img352.imageshack.us/img352/6964/fed2ft.jpg>

>>>I agree mostly with these impressions, except that a) your  
>>>sketchwork is not at all crummy, b) I see a projection on the  
>>>"stern" rather than an indentation and c) some of the apparent  
>>>skewed geometry, particularly the tapering flange, may be due to  
>>>motion blur (rapid oscillation).

>>>I was thinking of that, also. So I tried to make all three  
>>>sketches conform to characteristics I thought I saw in at least  
>>>two of the three angles. That way, I figured if there was motion  
>>>blur, it would have to be duplicated a couple of times at  
>>>different angles, which could be possible, but unlikely. The  
>>>angular skew of the top part is one of those features.

The skew of the "dome" still needs to be checked against the  
originals to rule out a scanning artefact, since it looks as  
though the sides run parallel or normal to the direction of the  
scan raster. I feel it may not be an artefact but it needs  
checking.

>>>I know I'm missing some details, and there are some things I  
>>>think I see that aren't really there (elephants in the clouds).

I agree. Having looked at the close-up high res scans using all  
kinds of digital filters I've seen lots of hints of ghostly  
marks that may or may not really be there at all.

<snip>

>>>Who had the original Heflin photos squirreled away for 30 years?

Good question. Given that what Ann Druffel now has are genuinely  
"the" originals, either Heflin himself squirreled them away or  
his story of giving them to the "NORAD" visitors is  
substantially true. The whole NORAD saga is one of the hardest  
parts of the claim to swallow, but this question still haunts  
me: What motivation did Heflin have for hiding fakes from  
photoanalysts in 1965 then "rediscovering" them in 1993 when

everybody and his brother was discovering digital image software? A few hundred dollars for medical bills? Doesn't ring true to me.

>Was Mr. Anonymous right about there being another set of photos  
>floating around out there that are fake? Or "real"?

You need to explain what you mean by this. AFAIK this person did not make any such claim. Please can you tell us what other set of photos you are referring to?

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:48:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Shell

>From: Dirk Vander Ploeg <[publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:56:00 -0400  
>Subject: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

>Source: UFO Digest.Com - Hamilkton, Ontario, Canada

><http://www.ufodigest.com/beeston.html>

>27 June 2006

>[Images at site]

>Another UFO Caught Accidentally by Digital Camera

>Date: May 1, 2006  
>Location: Beeston, Nottingham, England.  
>Witness Account: Adrian P.

>Received an email from Adrian P. on June 26, 2006. He was  
>walking his dog along with his girl friend in Beeston, which is  
>South-East of Nottingham, England.

>They had decided to take her new digital camera and try it out.  
>The actual photo was taken on Monday May 1, 2006.

>The photo is quite striking. The object to the right of the  
>church spire is very prominent and one wonders how the object  
>was not seen when first shot. One possible explanation is that  
>the craft was moving so quickly the human eye could not perceive  
>it. Another more easily acceptable reason is that the particular  
>view finder on the camera simple didn't show the entire panormal  
>of the scene. That is it only showed the center object in the  
>view finder.

Hate to say it, but to me it looks like a bird. Probably not a  
pelican, but some kind of flying fowl. Why it wasn't seen when  
the photo was taken is best explained by the fact that we tend  
to ignore ordinary things, like birds, most of the time. Only  
later, when the photo is viewed, and there's an unexpected shape  
on it, do we take notice. There are probably a lot of birds in  
this area, by the river.

Birds move pretty fast, and tend to blur with these digital  
cameras, which have remarkably slow shutter speeds. This shape  
is relatively consistent with that of other photos of birds  
taken by digital cameras. Head, tail, body, wings/wing shadows.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

From: Michael Salla <[exopolitics.nul](mailto:exopolitics.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 06:25:01 -1000  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:50:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 16:52:42 -0700 (PDT)  
>Subject: Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

>>From: Michael Salla <[exopolitics.nul](mailto:exopolitics.nul)>  
>>To: <[Ufoupdates.nul](mailto:Ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 03:52:33 -1000  
>>Subject: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

><snip>

>>Personally, the most satisfying part of the conference was the  
>>process by which both speakers and participants reached  
>>consensus on a conference Declaration promoting peaceful  
>>relations with extraterrestrial civilizations.

><snip>

>>In peace

>>Michael Salla

>Intending no disrespect, but how are proponents of exopolitics  
>different from the "space brothers" believers of the past?

>I admit I am uninformed, though not intentionally. But I am not  
>seeing a valid reason for the exopolitics movement. I understand  
>current ET motivation as malevolent and self-serving at best,  
>violently abusing all humanity at most.

>In my uninformed estimation, diplomacy only works with parties  
>who mutually respect each other. Theodore Roosevelt spoke softly  
>with those who respected big sticks. Current ET activity shows  
>no respect for any human powers.

>Please correct my ignorance, Michael.

Hello Rick,

The "space brothers" movement was based on the testimonies of  
contactees such as Adamski, Van Tassel, Menger, etc. Exopolitics  
as a movement is primarily based on the testimonies of  
whistleblowers many of whom have high credibility and whose  
testimonies can be confirmed. For example, Robert Salas  
described at the Hawaii Conference how almost 20 nuclear  
minuteman missiles were shutdown as a result of UFO activity  
over Malmstrom AFB in 1967. This event directly impacted on US  
national security yet the information was suppressed by the  
Strategic Air Command. Salas described how he was never  
subsequently debriefed about events and has written about it in  
his book, Faded Giant, which I highly recommend.

The Malmstrom event has direct policy implications in terms of  
UFOs and the ETH which is at the core of the exopolitics  
movement. Many other credible whistleblowers have come forward  
to testify to events that suggest a cover up of UFO related  
data, visiting extraterrestrials and the relationship with  
nuclear weapons. This is the main plank of exopolitics that I



and others have been promoting.

I think the testimonies of 'contactees', 'abductees', telepathic communicators etc., are also sources of information that can be used to varying degrees by those involved in exopolitics. I've tried to give varying weights of authenticity to these different sources which nevertheless leads to space brother criticisms of those involved in promoting exopolitics. Such criticisms are unfair since the primary sources of evidence continue to be whistleblowers whose credentials and testimonies can be checked, and which have profound policy implications. Examining the policy implications is critical since enough data has been accumulated over the last sixty years to get a fair idea of which is happening behind the scenes by those orchestrating a cover up based on national security concerns.

As for diplomacy working for only parties that only respect each other, I would qualify that and say diplomacy works when parties believe that the other will keep their agreements. Thus agreements can be reached with even the most egregious of actors provided they keep their word. Wasn't this the basis of the relationship between Roosevelt/Truman and Stalin for example? The alleged agreements reached between government agencies and visiting extraterrestrials is naturally a controversial topic but there is valid testimonial data that such agreements exist.

Aloha,

Michael

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Rediscovery Of Heflin Photos

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 17:35:14 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:53:39 -0400  
Subject: Rediscovery Of Heflin Photos

Dear List

Readers of the Druffel, Kelson & Wood JSE paper may have noted that Heflin's rediscovery of the photos in 1993 was brought to the attention of Bob Wood soon after by "the author Martin Caiden". It isn't clear yet what the full chain of events is connecting Heflin, Caiden and Wood at this time, but I thought listers who (like me) hadn't heard of Caiden might be interested to know something of his background, which is quite remarkable really.

The following piece appeared in a message board discussion of Indiana Jones novels, of which Caiden apparently wrote two.

He also wrote one "faction" novel with a UFO theme (in 1974, I discovered via Google) which might be relevant.

(Note: the apparent mis-spelling of "Caidin" below is commonplace on the web).

Source:

<http://raven.theraider.net/archive/index.php/t-6312.html>

-----

A prolific writer of over 150 scientific and fictional books, Martin Caidin was known as the "Hemingway of the Air," with a passion for living life to the fullest. As an orphan, he dreamed of escaping his life of abuse and drudgery by flying one of those beautiful birds in the sky. When he was 16, he stole an airplane for his first flight and was able to take off and land without putting a scratch on it. The relieved owner was so impressed that he offered to give Caidin flying lessons.

In 1955, Caidin worked secretly with Dr. Wernher von Braun and a small research group at Cape Canaveral to build the nation's first top secret moon rocket. While researching the Soviet space program and the life of Cosmonaut Gherman Stepanovich Titov, Caidin co-authored with Titov the book I Am Eagle. From this association came Caidin's best seller Marooned which was about American astronauts stranded in space and rescued by Soviet cosmonauts. Made into a blockbuster movie and filmed at Cape Canaveral with Caidin directing construction of the space capsule, every detail was so scientifically accurate (a trademark of all of Caidin's works) that it was officially sanctioned by NASA.

At the time the movie was filmed, Russia was totally against any joint manned space missions with the United States. However, when the movie was shown to the Soviet Academy of Science and the cosmonauts, they reversed their decision. According to both Phillip Handler, former president of the American Academy of Science, and official NASA reports, Caidin's movie Marooned was the major factor in the collaborative space effort leading to the Apollo-Soyuz joint U.S./Soviet space mission. To this day all Russian and American spacecraft have "common docking mechanisms" to allow for the possibility of future rescues.

Many of Caidin's books made it to Hollywood, another big success being Final Countdown. His book Cyborg was made into The Six Million Dollar Man as well as The Bionic Woman. Ironically, Cyborg was originally titled Miracle People, a non-fiction work about altering human bodies to allow them to function in space, but publishers wouldn't buy it. Most of Caidin's novels are based on fact, but many are on such sensitive subjects that in order to get them approved by government intelligence he had to include some fiction. Although pressed, he refused to tell which parts were factual. Two such books are The Mendelov Conspiracy (about UFOs) and The Messiah Stone which he said is 90 percent factual.

Caidin was as well known for his technically oriented nonfiction books as he was the big blockbuster novels. Whichever form his books took, one quality stood out -- the Caidin mark of strict scientific accuracy. The National War College, The Air University of the U.S. Air Force, and many other educational, training and special institutions use Caidin books as doctrine and strategy guides, historical references, and textbooks. He served as a nuclear warfare specialist for several states and was active with the Air Commandos and Strike Command in research about paramilitary strike teams.

An author who "lived what he wrote," Caidin spent five weeks with the famous USAF Thunderbirds jet aerobatic team. His book Thunderbirds! has gone through 22 printings and is still acclaimed as a classic documentary on the Air Force's aerial demonstration unit. Awarded the title "Thunderbird 8" by the team, Caidin is the only civilian ever to have lived and fly with them. He also flew as a stunt pilot on such films as The War Lover, The Battle of Britain, & The Longest Day and is famous for his breathtaking performances at leading airshow events.

Other nonfictional works such as Zero! and Samurai! resulted from Caidin's work while assigned to Air Force intelligence in Japan. He worked directly with Jiro Horikoshi (designer of the Zero fighter plane) and Masatake Okumiya (Chief of Japanese Navy intelligence in World War II).

The awards and honors beside Caidin's name are far too numerous to mention. He was a charter member of the Aviation Hall of Fame, founder of the American Astronautical Society, a member of the Missile, Range and Space Pioneers, and a Command Pilot for the following organizations: Confederate Air Force, Valiant Air Command, Warbirds of America, Experimental Aircraft Association, and Canadian Warplane Heritage.

Martin Caidin took on the role of delivering two novels to Lucas about Indiana Jones. During the course, he fell terminally ill. Not being a man to go against his word, he finished what he started.

Martin Caidin died of thyroid cancer March 24th, 1997 after a bitter struggle. He was 69.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Loving The Alien - A News Film By Ronan Gallagher

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 07:14:15 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 07:14:15 -0400  
Subject: Loving The Alien - A News Film By Ronan Gallagher

Source: Iron Mountain Movies

<http://www.ironmountainmovies.com//LoveAlienDVD/home.html>

28 June 2006

Loving The Alien - A News Film By Ronan Gallagher

'Loving The Alien' (26min: 30Sec) is a documentary type film inspired by and shot around the 2nd Irish International UFO Conference which was held in late August 2005 at The Bush Hotel, Carrick on Shannon, Co Leitrim in the North West of Ireland.

The area around nearby Boyle in Co Roscommon has become a hotspot for alleged UFO activity and has attracted a lot of interest from the media, UFO Researchers, and ordinary people. Whether one is sceptical of such accounts or a total believer, the fact is, that these UFO sightings are relatively common.

Loving the Alien is not about proving or disproving anyone's theories, or about mocking or ridiculing people or disrespecting their strongly held beliefs, it is hopefully more about being informative, imaginative, and above all, entertaining.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Metallic Object Near Aircraft Over Mexico 2006

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 08:16:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 08:16:44 -0400  
Subject: Metallic Object Near Aircraft Over Mexico 2006

Source: Devesh Kumar's Rip-Off Site [As in tit-for-tat]

Ripped image at:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/ufoupdates/listers/ixtapa.html>

Photograph Of Metallic Object Near Airplane Over Mexico 2006

Date  
May, 29, 2006

Location  
Ixtapa, Mexico

Summary: Taking pictures of the ocean horizon [from an airplane], we notice this metallic object sending some kind of lights, It just last few seconds and it when up we notice another object much farther.

Date Reported: 6/19/2006 7:05:23 PM

Comments about the image(s): Photograph of object (from airplane window).

Sighting Time: 2:30 PM  
Day/Night: Daytime  
No. of Witnesses: 6 other pictures  
Duration: 10sec the most

Size of Object(s)  
about 40 to 50 feet.

Distance to Object(s) & Altitude we were 7378' high, flying north west of Ixtapa Mexico 17\* 39' N 101\* 40' W

Full Description & Details  
Kind of diffuse with elongated areas, very irregular shape. It was approximately half mile when suddenly flew toward our plane and miss us for few feet. We fell some kind of pull from its direction. Few other passengers we very scared.

Can sighting be explained as any conventional man-made or natural object?

We knew it was flying along with us, suddenly just flew in our direction really fast!

Witness Background  
We fly very often, but never seen this, it is scary.

Views on UFOs, before and after sighting  
nothing I did not believe before

Other Comments  
please explain what we saw

Reported Sighting? No  
Name: Cristen Skaggs  
Location: Madison ,Winsconsin  
Age: 66

[Thanks to 'The Norm' 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

**Re: UK Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive' -**

From: **Kathy Kasten** <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 11:51:01 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:10:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: UK Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive' -

UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)> posted:

>Source: The Independant - London, UK

><http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/legal/article1115911.ece>

>28 June 2006

>Freedom Of Information Office 'Secretive'

>By Robert Verkaik

>Legal Affairs Correspondent

>A secretive Whitehall department set up by the Government to handle sensitive and difficult requests under the new Freedom of Information Act is itself in breach of the new legislation, a parliamentary committee says.

<snip>

I read items like this and wonder if dragging public officials from their desks, tarring and feathering them, driving them through the streets shoeless should be re-implemented. The more I think about it, the more I want to incite the public to join me in a good old fashion tarring and feathering rite. What do you say? Meet me in the square at noon!

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: UFOs And A Half-Naked Man - Kasten

From: **Kathy Kasten** <[catja90024.nul](mailto:catja90024.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 12:02:18 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:13:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFOs And A Half-Naked Man - Kasten

UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>posted:

>Source: Steve Olafson's The Brazosport News blog -Texas, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/lcfv2>

>Monday, June 26, 2006

>UFOs And A Half-Naked Man In A Small Town In Brazoria County

<snip>

There are not enough stories about half-naked men.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Old US Satellite Passes ISS Without Incident

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:22:29 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:22:29 -0400  
Subject: Old US Satellite Passes ISS Without Incident

Source: Spisce Travel.Com - Sydney South, NSW, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/fwl7u>

June 28, 2006

Old US Satellite Passes Space Station Without Incident

by Staff Writers  
Moscow, Russia (SPX)

An old U.S. Air Force spy satellite named Hitch Hiker 1 passed close but harmlessly by the International Space Station, a top ballistics expert with Russia's mission control center told the RIA Novosti news service Tuesday.

Hitch Hiker 1, launched aboard a Thor-Agena D rocket from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., on June 27, 1963, closed within 1,000 feet of the space station at a combined speed of more than 32,000 miles (52,000 kilometers) an hour.

Hitch Hiker, whose mission remains classified, was thought to be designed to detect Soviet Union nuclear weapons tests from its polar orbit.

"Our calculations have been correct - the object flew past the station," Nikolai Ivanov told the news service, adding the ISS crew had not been instructed to try to photograph Hitch Hiker, because it was moving at such a high speed.

"The speed was more than 14 kilometers (9 miles) per second, and it was impossible to record it," Ivanov said. He noted that the U.S. Space Catalog contains more than 10,000 various objects of different sizes currently in orbit around Earth - including the space station.

"Only 10 percent of these objects, each of which has a number, are operable spacecraft, and the rest are just space garbage," Ivanov said.

He added, however, that if mission controllers' calculations had been incorrect, the satellite could have pierced or several damaged the station. He said Russian and NASA systems had been monitoring the encounter.

"The ISS had a special procedure, developed in advance, for emergency maneuvers to swerve away from space garbage," Ivanov said. "The ISS has used six such maneuvers in its history - four with the help of Progress spacecraft and two using shuttles."

[Thanks to Milos Krmelj 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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS -

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 19:32:04 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:23:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Unidentified Floating Object Near ISS -

>Source: The Khaleej Times - Dubai, UAE

><http://tinyurl.com/z3d78>

>27 June 2006

>Unidentified Floating Object Near International Space Station  
>(DPA)

>MOSCOW - An unknown floating object close to the International  
>Space Station ISS has concerned ground control, according to  
>reports from the US Space Agency NASA on Tuesday.

<snip>

>"The object has no number in the list of space debris," Kireyev  
>said, according to reports from the Russian Itar-Tass agency.

>"It is however probably an old piece of space exploration  
>equipment."

<snip>

>[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Hi Everyone!

According to the updated story at the same Khaleej Times Online web site, this unidentified "floating" object is now identified as "a piece of abandoned American cargo launched in 1963". This added information is surprising and very strange indeed.

Project Mercury came to an end in 1963. The total number of manned and unmanned U.S. rocket launches that succeeded in placing something in orbit or escaping the Earth altogether by 1963 were very few. We would certainly have assigned a space debris number for such a large piece of "space exploration equipment" still in orbit around the Earth.

With the Space Shuttle Discovery scheduled to be launched on July 1 and the immediate future of NASA's manned space program resting on the success of this flight, I would not rule out the possibility that this "UFO" in orbit alongside the International Space Station is a secret U.S. military/intelligence payload for the purpose of accessing any launch damage to Discovery or even to serve in the role of a rescue vehicle for the Shuttle's crew.

The secret U.S. military/intelligence manned space program is better funded and equipped than NASA's. I recall when one Canadian astronaut who had flown in the Space Shuttle informed me that NASA's pilot astronauts drool at the prospect of one day flying those more advanced spacecraft their counterparts in the military/intelligence space program have.

If NASA knew back in 2003 of the capability of their military/intelligence space colleagues and asked for help as it did back in 1981 after the first Space Shuttle (Columbia) was launched,

they probably could have prevented the loss of Columbia and its crew. Who else could easily see the number of missing tiles that had fallen off on Columbia's maiden flight back in 1981 from very closeup allowing NASA to assess the damage to the Space Shuttle while in orbit? The U.S. public experienced a great loss and continues to pay a big price for the ongoing secrecy...

Since even very small satellites can be seen by observers from the ground, try to see the International Space Station when it passes overhead where you live sometime after the Space Shuttle is launched. As Discovery closes in for its rendezvous and docking with the International Space Station, you will see two bright star-like objects moving through the dark sky in tandem. Do not be too surprised if you spot three, the third being the UFO mentioned in the Khaleej Times Online news article above.

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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:28:39 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:28:39 -0400  
Subject: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial

Source: The Scotsman - Edinburgh, Scotland

<http://news.scotsman.com/latest.cfm?id=947932006>

Thursday, 29th June 2006

Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial  
By Sven Nordenstam

SHEFFIELD (Reuters) - Last month, the Ministry of Defence made public a top secret report on UFOs, concluding that three decades of sightings had failed to produce evidence of visiting extraterrestrials.

Case closed for alien aficionados? Not so.

Far from alleviating UFO buffs' suspicions that governments are concealing what they know, the report has intensified them.

"I just e-mailed the MoD explaining my disgust at their latest UFO report," an Internet UFO forum member wrote, saying the Ministry was in denial.

Instead of alien spacecraft, man-made vehicles and natural phenomena, some of them little known, were behind the UFO sighting, according to the report that runs to almost 500 pages.

David Clarke, a journalist and folklorist who used freedom of information laws to gain access to the report, said UFO believers would not accept any explanation for the phenomenon other than the extraterrestrial one.

"They've got the truth, but it's not what they want to hear," he said, speaking in a cafe near Sheffield Hallam University where he teaches journalism.

"They want to hear 'yes, there are aliens' but, because the report says there is no evidence, it's not good enough," said Clarke who has written several books on supernatural beliefs, including UFOs.

"The only thing they can do now is pray that there must be more files that are even more secret than these, being concealed."

### Alien Hypothesis

Last year, the alien hypothesis gained a prominent supporter in Paul Hellyer, a former Canadian defence minister, who told a conference that UFOs were "as real as the airplanes that fly over your head".

Hellyer told Reuters by telephone from Toronto he had become convinced of the existence of alien visitors from reading a book on the subject last year and that he was disappointed in the conclusions of the report.

"I think it's just one more man-made hurdle to trying to get the truth out," he said.

"Maybe I'm a little too suspicious, but the fact that the report was completed in 2000, just when the Brits were passing the new Freedom of Information Act, might easily have been in the minds of some of the drafters at the time they were writing their conclusions."

Nick Pope, a Defence Ministry official who worked on UFO cases from 1991 to 1994, said the release of the report was an indication of the British government's openness on the subject.

"In Britain, I'm convinced there's no cover-up, there's no conspiracy," he said. Many UFO researchers disagreed with him and believed he was part of the conspiracy since he worked for the government and used to work with UFO cases, he added.

"But I can't win with arguments like that, because whatever I say, they won't believe it."

No Proof

Pope has written several books on UFOs. He said he did not rule out aliens as the explanation for UFOs, but added there was no conclusive proof.

In the absence of the "almost cliched landing-on-the-White-House-lawn type scenario," Pope said the existence of aliens could be proved if radio astronomers picked up an intelligent signal or if extraterrestrial metal pieces were discovered.

If there are alien visitors, "the lack of artefacts is a significant mystery", meaning they must either have completely accident-proof vehicles, or have mastered teleportation and be able to scoop up debris, the report said.

To the folklorist Clarke, claims of the discovery of pieces from alien craft and marks on the ground bear a resemblance to tales from the past.

"It's like these fairy stories when people visit fairyland. They're given a gift by the fairies, and when they come back it just dissolves."

Until an alien spacecraft can be publicly examined or a signal from the green men is detected, the final line of the 1951 film "The Thing from Another World" still applies for UFO believers: "Keep watching the skies."

(c) Reuters 2006

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 20:50:24 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:32:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - Balaskas

>From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 07:39:06 +0100  
>Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something?

>Hello List,

>Thanks to Steven, Bob and Nick for back-up.

>Do you think we might go further with what we have now?

We have, and in part thanks to ufology!

Only a few days ago a physics and space scientist friend and colleague from York University, Stoyan Sargoytchev, presented me with a personalized autographed copy of his new book, 'Basic Structures of Matter Supergravitation Unified Theory'. This long awaited 500 page plus theoretical book is his life's work and confirms and explains among many other things, the incredible findings by researchers such as Wilbert B. Smith and his close associates at the NRC labs in Ottawa in the 1950s through the direct knowledge gained from "The Boys Topside". Stoyan's book, recently reviewed in the Canadian Association of Physicists (CAP) Journal, 'Physics in Canada' has already aroused much interest and debate among physicists here that I predict it will create a revolution in physics surpassing what Albert Einstein achieved when he published five major papers during his "miracle year" in 1905 which changed the way we understand the universe.

Stoyan's findings also promise us many exciting possibilities, including interstellar space travel through the control of gravitation and inertia of material objects and the tapping of non-EM energy from the not so empty "vacuum" of space. With Stoyan's book we can now finally understand the science of our ET visitors/neighbours and soon replicate the technology behind UFOs.

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://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 10:16:57 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 09:34:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 13:06:42 -0700  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:36:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

<snip>

>>The thing seems to have a kind of "prow," which looks like a  
>>tapering but may not be. The base appears to be circular, but  
>>that just might be my brain trying to make it circular. The  
>>bottom shot shows that there could be a kind of indentation on  
>>the "stern" that could be something related to propulsion. Or  
>>maybe just a bumper! The base itself is not uniformly wide. It  
>>actually looks like it might have a kind of lifting body curve  
>>to it. I see dark bands on the top part that don't seem to be  
>>reflection effects, but something else. Windows? Exhaust panels?  
>>And I think I see a flattened dome on the very top that is set  
>>back a bit from the prow.

>>All-in-all, what I see is a surprisingly aysmmetrical thing,  
>>with some interesting aerodynamic-looking features, that  
>>actually more resembles a fedora than a train wheel. To me,  
>>anyway.

<snip>

>There is indeed some banding, which I now believe is the result  
>of the mirror-like surface reflecting features in the  
>surrounding 180 degrees, like a pantoscopic cylindrical fun-  
>house mirror. This may provide critical "fingerprints" of just  
>where the object is, near (hoax) or far (genuine). This is  
>something I am working on now.

Great idea, David.

>One problem is trying to reproduce the shape of the object  
>reasonably accurately because the reflections are critically  
>dependent on the shape. E.g., very slight changes in the slope  
>of the top dome can determine whether it reflects sky or  
>countryside towards the camera. Is there a small "dome" on top,  
>or can top reflections be reasonable accurately recreated with a  
>bevel on the top (current model)? Possibly the "dome" that  
>seems to be there in photo 1 is an artifact of bright sun glare  
>off the top bevel.

I think what you call a dome up on the tip-top of what I've been  
calling the dome (the superstructure) is an artefact of that  
bright specular reflection.

>One nice feature about ray tracing is that it permits one to do  
>any number of "what-if?" scenarios very easily. E.g., if I want  
>to see what surrounding features are reflected where in the  
>object, I can eliminate them one by one and watch how the  
>reflections change on the various object surfaces in the



>different photos.

>Photo 2 I find most interesting in this regard. If it's a near  
>model, then it turns out the underside is reflecting the bushes  
>next to the van by the side of the road. If it's a distant  
>object, then it is reflecting the field that the object is  
>flying over. Right now I would lean to the former. The  
>underside looks like it is reflecting the darker nearby brush,  
>rather than the lighter distant field, but there are  
>uncertainties in the lightness of these features.

It's hard to gauge much of the density could be shadowing on a poorly reflective undersurface, and how much could be an image of the ground in an efficiently reflecting mirror surface. If it were a toy train wheel, for example, I would expect that the normally hidden inner surface (which this is, ex hypothesi) would not be polished to a speculum. This would be uneconomical. I'd expect to see a relatively dull metal surface textured with concentric lathe machining marks. Maybe they do polish them, though.

>There is also some interesting banding in photo 2 that might  
>also suggest nearness. E.g., some darker regions on the left of  
>the close-up object of photo 2 could correspond to a reflection  
>of the power pole about 20 feet in front of and to the right of  
>the van, which show up in the ray-traced reproduction. Another  
>could correspond to a hypothetical suspension pole on the van  
>holding up a model outside the window. There are no  
>corresponding bands in a ray-tracing saucer off in the distance  
>over the field.

These density variations are subtle. But what about the much more definite darkening on the lower left edge of the flange which looks as though the bottom disc is mis-shapen. If this is a reflection, does it correspond with the roof of the van maybe?

>However, before screaming "hoax," I should also point out that  
>the reflected power pole and suspension rod also show up in the  
>ray-traced model object of photo #3, yet I don't see equivalent  
>bands in the real blow-up of the object in photo 3. Lack of  
>clarity or "graininess" in the photos is frustrating. Possibly  
>high quality enhancements of the originals would bring out such  
>details, or perhaps not.

>We would also still have to account for the "smoke trail" seen  
>in enhancements of the photo 3 object. Heflin would have to  
>conceal something like a smoking cigarette stub on the back of a  
>hoax model to maybe recreate this feature plus a suggestion of  
>rising smoke in photo 2, then mention nothing about it later,  
>such as dropping hints like, "I am quite sure I saw smoke coming  
>off the object when I shot photos 2 & 3.

I agree with your subtext, which is that this is pretty implausible. It would be easier to think that the "trail" was made with oily smudges on the window glass, or even that it was a fortuitous emulsion blemish of some kind. The latter may seem incredible, but is not ruled out. There is nothing in the JSE paper that describes any close examination of the print emulsion.

Incidentally, I'm told that certain model locomotives with drive wheels of the type resembling (generally) Heflin's object were sold with a system for blowing "smoke rings" from the funnel (stack) using chemical pellets, the implication being that this may have given a hoaxer the idea of a connection between an airshow smoke ring and a train wheel 'UFO'. Are there any railway modellers out there who can comment on this? I recall Hornby OO locomotives from the late 1960s that seeped whisps of white smoke, but I don't recall "smoke rings" as such.

>My mind continues to go back and forth as to whether this is a  
>hoax or not. I'll let the group know if I find something more  
>conclusive.

Mine too.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 06:41:36 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 09:48:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference -

>From: Michael Salla <[exopolitics.nul](mailto:exopolitics.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 06:25:01 -1000  
>Subject: Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

>>From: Rick Nielsen <[nilthchi.nul](mailto:nilthchi.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 16:52:42 -0700 (PDT)  
>>Subject: Re: ET Civilizations & World Peace Conference

<snip>

>>Intending no disrespect, but how are proponents of exopolitics  
>>different from the "space brothers" believers of the past?

>>I admit I am uninformed, though not intentionally. But I am not  
>>seeing a valid reason for the exopolitics movement. I understand  
>>current ET motivation as malevolent and self-serving at best,  
>>violently abusing all humanity at most.

>>In my uninformed estimation, diplomacy only works with parties  
>>who mutually respect each other. Theodore Roosevelt spoke softly  
>>with those who respected big sticks. Current ET activity shows  
>>no respect for any human powers.

>>Please correct my ignorance, Michael.

>Hello Rick,

>The "space brothers" movement was based on the testimonies of  
>contactees such as Adamski, Van Tassel, Menger, etc. Exopolitics  
>as a movement is primarily based on the testimonies of  
>whistleblowers many of whom have high credibility and whose  
>testimonies can be confirmed.

<snip>

>As for diplomacy working for only parties that only respect each  
>other, I would qualify that and say diplomacy works when parties  
>believe that the other will keep their agreements. Thus  
>agreements can be reached with even the most egregious of actors  
>provided they keep their word.

<snip>

>Aloha,  
>Michael

Thanks Michael. You answered my questions and I appreciate that.  
I understand your point of view a little better now, though I  
remain agreeably disagreed with you on this topic.

I still have the same concerns, and now one more: I still see  
exopolitics as wishful thinking at best, and possibly valid only  
with ET's who are more approachable, more respectful of humans  
really, than the grays who predominate. That is, if those other  
types of ET even exist.

I also still believe diplomacy only works with those who

mutually respect each other. And now I have one more concern, I wonder whose authority will be respected more, or even considered by ET, governmental entities or organized groups of concerned humans.

From their past behaviors it appears that the grays, at least, respect neither.

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - Dickenson

From: Ray Dickenson <[ray.dickenson.nul](mailto:ray.dickenson.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 14:59:41 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 09:49:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - Dickenson

>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 20:50:24 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something?

>Only a few days ago a physics and space scientist friend and  
>colleague from York University, Stoyan Sargoytchev, presented me  
>with a personalized autographed copy of his new book, 'Basic  
>Structures of Matter Supergravitation Unified Theory'.

Hi Nick,

That's really interesting, and it seems he's one of the few  
professionals to recently state out loud (on his theoretical  
page - see <http://www.helical-structures.org/>) that the  
Michelson-Morley experiment - taken by the media and most book-  
scientists to be a proof of something - not only didn't prove  
anything, but, due to Lorentz contraction, couldn't ever have  
proved anything.

Will watch developments with interest.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 17:00:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 09:54:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Shough

>From: Kelly Freeman <[Khfflsciufu.nul](mailto:Khfflsciufu.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 10:37:53 EDT  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Robert Gates <[RGates8254.nul](mailto:RGates8254.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 01:01:29 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

><snip>

>>Better yet, besides model trains, friends of friends, who knew  
>>somebody that lived in Orange County in 1965 are absolutely sure  
>>that another Heflin hobby was welding, so naturally what was in  
>>the picture was a pie pan that had been reshaped and re welded  
>>by Heflin... :)

>>Naturally, keeping in skeptibunker fashion, the above would be  
>>seized upon as a total and complete explanation, case  
>>closed...never mind any problems.

>Hello Robert, EBK and List,

>I have only been following this thread intermittently, but I am  
>curious as to whether or not anybody has taken the time to try  
>and simulate the Heflin event.

>Has anybody actually gone to the location of the sighting and  
>tried to hoax the same UFO using theories proposed in this  
>thread? Would it, in fact, be possible at all?

>A scientific approach would be to observe, theorize and test  
>that theory/theories under the same or similar conditions of the  
>event. I am not aware of it being done in this case.

>If it has been done, what were the results? Any discussion as as  
>to whether the photos are genuine or not, IMHO, should be based  
>on those results.

Kelly

Viktor Golubik is reportedly undertaking tests with a similar camera. Last I heard he was intending to reconstruct the precise sightlines using a similar Ford Econoline van. This should tell us a lot of useful things. But just hanging up models and photographing them will not necessarily tell us anything useful.

In 1967 (I think) JPL image expert Robert Nathan sat in the same Econoline van at the same spot with the same camera and made some tests, but apparently he did not feel the need to attempt a simulation. He did discover, though, that Heflin would not have seen a distant object like the object in photo #1 in the camera's pop-up viewfinder - it would have been obscured by the van roof. If it were a small model near the window, of course, he would have seen it in the viewfinder. According to Hartmann, Nathan challenged Heflin, who replied that he had "shot from the hip", presumably in haste, and didn't use the viewfinder on that

shot. This is the sort of test of internal consistency that can be done by reconstruction and is potentially more powerful than just simulating images.

Hartmann did attempt a simulation in a similar van at the same spot with the same or a similar camera in 1968. He used a lens cap on a thread hanging in front of the windscreen. As is well known this photo is shown in the Condon Report and has been discussed extensively here on the List. What it proves is that you can take a photo of a lens cap hanging in front of the windscreen.

We already know that the depth of field is such that if someone comes up with a train wheel having approximately the proportions of the Heflin object and hangs it outside a van on Myford Rd they may well be able to produce pictures that look very similar. But to address your point, I repeat the caution that unless new information emerges from studies of the original prints when they eventually are available for study (such as discovery of a trademark symbol or catalogue number stamped on the bottom) this would not be a definitive scientific test IMO.

If the result didn't look much like the Heflin photos this alone would not prove that they are genuine. If it did look very like the Heflin photos, this alone would not prove they are fakes. There are several subtle interrelating issues of geometry, psychology and testimony that need to be balanced to arrive at a judgement. Simulation is just one tool in the kit.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: SETI & CSICOP - Shell

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 11:45:48 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 09:56:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP - Shell

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 10:05:48 -0300  
>Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:42:10 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP

>>>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:51:23 +1000  
>>>Subject: SETI & CSICOP

>>>Hi all,

>>>Thought I would forward on my most recent column for our free  
>>>online magazine Sub Rosa

>>><http://subrosa.dailygrail.com>

>>><snip>

>>>In his view, SETI is popular  
>>>because of its quasi-religious features; perhaps there are  
>>>benevolent 'beings' out there, more advanced than us, who have  
>>>>wondrous things to show us - it's interesting to note the lack of  
>>>concern in SETI circles about the dangers posed by contacting an  
>>>alien civilisation.

>>>Just a quick two cents about this notion. If you ignore the UFO  
>>>and channeling evidence, and go along with the "Fermi Paradox"  
>>>assumption that we have not had contact with ET civilizations,  
>>>perhaps the most compelling reason why that's happened is that  
>>>all the civilizations that managed to survive were smart enough  
>>>to \_shut up\_ and not make their presence known until they knew  
>>>what, if anything, was out there.

>>>If Nature as we know it extends past our planetary boundaries,  
>>>who knows what kind of vicious and nasty predatory species are  
>>>out there, equally stealthy, waiting for a telltale radio signal  
>>>like a bobber on the end of a fishing line?

>>>Enrico Fermi did not say nobody was visiting.

>>>After a discussion at lunch in which it was agreed that it  
>>>wouldn't take too many million years for the whole galaxy to be  
>>>colonized, he asked the sensible question "So where is  
>>>everybody?".

Okay, now again we're running into a difference of interpretation here. I agree that he was beginning with the assumption that there were at least some, possibly many, ET civilizations. But if he is asks, "where is everybody?" he's establishing the additional assumption that there is no accepted evidence to indicate we're being visited. Indication of an absence, assumed by a lack of positive indication of presence.

>>>Obviously there are many possible answers.



There certainly are, assuming there are ET civilizations. However, one of the most obvious answers is to recognize that the assumption is wrong and that there are no ET civilizations out there to do the colonizing.

>One answer is that they are all over the place and the government knows they are, and doesn't want to let anybody know >because it would mean a loss of power and others might find out >about their technology.

>Another answer is that they have bases on asteroids or the back side of the moon or on other satellites.

>Another is they are quarantining us to make sure we don't escape >to attack out there; or There are rules about colonizing planets >on which there is already a civilization, primitive though it >may be, etc., etc., etc.

Exactly. But there's another side to every hypothetical coin. For every government that wants to keep ET life a secret, there is likely another who would prefer to have it exposed, as it would mean a potential for leveling the technological playing field. And if ET civilizations are "all over the place," most of them may be hiding from us (or other predatory alien species) on purpose, but at least a few of them would not only want to show themselves, but make very obvious, dramatic displays of their existence and power, like the ETs in "Independence Day."

We don't seem to have been invaded yet, unless there's been some kind of "secret" invasion. I don't know of any formalized contact with ET civilizations, unless you buy into what John Lear is talking about over the abovetopsecret.com UFO forum.

So it all brings us back to the original Fermi question of "where is everybody?" As a hopeful skeptic, until I see incontrovertible evidence that convinces me of their existence, my default answer to the question is that they don't exist. And as someone who recognizes the potential for a very hostile and predatory alien presence in the galaxy, I hope they stay non-existent long enough for us to develop better defenses, because it doesn't look like we're going to be shutting up any time soon.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 13:33:47 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 09:58:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Ledger

>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0500 (CDT)  
>Subject: Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

>>From: Dirk Vander Ploeg <[publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:56:00 -0400  
>>Subject: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

>>Source: UFO Digest.Com - Hamilkton, Ontario, Canada

>><http://www.ufodigest.com/beeston.html>

>>27 June 2006

>>[Images at site]

>>Another UFO Caught Accidentally by Digital Camera

>>Date: May 1, 2006  
>>Location: Beeston, Nottingham, England.  
>>Witness Account: Adrian P.

>>Received an email from Adrian P. on June 26, 2006. He was  
>>walking his dog along with his girl friend in Beeston, which is  
>>South-East of Nottingham, England.

>>They had decided to take her new digital camera and try it out.  
>>The actual photo was taken on Monday May 1, 2006.

>>The photo is quite striking. The object to the right of the  
>>church spire is very prominent and one wonders how the object  
>>was not seen when first shot. One possible explanation is that  
>>the craft was moving so quickly the human eye could not perceive  
>>it. Another more easily acceptable reason is that the particular  
>>view finder on the camera simple didn't show the entire panormal  
>>of the scene. That is it only showed the center object in the  
>>view finder.

>>Hate to say it, but to me it looks like a bird. Probably not a  
>>pelican, but some kind of flying fowl. Why it wasn't seen when  
>>the photo was taken is best explained by the fact that we tend  
>>to ignore ordinary things, like birds, most of the time. Only  
>>later, when the photo is viewed, and there's an unexpected shape  
>>on it, do we take notice. There are probably a lot of birds in  
>>this area, by the river.

>>Birds move pretty fast, and tend to blur with these digital  
>>cameras, which have remarkably slow shutter speeds. This shape  
>>is relatively consistent with that of other photos of birds  
>>taken by digital cameras. Head, tail, body, wings/wing shadows.

Come on Tim,

If you are going to come up with an explanation, let's have  
something a little less silly.

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](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial -

From: **Stanton Friedman** <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 13:37:23 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:11:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial -

>Source: The Scotsman - Edinburgh, Scotland

><http://news.scotsman.com/latest.cfm?id=947932006>

>Thursday, 29th June 2006

>Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial  
>By Sven Nordenstam

>SHEFFIELD (Reuters) - Last month, the Ministry of Defence made  
>public a top secret report on UFOs, concluding that three  
>decades of sightings had failed to produce evidence of visiting  
>extraterrestrials.

>Case closed for alien aficionados? Not so.

<snip>

Yes, folklore rides supreme again. First let us note that the  
Condign Report was classified SECRET. It was not classified  
TOP SECRET or TS codeword. The FBI once stated that the military  
considers the subject TS. Wilbert Smith noted that UFOs are the  
most classified subject in the US even more so than the H-bomb.

USAF General Carroll Bolender noted that "reports which could  
effect national security are not part of the Blue Book System".  
The 156 NSA UFO documents finally released in about 1997 were  
TOP SECRET UMBRA and were about 95% whited out. The CIA UFO  
documents(Not all released) located by the NSA were very heavily  
blacked out. Some of the released pages had 8 words that could  
be released. One said "deny in toto" so no words were released.

Artifacts have indeed been recovered - Roswell - and kept  
classified. The notion, that materials which could conceivably  
lead to new and exciting military technology would be released  
for all (including enemies) to handle and study, is absurd on  
its face, Clarke notwithstanding. Publicly examined, indeed.

It is clear that military pilots in the USA were ordered to  
shoot down UFOs if they didn't land when instructed to do so. It  
seems reasonable that the same orders were given in the UK. If  
planes managed to shoot down UFOs, or if UFOs managed to shoot  
down or "disintegrate" UK planes, that information would be TOP  
SECRET code word.

Need I repeat that the Condign approach to plasmas as explaining  
UFOs was ridiculous and had long since been scientifically  
destroyed by Jim McDonald and even the Condon Report?

Stan Friedman

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Old US Satellite Passes ISS Without Incident -

From: **Tim Shell** <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 12:06:07 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:13:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Old US Satellite Passes ISS Without Incident -

>Source: Spisce Travel.Com - Sydney South, NSW, Australia

><http://tinyurl.com/fwl7u>

>June 28, 2006

>Old US Satellite Passes Space Station Without Incident

>by Staff Writers  
>Moscow, Russia (SPX)

>An old U.S. Air Force spy satellite named Hitch Hiker 1 passed  
>close but harmlessly by the International Space Station, a top  
>ballistics expert with Russia's mission control center told the  
>RIA Novosti news service Tuesday.  
>>Hitch Hiker 1, launched aboard a Thor-Agena D rocket from  
>Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., on June 27, 1963, closed  
>within 1,000 feet of the space station at a combined speed of  
>more than 32,000 miles (52,000 kilometers) an hour.

<snip>

>"Only 10 percent of these objects, each of which has a number,  
>are operable spacecraft, and the rest are just space garbage,"  
>Ivanov said.

Opportunity knocks! If I was an enterprising guy with a few million bucks to throw around, I'd go into the space garbage clean-up business. I reckon that a little automated satellite could be built with a big magnet on it that could fly up to these things and either purposely crash them or lift them up and out of Earth's orbit. For a very reasonable fee.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Rediscovery Of Heflin Photos - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 14:20:28 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:24:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Rediscovery Of Heflin Photos - Ledger

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 17:35:14 +0100  
>Subject: Rediscovery Of Heflin Photos

>Readers of the Druffel, Kelson & Wood JSE paper may have noted  
>that Heflin's rediscovery of the photos in 1993 was brought to  
>the attention of Bob Wood soon after by "the author Martin  
>Caiden". It isn't clear yet what the full chain of events is  
>connecting Heflin, Caiden and Wood at this time, but I thought  
>Listeners who (like me) hadn't heard of Caiden might be interested  
>to know something of his background, which is quite remarkable  
>really.

>The following piece appeared in a message board discussion of  
>Indiana Jones novels, of which Caiden apparently wrote two.

>He also wrote one "faction" novel with a UFO theme (in 1974, I  
>discovered via Google) which might be relevant.

>(Note: the apparent mis-spelling of "Caidin" below is  
>commonplace on the web).

>Source:

><http://raven.theraider.net/archive/index.php/t-6312.html>

>-----

>A prolific writer of over 150 scientific and fictional books,  
>Martin Caidin was known as the "Hemingway of the Air," with a  
>passion for living life to the fullest. As an orphan, he dreamed  
>of escaping his life of abuse and drudgery by flying one of  
>those beautiful birds in the sky. When he was 16, he stole an  
>airplane for his first flight and was able to take off and land  
>without putting a scratch on it. The relieved owner was so  
>impressed that he offered to give Caidin flying lessons.

>In 1955, Caidin worked secretly with Dr. Wernher von Braun and a  
>small research group at Cape Canaveral to build the nation's  
>first top secret moon rocket. While researching the Soviet space  
>program and the life of Cosmonaut Gherman Stepanovich Titov,  
>Caidin co-authored with Titov the book I Am Eagle. From this  
>association came Caidin's best seller Marooned which was about  
>American astronauts stranded in space and rescued by Soviet  
>cosmonauts. Made into a blockbuster movie and filmed at Cape  
>Canaveral with Caidin directing construction of the space  
>capsule, every detail was so scientifically accurate (a  
>trademark of all of Caidin's works) that it was officially  
>sanctioned by NASA.

<snip>

>Martin Caidin took on the role of delivering two novels to Lucas  
>about Indiana Jones. During the course, he fell terminally ill.  
>Not being a man to go against his word, he finished what he  
>started.

>Martin Caidin died of thyroid cancer March 24th, 1997 after a

>bitter struggle. He was 69.

Hi Martin,

I grew up reading Martin Caidin's books. He was a pilot's pilot and loved flying. I met him finally at the Oshkosh Experimental Aircraft Association' Fly-In in either 1986 or 1987. Sadly we had to drive in after waiting 4 days for the ceiling to lift over eastern Canada.

Martin was signing books but had flown into Oshkosh in his own restored German Junkers Ju.52 which he named "Iron Annie". Once he got talking airplanes you couldn't stop him. Not that I wanted to. I thanked him for being one of those who got me off my ass and into flight training.

Caidin had the run of NASA. He was like the Tom Clancy of his day but was a long time pilot to boot. His book Marooned was responsible for the US and the Soviets getting together and standardising air-hose fittings and lockout-chamber hatches etc., just in case such a thing should happen.

Oshkosh is a great place to run into these pilots [usually for a week beginning at the end July and early August] though the legends are dying out. I met pappy Boyington there - Baa, Baa Black Sheep. He was selling his book. A few stalls further on was another stall with a small Japanese man selling his book, The Man Who Shot Down Pappy Boyington.

Don Ledger

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [ufoupdateslist.com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## UFO Caught On Camera In Banbury

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:30:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:30:35 -0400  
Subject: UFO Caught On Camera In Banbury

Source: The Banbury Guardian - Oxfordshire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/ozgc3>

29 June 2006

UFO Caught On Camera

A pleasant evening barbecue turned into a sci-fi drama when a teenager spotted a UFO and captured it on film.

For 19-year-old Jamie Crawford it was a dream come true when he was able to reach for his camcorder and record his sighting.

An expert has confirmed the images are genuine.

"I've always wanted to see a UFO and to catch one on tape is a real bonus," said Mr Crawford of Marjoram Walk, Banbury. "I was very excited and shaking like mad while I filmed.

"We were just serving food in our back garden and I saw something peculiar out the corner of my eye. I got the camcorder and as soon as I zoomed in I thought 'I've caught a UFO'."

Mr Crawford said to the naked eye the object was about the size of a thumb nail and glinted in the sun. It was visible for about seven minutes and seemed to float slowly upwards at an angle before disappearing.

From his Hanwell Fields home the object was southeast, the same direction of the now disused RAF Upper Heyford airbase. The incident took place at about 7pm on Thursday June 8.

Mr Crawford said: "One of my friends was a bit sarcastic at first when I pointed it out in the sky, but then he admitted it was a bit weird.

"I've always believed in aliens and this has confirmed my theories. I'm not sure what they'd be doing here, maybe monitoring how we live, but I'm going to keep checking the skies."

Mr Crawford's video footage was converted to stills by a technician at Oxford and Cherwell Valley College's Banbury campus media department.

Kevin Robinson, programme manager for media and performing arts, witnessed the transfer and said the images on the camera looked genuine and reflected real structure, not digital distortion or ghosting.

Suggestions in the editing suite included a Harrier jump-jet, Chinook helicopter and squashed fly, though Mr Robinson's personal preference was a Stealth bomber.

"At that distance and zoom if it was heading towards the camera

before banking and heading away it might give the false impression that it was hardly moving," he said.

"It seems an awful long way for aliens to come just to watch someone's barbeque, but whatever it was it was definitely 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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Soo Michigan Police Investigate UFO Report

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:33:42 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:33:42 -0400  
Subject: Soo Michigan Police Investigate UFO Report

Source: Soo Today - Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario

<http://www.sootoday.com/content/info/contact.asp>

Thursday, June 29, 2006

Soo Michigan Police Investigate UFO Report

By David Helwig  
SooToday.com

Tonight's edition of the Soo Evening News reports that police responded to a report of an unidentified flying object on Wednesday night in the 1000 block of East 7th Avenue in the Michigan Soo.

The UFO is said to have hovered without noise there almost one hour.

It was very shiny on top, just like the visor on an astronaut's helmet, the newspaper said.

"While police might have dismissed the report had it come from a lone individual, neighbors and other supported the original caller's claims of a strange object hovering in the sky," the Evening News said.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Secrecy News -- 06/29/06

From: Steven Aftergood <[saftergood.nul](mailto:saftergood.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 14:10:45 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:35:40 -0400  
Subject: Secrecy News -- 06/29/06

SECRECY NEWS  
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy  
Volume 2006, Issue No. 72  
June 29, 2006

Secrecy News Blog: <http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/>

Support Secrecy News:  
[http://www.fas.org/static/contrib\\_sec.jsp](http://www.fas.org/static/contrib_sec.jsp)

\*\* "SEALED V. SEALED": HOW COURTS CONFRONT STATE SECRETS  
\*\* HOW DID U.S. ASSESS IRAQI BIOWEAPON PRODUCTION?  
\*\* DHS, CRS ON SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION  
\*\* FACING DEATH: MORTUARY AFFAIRS IN JOINT OPERATIONS

"SEALED V. SEALED": HOW COURTS CONFRONT STATE SECRETS

The government's increasing use of the "state secrets privilege" to resist civil litigation on national security matters has often been met by courts with uncritical, even abject deference to the executive agencies that invoke the privilege. But another, more assertive response is possible.

"The state secrets privilege is absolute," wrote Judge Royce C. Lamberth categorically in a newly disclosed decision from July 2004.

In that case, former DEA agent Richard Horn alleged that his phone had been illegally wiretapped by the U.S. government when he served in Myanmar (Burma) in 1993. The government asserted the state secrets privilege and moved for dismissal.

Plaintiff Horn then proposed that the provisions of the Classified Information Procedures Act (CIPA) be adapted to permit the secure adjudication of classified information in his lawsuit, as is done in certain criminal trials such as espionage cases.

But, Judge Lamberth reasoned, "If the Court adopted CIPA,... the [state secrets] privilege would not be absolute." So he simply dismissed the case.

Horn's lawsuit -- Horn v. Huddle, D.C. District Case No. 94-1756 -- is sealed. It does not appear in the public docket of the D.C. District Courthouse. Instead, it is tagged "SEALED v. SEALED" with the annotation "Case is not available to the public."

But a redacted copy of Judge Lamberth's July 28, 2004 order dismissing the case was obtained by Secrecy News. It is available here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/statesec/horn072804.pdf>

A markedly different judicial response to a state secrets claim may be emerging in a current lawsuit brought by the Electronic Frontier Foundation alleging unlawful domestic surveillance.

Instead of simply granting "absolute" deference to the government whenever it asserts the state secrets privilege, the Court admitted that there are multiple interests at stake that must somehow be reconciled:

"How can the court minimize the conflict between plaintiffs' right to litigate this case and the government's duty to protect state secrets?" Judge Vaughan R. Walker asked the parties in a January 20 order:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/statesec/hepting062006.pdf>

"Allowing the executive branch to treat the privilege as an absolute bar to judicial review, as the Bush administration is attempting, would be profoundly unwise," argued constitutional scholar Louis Fisher in a new op-ed. "It would let self-serving assertions by one of the litigants usurp the judge's authority."

See "State Your Secrets" by Louis Fisher, Legal Times, June 26 (reprinted with permission):

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/statesec/fisher.pdf>

A critical view of the Bush Administration's use of the state secrets privilege was presented in "The Bush Code of Secrecy" by Mark Follman, Salon, June 23:

[http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2006/06/23/state\\_secrets/](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2006/06/23/state_secrets/)

Last March, the Central Intelligence Agency asserted the state secrets privilege in a somewhat mysterious case called Jane Doe v. CIA, and moved for dismissal. Last week, Mark S. Zaid, the attorney for "Jane Doe," asked the Court not to dismiss the case. See:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/jud/statesec/doe061906.pdf>

"The privilege has been used in this administration more than any other administration," according to University of Texas-El Paso professor William Weaver.

"Depending on how you count it, it's been asserted ... between 19 and 21 times," he told National Public Radio on June 19.

#### HOW DID U.S. ASSESS IRAQI BIOWEAPON PRODUCTION?

One of the most vivid allegations made by the U.S. government regarding Iraqi weapons of mass destruction was the claim that Iraqi had developed mobile laboratories for the production of biological weapons. The allegation, based on reports from a source known as "Curveball," proved to be false.

But the U.S. intelligence assessment of the supposed mobile BW labs, though erroneous, raised questions that still remain unanswered, wrote bioweapons expert Milton Leitenberg of the University of Maryland.

According to a cryptic reference spotted by Leitenberg in the Silberman-Robb WMD Commission report, U.S. contractors performed a "replication" of the Iraqi design and found that "it works."

The exact nature of this "replication" and whether it led to the production of actual BW agents are among several lingering questions he posed.

See "Unresolved Questions Regarding US Government Attribution of a Mobile Biological Production Capacity by Iraq" by Milton Leitenberg, June 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/unresolved.pdf>

#### DHS, CRS ON SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION

"Sensitive Security Information (SSI) is information that would be detrimental to transportation security if publicly disclosed," according to a Department of Homeland Security directive released last week under the Freedom of Information Act.

See DHS Management Directive 11056, "Sensitive Security Information," December 16, 2005:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/othergov/dhs/md11056.pdf>

Confusingly, however, SSI is also a control marking used by the Department of Agriculture to mean something quite different, observed information policy expert Harold C. Relyea of the Congressional Research Service in a new report on classification and other information controls.

SSI "is both a concept and a control marking used by the Department of Agriculture (USDA), on the one hand, and jointly by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) of the Department of Homeland Security as well as by the Department of Transportation, on the other hand, but with different underlying authorities, conceptualizations, and management regimes for it," he wrote.

See "Security Classified and Controlled Information: History, Status, and Emerging Management Issues," June 26, 2006:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/secrecy/RL33494.pdf>

While the number of different designations for "sensitive but unclassified" information has been estimated at over 60, that number approaches 100 if different agency definitions of the same designation are taken into account, a Justice Department official told Secrecy News.

#### FACING DEATH: MORTUARY AFFAIRS IN JOINT OPERATIONS

In a somewhat gruesome but unblinking new publication prepared for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the U.S. military prescribes doctrine for the recovery, identification, handling and burial of deceased soldiers, enemy combatants and civilian detainees.

The violent, horrible death of combatants and non-combatants is of course a defining characteristic of war. And the strange efforts by the Bush Administration to prevent the media from photographing flag-draped coffins of soldiers killed in Iraq (until a lawsuit overturned the policy last year) did nothing to change this reality.

The new doctrinal publication anticipates that the casualties of war may be mutilated or dismembered. They may be dangerously contaminated with chemical or biological agents or radioactive materials. Mass casualties may overwhelm existing facilities, forcing improvised solutions such as mass interment.

The publication stresses the dignified treatment of the dead, and includes summary accounts of the rituals associated with Protestant, Catholic, Jewish and Muslim religious traditions. ("Other than common respect, Buddhists do not have any particular requirements concerning the handling of human remains following death.")

See "Mortuary Affairs in Joint Operations," Joint Publication 4-06, June 2006 (195 pages, 2.5 MB):

[http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jp4\\_06.pdf](http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jp4_06.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](mailto:secrecy_news-request.nul) with "subscribe" in the body of the message.

OR email your request to [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](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](http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html)  
email: [saftergood.nul](mailto: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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial -

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 17:05:30 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:38:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial -

><http://news.scotsman.com/latest.cfm?id=947932006>

>Thursday, 29th June 2006

>Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial  
>By Sven Nordenstam

<snip>

>If there are alien visitors, "the lack of artefacts is a  
>significant mystery", meaning they must either have completely  
>accident-proof vehicles, or have mastered teleportation and be  
>able to scoop up debris, the report said.

I wonder why all commentators who state there are no artifacts  
always avoid mentioning the other possibility - that artifacts  
are swiftly and systematically confiscated. I also wonder why  
skeptics consider that impossible.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Are We Missing Something? - White

From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 17:13:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:39:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something? - White

>From: Nick Balaskas <[Nikolaos.nul](mailto:Nikolaos.nul)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 20:50:24 -0400 (Eastern Standard Time)  
>Subject: Re: Are We Missing Something?

<snip>

>Stoyan's findings also promise us many exciting possibilities,  
>including interstellar space travel through the control of  
>gravitation and inertia of material objects and the tapping of  
>non-EM energy from the not so empty "vacuum" of space. With  
>Stoyan's book we can now finally understand the science of our  
>ET visitors/neighbours and soon replicate the technology behind  
>UFOs.

Do let us know if his theories are successfully demonstrated  
in the lab, Nick. Praying.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 15:35:01 -0700  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 10:41:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Rudiak

>From: Martin Shough <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 10:16:57 +0100  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 13:06:42 -0700  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006 14:36:58 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

><snip>

>>>The thing seems to have a kind of "prow," which looks like a  
>>>tapering but may not be. The base appears to be circular, but  
>>>that just might be my brain trying to make it circular. The  
>>>bottom shot shows that there could be a kind of indentation on  
>>>the "stern" that could be something related to propulsion. Or  
>>>maybe just a bumper! The base itself is not uniformly wide. It  
>>>actually looks like it might have a kind of lifting body curve  
>>>to it. I see dark bands on the top part that don't seem to be  
>>>reflection effects, but something else. Windows? Exhaust panels?  
>>>And I think I see a flattened dome on the very top that is set  
>>>back a bit from the prow.

>>>All-in-all, what I see is a surprisingly aysmmetrical thing,  
>>>with some interesting aerodynamic-looking features, that  
>>>actually more resembles a fedora than a train wheel. To me,  
>>>anyway.

><snip>

>>There is indeed some banding, which I now believe is the result  
>>of the mirror-like surface reflecting features in the  
>>surrounding 180 degrees, like a pantoscopic cylindrical fun-  
>>house mirror. This may provide critical "fingerprints" of just  
>>where the object is, near (hoax) or far (genuine). This is  
>>something I am working on now.

>>One problem is trying to reproduce the shape of the object  
>>reasonably accurately because the reflections are critically  
>>dependent on the shape. E.g., very slight changes in the slope  
>>of the top dome can determine whether it reflects sky or  
>>countryside towards the camera. Is there a small "dome" on top,  
>>or can top reflections be reasonable accurately recreated with a  
>>bevel on the top (current model)? Possibly the "dome" that  
>>seems to be there in photo 1 is an artifact of bright sun glare  
>>off the top bevel.

>I think what you call a dome up on the tip-top of what I've been  
>calling the dome (the superstructure) is an artefact of that  
>bright specular reflection.

I also think it is an artefact of the reflection. The second  
bright specular reflection off the lower rim immediately below

the top one similarly causes distortion around it, such as the edge of the lower rim getting pushed out a little bit. My guess is some sort of light scatter in the immediate area around the glare on the film. Perhaps Bob Shell can comment.

One thing you can probably take to the bank based on my raytracing is the time of day. Hartmann in the Condon Report placed it at around 12:30 PDT, based on the shadow cast by the power pole immediately in front of Heflin photo 1. That seems to correct, probably to within 5 minutes. This has implications about shadows being cast, at least in photo 1, by any nearby model and suspension pole.

>>One nice feature about ray tracing is that it permits one to do  
>>any number of "what-if?" scenarios very easily. E.g., if I want  
>>to see what surrounding features are reflected where in the  
>>object, I can eliminate them one by one and watch how the  
>>reflections change on the various object surfaces in the  
>>different photos.

>>Photo 2 I find most interesting in this regard. If it's a near  
>>model, then it turns out the underside is reflecting the bushes  
>>next to the van by the side of the road. If it's a distant  
>>object, then it is reflecting the field that the object is  
>>flying over. Right now I would lean to the former. The  
>>underside looks like it is reflecting the darker nearby brush,  
>>rather than the lighter distant field, but there are  
>>uncertainties in the lightness of these features.

>It's hard to gauge much of the density could be shadowing on a  
>poorly reflective undersurface, and how much could be an image  
>of the ground in an efficiently reflecting mirror surface. If it  
>were a toy train wheel, for example, I would expect that the  
>normally hidden inner surface (which this is, ex hypothesi)  
>would not be polished to a speculum. This would be uneconomical.  
>I'd expect to see a relatively dull metal surface textured with  
>concentric lathe machining marks. Maybe they do polish them,  
>though.

Went down to the basement and pulled out my old Lionel train. The large drive wheels on the engine, to my surprise, are smooth on the "bottom", but none of the wheel is specular smooth. The "top" and "bottom" are painted with flat black paint, and the "top" was cast with a lot of grooved wheel spoke detail. Of course Heflin could always smooth things out, say spray paint a train wheel with shiny paint, etc., etc.

Other details is that the drive wheel was 1-1/2 inches in diameter, about the right size for a hoax (see below), but other proportions are all wrong. As discussed here before, the ratio of the lower "flange" to the top "dome" is much lower on a real train wheel than in the Heflin object. The ratio on Heflin's object I measured at about 1.38, whereas on the train wheel it is  $1\frac{1}{2} / 1\frac{1}{4} = 1.17$ . Further, the "dome" edge is square to the track, not slightly beveled or tilted as in Heflin.

Of course, this is just one train wheel, and maybe there is another model train wheel out there with the correct proportions, etc., etc.

I'm getting close to determining just where the camera would have been in photos 1-3. One result is setting the lower limit on a model size. I'm currently using a "wheel" 1-1/3 inches in diameter, and that would place it just outside the windshield in photo 1, or about 25 inches from the camera. It can't be any smaller than this or it starts coming through the windshield. To match various items seen in perspective, Heflin would be sitting about 15-16 inches back of the front edge of his car door window.

Using the same size model and matching image size places the model ~37 inches from the camera in photo 2 and ~38 inches in photo 3. Of course, using a larger "wheel" means scaling the distances to larger values. The fact that the object in #1 seems as focused as in #2 and #3, yet would only be about 2 feet from the camera if it were as small as 1-1/3 inches, suggests a bigger "wheel" further away. So does, as I discuss below, the need to push a model further away by at least 3 inches, to keep its shadow on the windshield out of the picture.

I'm surprised at where the positions of the camera in photos 2

and 3 are turning out to be. It's pretty close to the following. The camera was 1 inch behind the right edge of the passenger window in #2 and only 26+ inches from the lower part of the window (remember that the top of the window and car is tilted in 2-3 inches, so I'm referencing everything to the bottom, inner part of the window). Surprisingly in photo 3, the camera is 2 inches further right or behind the window and 4 inches closer to the window, or only about 22 inches away. This means that Heflin was actually about 12% closer to the door/window in #3 than the 5% we previously thought. (Perspective is tricky.) To compensate, any model in photo #3 has to be about 4 inches further away from the car, than in photo #2 (assuming a 1-1/3" model), or about 1 foot away from the bottom of the window, vs. about 8" for photo #2. The top of the side mirror mount, to scale things, is sticking out only about 6" beyond the window bottom.

To get photos 2 & 3, Heflin would have to slide over to the right 2+ feet and be sitting on the top of the motor, which sat between the driver and passenger seats in these 1960s Ford Econoline vans.

>>There is also some interesting banding in photo 2 that might  
>>also suggest nearness. E.g., some darker regions on the left of  
>>the close-up object of photo 2 could correspond to a reflection  
>>of the power pole about 20 feet in front of and to the right of  
>>the van, which show up in the ray-traced reproduction. Another  
>>could correspond to a hypothetical suspension pole on the van  
>>holding up a model outside the window. There are no  
>>corresponding bands in a ray-tracing saucer off in the distance  
>>over the field.

>These density variations are subtle. But what about the much  
>more definite darkening on the lower left edge of the flange  
>which looks as though the bottom disc is mis-shapen. If this is  
>a reflection, does it correspond with the roof of the van maybe?

The tilt of the bottom on object #2 is such that it would reflect the underbrush next to the road. That could conceivably account for the mottled appearance when enhanced. The edge of the bottom "flange" is something else. The dark area towards the left corresponds to the top of the van above the passenger window, though to my knowledge, there was nothing dark about this. To the right of this area is the rest of the van top towards the reason, which for some reason is lighter in shade. Furthest to the right and left are reflected images of the sky.

I can get various "notching" effects along the bottom of the edge by beveling it. In effect, this creates another wide-angle panorama of things lower down. For a near model, what shows up on the bevel is very touchy, depending on the width and angle of the bevel. With a shallow bevel, a lot of features of the van show up; with a steeper one, it starts showing ground again. This is something I'll have to play with to see if I can reproduce reasonably closely the notching and shading of #2.

In contrast, ray-tracing a distant object doesn't tend to show such notching. On the other hand, all I have in my ray-tracing model out there at present is blank ground corresponding to the field area.

<snip>

>>We would also still have to account for the "smoke trail" seen  
>>in enhancements of the photo 3 object. Heflin would have to  
>>conceal something like a smoking cigarette stub on the back of a  
>>hoax model to maybe recreate this feature plus a suggestion of  
>>rising smoke in photo 2, then mention nothing about it later,  
>>such as dropping hints like, "I am quite sure I saw smoke coming  
>>off the object when I shot photos 2 & 3.

>I agree with your subtext, which is that this is pretty  
>implausible. It would be easier to think that the "trail" was  
>made with oily smudges on the window glass, or even that it was  
>a fortuitous emulsion blemish of some kind. The latter may seem  
>incredible, but is not ruled out. There is nothing in the JSE  
>paper that describes any close examination of the print  
>emulsion.

Smudges on the glass is not likely, as they would show up in

both photos. Also, there is a question of focus, since the distance is only 2 feet from the camera.

Fortuitous emulsion blemishes also seem extremely unlikely, both from a photographic standpoint and also the amazing coincidence with Heflin's backstory of what happened.

If the smoke is there and this is a hoax, then I think the most likely explanation is Heflin deliberately put it there. But how? Like many details in a hoax scenario, how it was carried off is not obvious. Part of cigarette would be difficult to conceal and also throw the balance off. A small match wouldn't burn long enough, unless Heflin had a confederate. Otherwise, he would have to race back into camera position after lighting the match. Maybe something like a smoking piece of incense stick? That might burn long enough, but again there are balance and suspension issues plus Heflin (sans confederate) racing back and forth to set things up on his model, then get back into position to take his photos.

There are lots of little details like this that would need to be worked out. Hiding shadows from suspension rods and keeping shadows of the model off the windows would be a problem, and ray-tracing reveals it is not a trivial one. E.g., to keep a model from casting a shadow on the windshield in photo #1, it would have to be at least 3 more inches away from the glass. If Heflin used a single point suspension, then a rod has to be angled way up in the air to keep it from casting a shadow in the window in photos 2 & 3. It may not be possible to keep the shadow out of the way in photo #1 (haven't worked it out yet). Double suspension (as suggested by Victor), is a possibility, but a more elaborate hoax. Hiding a suspension rod hanging off the roof to Heflin's right in photos 2 & 3 is very difficult. The side view mirror would reveal such a rod in most positions if it was hanging off the roof. The only position I've found that wouldn't show up in the mirror is the window post just behind the front window, but changing sun angles would have given Heflin only a few minutes of shooting "window", else the shadow of the rod would start to creep onto the passenger window again.

Another possibility would be to poke some poles into the dirt beyond the range of the camera view and the side mirror. Sure this can be done, but again the hoax becomes more elaborate. Heflin would almost certainly have had to have tried a few "dry runs," realized the problems with the tell-tale shadows, and experimented with how to get rid of them. This would also have to take into account the angle of the sun when he shot the photos near noon (and least in photo 1). It's all very complicated, and I have yet to work out scenarios in which a hoax like this might have been pulled off.

If Heflin was hoaxing, there were ways he could have pulled off the hoax that would have been a lot easier, such as rolling down his passenger side window to prevent shadowing of a support pole, or turning his van in a different direction, or choosing a different time of day.

>Incidentally, I'm told that certain model locomotives with drive  
>wheels of the type resembling (generally) Heflin's object were  
>sold with a system for blowing "smoke rings" from the funnel  
>(stack) using chemical pellets, the implication being that this  
>may have given a hoaxer the idea of a connection between an  
>airshow smoke ring and a train wheel 'UFO'. Are there any  
>railway modellers out there who can comment on this? I recall  
>Hornby OO locomotives from the late 1960s that seeped whisps of  
>white smoke, but I don't recall "smoke rings" as such.

My Lionel train was one of those "smokers." I think it used little camphor pellets that were heated up, then a small bellows pushed the "smoke" out. I don't remember it blowing "smoke rings" either. Saying that Heflin got the idea of his hoax from a smoker model train seems like another one of those skeptical stretches of imagination.

Also what air show was Heflin's smoke ring supposed to come from? I used to attend a fair number of air shows back in those days, complete with bombing, and don't remember a single smoke ring. Somehow Heflin supposedly not only films such an air show smoke ring, but then manages to integrate it perfectly into a UFO photo hoax, including matching up a power line wire and some orange tree branches near his UFO photo hoax location to the

photo of his air show smoke ring presumably taken somewhere else.

>>My mind continues to go back and forth as to whether this is a  
>>hoax or not. I'll let the group know if I find something more  
>>conclusive.

>Mine too.

Getting numerous subtle details right and consistent would seem to argue against a hoax. On the other hand, the ray-tracing suggests reflections off the object might be more consistent with a model rather than a distant object. That's where I stand now, on the fence.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Check Your Site Statistics For Hong Kong

From: **Larry Hatch** <[larryhatch.nul](mailto:larryhatch.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 01:28:01 -0700  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 11:54:00 -0400  
Subject: Check Your Site Statistics For Hong Kong

Hello all:

Anybody with a UFO related website should check their access\_log files for hits from this outfit in Hong Kong:

<http://www2.discuss.com.hk/viewthread.php?tid=1787616&page=1&extra=page=1>

They took the liberty of hot-linking not one, but 17 (seventeen) of my map images, with no credits, no links back to my site, and leaving me to pay for the bandwidth (This is China, mind you. Lots of UFO interested people.)

Geez. I thought my little site suddenly got popular. Instead, the sightings maps are being used to sell all sorts of stuff I can't decipher.

BTW: If you visit too late, the maps won't show at all. I'm going to use .htaccess to ban that whole domain from my site entirely, and sooner rather than later.

If it was just one image, I could swap in a smaller one. I kinda like Spongebob Squarepants, but not 17 times over.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: SETI & CSICOP - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 22:08:05 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 11:49:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP - Golubik

>From: Stanton Friedman <[fsphys.nul](mailto:fsphys.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 10:05:48 -0300  
>Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 11:42:10 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: SETI & CSICOP

>>>From: Greg Taylor <[greg.nul](mailto:greg.nul)>  
>>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:51:23 +1000  
>>>Subject: SETI & CSICOP

>>>Hi all,

>>>Thought I would forward on my most recent column for our free  
>>>online magazine Sub Rosa

>>><http://subrosa.dailygrail.com>

>>><snip>

>>>In his view, SETI is popular  
>>>because of its quasi-religious features; perhaps there are  
>>>benevolent 'beings' out there, more advanced than us, who have  
>>>>wondrous things to show us - it's interesting to note the lack of  
>>>concern in SETI circles about the dangers posed by contacting an  
>>>alien civilisation.

>>>Just a quick two cents about this notion. If you ignore the UFO  
>>>and channeling evidence, and go along with the "Fermi Paradox"  
>>>assumption that we have not had contact with ET civilizations,  
>>>perhaps the most compelling reason why that's happened is that  
>>>all the civilizations that managed to survive were smart enough  
>>>to \_shut up\_ and not make their presence known until they knew  
>>>what, if anything, was out there.

>>>If Nature as we know it extends past our planetary boundaries,  
>>>who knows what kind of vicious and nasty predatory species are  
>>>out there, equally stealthy, waiting for a telltale radio signal  
>>>like a bobber on the end of a fishing line?

>>>Enrico Fermi did not say nobody was visiting.

>>>After a discussion at lunch in which it was agreed that it  
>>>wouldn't take too many million years for the whole galaxy to be  
>>>colonized, he asked the sensible question "So where is  
>>>everybody?".

>>>Obviously there are many possible answers.

>>>Fermi was well know for asking questions as an important part of  
>>>teaching.

>>>One answer is that they are all over the place and the  
>>>government knows they are, and doesn't want to let anybody know  
>>>because it would mean a loss of power and others might find out



>about their technology.

>Another answer is that they have bases on asteroids or the back  
>side of the moon or on other satellites.

>Another is they are quarantining us to make sure we don't escape  
>to attack out there; or There are rules about colonizing planets  
>on which there is already a civilization, primitive though it  
>may be, etc., etc., etc.

It might be interesting to discover that many have debated and  
speculated upon life elsewhere.

A real great read for all those interested is available in  
paperback. In 1998, I could only find this book in just a few  
public libraries.

The Extraterrestrial Life Debate, 1750-1900  
by Michael J. Crowe

Enjoy...

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 08:29:25 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 15:33:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos - Golubik

>From: David Rudiak <[drudiak.nul](mailto:drudiak.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 17:07:52 -0700  
>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](mailto:Diverge247.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:22:58 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: The Truth About the Heflin Photos

If I didn't make that offer as clear as I could have then I apologise. I recalled being very open about sharing one. You and Martin were working together and I was new on the list. If you still want one let me know? I was surprised not to have gotten a response from him... that's all? That he never would have brought that up with you in all that time.

I think it best that we don't side-tracked any further and move on to better things. It all sounds good to me. Best to wait and compare notes too.

I work long hours and have to measure my time accordingly and carefully.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Shough

From: **Martin Shough** <[parcellular.nul](mailto:parcellular.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 15:53:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 15:35:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Shough

>From: Don Ledger <[dledger.nul](mailto:dledger.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 13:33:47 -0300  
>Subject: Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

>>From: Tim Shell <[tshell.nul](mailto:tshell.nul)>  
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>>Date: Wed, 28 Jun 2006 11:30:03 -0500 (CDT)  
>>Subject: Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

>>>From: Dirk Vander Ploeg <[publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.nul)>  
>>>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:56:00 -0400  
>>>Subject: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

>>>Source: UFO Digest.Com - Hamilkton, Ontario, Canada

>>><http://www.ufodigest.com/beeston.html>

>>>27 June 2006

>>>[Images at site]

>>>Another UFO Caught Accidentally by Digital Camera

>>>Date: May 1, 2006  
>>>Location: Beeston, Nottingham, England.  
>>>Witness Account: Adrian P.

>>>Received an email from Adrian P. on June 26, 2006. He was  
>>>walking his dog along with his girl friend in Beeston, which is  
>>>South-East of Nottingham, England.

>>>They had decided to take her new digital camera and try it out.  
>>>The actual photo was taken on Monday May 1, 2006.

>>>The photo is quite striking. The object to the right of the  
>>>church spire is very prominent and one wonders how the object  
>>>was not seen when first shot. One possible explanation is that  
>>>the craft was moving so quickly the human eye could not perceive  
>>>it. Another more easily acceptable reason is that the particular  
>>>view finder on the camera simple didn't show the entire panormal  
>>>of the scene. That is it only showed the center object in the  
>>>view finder.

>Hate to say it, but to me it looks like a bird. Probably not a  
>pelican, but some kind of flying fowl. Why it wasn't seen when  
>the photo was taken is best explained by the fact that we tend  
>to ignore ordinary things, like birds, most of the time. Only  
>later, when the photo is viewed, and there's an unexpected shape  
>on it, do we take notice. There are probably a lot of birds in  
>this area, by the river.

>>Birds move pretty fast, and tend to blur with these digital  
>cameras, which have remarkably slow shutter speeds. This shape  
>is relatively consistent with that of other photos of birds  
>taken by digital cameras. Head, tail, body, wings/wing shadows.

>Come on Tim,

>If you are going to come up with an explanation, let's have  
>something a little less silly.

Don

Why is this so silly? My own first impression was the same:  
"Looks like a bird." I don't have any proof that it's a bird,  
but it could easily be.

In the Heflin case the object 'looks like' a wheel or whatever,  
but that isn't good enough. There it's worth expending some  
energy to check it because of the amount of information -  
multiple photographs, eyewitness report, circumstantial evidence  
etc. But even in that case it isn't "silly" to say that it looks  
like a wheel, and could be. It is a conjecture.

In this case we only have a single isolated photo and no  
eyewitness report. It looks like a possible bird. It could be a  
bird. Given the limited informatio that's a reasonable  
conjecture IMO. Can you falsify it?

Martin

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial -

From: Greg Boone <[Evolbaby.nul](mailto:Evolbaby.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 08:57:04 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 15:39:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial -

>From: Eleanor White <[eleanor.nul](mailto:eleanor.nul)>  
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)  
>Date: Thu, 29 Jun 2006 17:05:30 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial

>><http://news.scotsman.com/latest.cfm?id=947932006>

>>Thursday, 29th June 2006

>>Conspiracy Theorists Unmoved By UFO Denial  
>>By Sven Nordenstam

><snip>

>>If there are alien visitors, "the lack of artefacts is a  
>>significant mystery", meaning they must either have completely  
>>accident-proof vehicles, or have mastered teleportation and be  
>>able to scoop up debris, the report said.

>I wonder why all commentators who state there are no artifacts  
>always avoid mentioning the other possibility - that artifacts  
>are swiftly and systematically confiscated. I also wonder why  
>skeptics consider that impossible.

Well said Eleanor White.

I remember the artifact debate I had years ago. I too was perplexed as to why no undisputable physical evidence.

I was aware of trace cases as I had been to several and have samples in my possession. Then one day a friend came over and tried to use one of my samples, a piece of metal as a tool. I realized that sometimes people don't know what they're doing and we don't label things 'UFO Evidence Exhibit A'. Also, I recall a common chuckle at the city desk of a newspaper I worked at was when sherrif's investigators or museum curators would show up at someone's house because some odd object often used as a doorstop or paperweight turned out to be a live ammunition piece or a rare bone fragment or some lost piece of technology from one of the high end labs in the region.

Everything from old cannonballs encased in sediment people thought were rocks and made good doorsteps or conversation pieces to rare mammoth teeth.

The assumption these alien craft crashes aren't frequent and numerous but having occurred for centuries may mean there are pieces all over. Some as yet undiscovered and some discovered yet unclassified and some in the possession of archivists unaware of their origin. I have several friends who work at major museums who have told me of immense files of forgotten, unattended to, and unclassified artifacts. Not enough manpower to go through them all and many discoveries going back hundreds of years still unattended and needing re-examination.

For sure there're artifacts collected by the authorities and by visitors themselves. Even if one did have an artifact how to go about getting it verified? There's no one you can trust that the

press and authorities wouldn't try to invalidate in a heartbeat. We can't trust our press and I'm certain, in the not too distant future documents regarding the press's dirty laundry with the intelligence communities will emerge. Then as soon as they realize the game is up they'll rat each other out.

Something will break eventually. More than likely from a private collection. Best we can do is wait and watch.

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](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [2006](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

## Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Burns

From: Max Burns <[max.burns.nul](mailto:max.burns.nul)>  
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 16:06:15 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jun 2006 15:56:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo - Burns

>From: Dirk Vander Ploeg <[publisher.nul](mailto:publisher.nul)>  
>To: <[ufoupdates.nul](mailto:ufoupdates.nul)>  
>Date: Tue, 27 Jun 2006 14:56:00 -0400  
>Subject: Nottinghamshire UK UFO Photo

>Source: UFO Digest.Com - Hamilkton, Ontario, Canada

><http://www.ufodigest.com/beeston.html>

>27 June 2006

>[Images at site]

>Another UFO Caught Accidentally by Digital Camera

>Date: May 1, 2006  
>Location: Beeston, Nottingham, England.  
>Witness Account: Adrian P.

EBK, Listerians,

I live within a few miles of where the picture was taken. I am going to try and interview the guy myself and will report the full text of my recorded interview with the man - if he agrees to meet with me.

I'm in the process of moving house so am too busy for the next few days.

I didn't think it looked like a bird.

Max

[ [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)